

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 8, 1957

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

Almighty God, under the all-embracing canopy of Thy goodness and mercy which have followed us all the days of our lives, we come as children in our Father's house. Beneath all diversities of gifts, of tasks, of backgrounds and tradition, we seek the common unity which, beneath superficialities, binds us together with the cords of Thy brooding love that faileth never. Turning aside from all the divisive forces in the world about us, which tear and separate and push apart, we would bow in penitence at the altar of the one God whose love shed abroad in our hearts alone can send us out on our differing and often our difficult paths, hoping all things, believing all things, enduring all things. May the assurance that the kindly light will lead us on, rid our hearts now, we beseech Thee, of all vain anxieties and paralyzing fears. As we face yet another week, give us cheerful and buoyant spirits and peace in doing Thy will. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 4, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were 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 a bill (H. R. 6287) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6287) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BUSH, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Fred A. Bantz, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy, vice Raymond Fogler, resigned;

Donald A. Quarles, of New Jersey, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense, vice Reuben B. Robertson, Jr.;

James H. Douglas, of Illinois, to be Secretary of the Air Force, vice Donald A. Quarles;

Gen. Nathan F. Twining, United States Air Force, for appointment as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff;

Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, United States Navy, for appointment as Chief of Naval Operations, Department of the Navy; and

Gen. Thomas D. White, United States Air Force, for appointment as Chief of Staff, Department of the Air Force.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the nomination of Vice Adm. Austin K. Doyle to be a vice admiral while serving as commander of our defense command on Formosa; Vice Adm. Roscoe H. Hillenkoetter to be placed on the retired list in the grade of vice admiral; Rear Adm. George W. Anderson, Jr., to be a vice admiral while serving as chief of staff and aide to the commander in chief of the Pacific fleet, and Rear Adm. Donald B. Duncan for appointment to the grade of admiral on the retired list. I ask that these nominations be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. JACKSON. In addition to the above, I report favorably a group of promotions in the Regular Air Force in the grade of lieutenant colonel and below, and a group of appointments and promotions in the Navy and Marine Corps in the grade of captain and below. All of these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Washington.

The nominations are as follows:

Elery David Preston, Jr., and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Air Force; and

John H. Thomas (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be an ensign in the Navy, and Henry Santina, and sundry other civilian college graduates, for appointment in the Medical Corps of the Navy.

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

Ben Peterson, of Idaho, to be United States attorney for the district of Idaho, vice Sherman F. Furey, Jr., resigned;

Anthony Julian, of Massachusetts, to be United States attorney for the district of Massachusetts;

Frank O. Bell, of California, to be United States marshal for the northern district of California; and

Robert W. Ware, of California, to be United States marshal for the southern district of California.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

UNITED NATIONS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Stanley C. Allyn, of Ohio, to be the representative of the United States of America to the 12th session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

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

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Francis H. Russell, of Maine, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to New Zealand.

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

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Alan T. Waterman, of Connecticut, to be Director of the National Science Foundation for a term of 6 years.

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

NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Orman W. Ketcham, of Maryland, to be judge of the juvenile court for the District of Columbia, for a term of 6 years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, by request, I ask that this nomination be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be passed over.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Katherine Brownell Oettinger, of Massachusetts, to be Chief of the Children's Bureau, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

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

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the

postmaster nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the postmaster nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour, for the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business. In that connection, I ask unanimous consent that statements be limited to 3 minutes.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT OF UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the United States Soldiers' Home, for the fiscal year 1956, and a report of the general inspection of the Home, 1956, by the Inspector General of the Army (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 15, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL ACT

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 15 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AUDIT REPORT ON AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM SERVICE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Agricultural Conservation Program Service, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON BURNS CREEK DAM, POWERPLANT, AND RESERVOIR, PALISADES PROJECT, IDAHO

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the Burns Creek dam, powerplant, and reservoir, Palisades project, Idaho (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CONTRACT FOR TEMPORARY OPERATION OF MCKINLEY PARK HOTEL, MOUNT MCKINLEY NATIONAL PARK, ALASKA

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a contract negotiated with

National Park Concessions, Inc., for the temporary operation of the McKinley Park Hotel, Mount McKinley National Park, Alaska, covering the period May 14 to September 30, 1957 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

NOTICE TO UNITED STATES COURTS OF APPEALS IN CERTAIN CASES

A letter from the Acting Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for reasonable notice of applications to the United States courts of appeals for interlocutory relief against the orders of certain administrative agencies (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

UNIFORMITY OF LAW RELATING TO RECORD ON REVIEW OR ENFORCEMENT OF CERTAIN ORDERS

A letter from the Acting Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the abbreviation of the record on the review or enforcement of orders of administrative agencies by the courts of appeals and the review or enforcement of such orders on the original papers and to make uniform the law relating to the record on review or enforcement of such orders, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

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

GRANTING TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered, granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

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

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT, RELATING TO PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN CHEMICAL ADDITIVES IN FOOD

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use in food of chemical additives which have not been

adequately tested to establish their safety (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Resolution requesting enactment of area development legislation now being considered in the Congress of the United States.

"Whereas a high and stable level of employment and prosperity is vital to the best interests of Minnesota and the United States; and

"Whereas, many communities and areas in Minnesota need and want expanded development of their local resources to alleviate unemployment and underemployment to secure their fair share of our national income; and

"Whereas the area development bill, S. 964, now being considered by the Congress of the United States is written to provide for the elimination of unemployment and underemployment and to obtain the policies and purposes set out above: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives, That the Congress be requested to support and enact the area development bill S. 964; Be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house of representatives be instructed to transmit copies of the resolution to the chief officers of the Congress of the United States.

"A. I. JOHNSON,

"Speaker, House of Representatives.

"I hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of Legislative Resolution 13, which was passed by the house of representatives on the 3d day of April 1957.

"G. H. LEAHY,

"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

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

"Senate Joint Resolution 73

"Resolution relative to the development of navigable waterway connecting the Tombigbee and Tennessee Rivers by the construction of a canal in the State of Mississippi

"Whereas our sister States, the State of Mississippi and the State of Alabama, are contemplating the execution of an interstate compact looking to the development of a navigable waterway connecting the Tombigbee and Tennessee Rivers by way of the east fork of the Tombigbee River and Mackeys and Yellow Creeks, so as to provide a 9-foot navigable channel from the junction of Tombigbee and Warrior Rivers at Demopolis, in the State of Alabama, to the junction of Yellow Creek with the Tennessee River at Pickwick Pool, in the State of Mississippi, a development which will be of much economic benefit to the State of Tennessee when it is completed; and

"Whereas the State of Tennessee has a vital interest in the development contemplated and gives wholehearted support to the promotion of this undertaking: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee (both houses concurring), That this body hereby records its approval and endorsement of the proposed undertaking and joins with the legislatures of the State of Mississippi and the State of Alabama in urging the Congress of the United States to

provide the financial systems necessary to enable the Corps of Engineers to undertake and complete this project, and respectfully requests the members of the Tennessee congressional delegation to aid and assist in every possible way to bring about this development at the earliest possible date.

"This body further respectfully requests the President of the United States to consider the urgency and importance of this project and to give encouragement to its undertaking.

"Resolved also, That the secretary of state of the State of Tennessee be directed to send a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to each member of the Tennessee congressional delegation, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the President of the Senate of the United States, and to the Governors of the States of Mississippi and Alabama.

"Adopted March 21, 1957.

"JARED MADDUX,
"Speaker of the Senate.

"JAMES L. BOMAR,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Approved March 29, 1957.

"FRANK G. CLEMENT,
"Governor."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Concurrent Resolution 30

"Whereas there are five proposed amendments to the Constitution of the United States pending before the Congress which, if proposed to the States for ratification, would give an opportunity to bring about certain reforms in Constitution; and

"Whereas the Byrd-Bridges amendment would require annual budget balancing by limiting congressional expenditures in any fiscal year to the estimated receipts of the Government for that fiscal year, except in times of dire emergency to be determined by three-fourths vote of the Congress; and

"Whereas the Reed-Dirkson amendment would limit the top rate of income taxes, but would permit Congress to exceed the limit by a three-fourths vote, and would return to the States the sole right to tax inheritance and gifts; and

"Whereas the Mundt-Coudert amendment would take away the excessive power now exercised by the minority groups in larger cities under the present electoral college system, by requiring the choosing of electors by congressional districts plus two at large to correspond with each State's two United States Senators; and

"Whereas the Reed-Walter amendment would give to 36 States the full power to amend the Constitution without the intervention of Congress; and

"Whereas the Bricker amendment would prevent the overriding of our Constitution and our domestic laws by means of the treaty power; and

"Whereas it is believed that the aforementioned proposed amendments should be submitted to the several States in order that the States might have an opportunity to ratify or reject the same: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 61st General Assembly of the State of Arkansas (the Senate concurring therein):

"SECTION 1. That the General Assembly does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to submit the aforementioned proposed amendments to the Constitution of the United States to the States for ratification or rejection.

"SEC. 2. That the secretary of state, upon the adoption of this resolution, furnish a copy of the same to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of

Representatives of the United States Congress and to each member of the Arkansas congressional delegation.

"NATHAN GORDON,
"President of the Senate.
"GLENN F. WALTHER,
"Speaker.
"ARTHUR SHIREY, JR.,
"Secretary.
"_____
"Governor."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Joint Resolution 15

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to enact H. R. 5134, a bill to provide assistance to the States in the construction, modernization, additions, and improvements of domiciliary and hospital buildings of State veterans' homes by a grant to subsidize, in part, the capital-outlay cost

"Whereas there is an alarming shortage of hospital and domiciliary beds in California provided by the United States Veterans' Administration for veterans of all wars; and

"Whereas the ever-increasing migration of veterans into California from every State in the Nation has brought here hundreds upon hundreds of thousands of veterans; and

"Whereas the veterans' population of California stands today as one of the largest, if not the largest, in the United States; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has recognized assistance given by the States in their care for thousands of disabled war veterans through Federal-aid subsidies in part payment for day-by-day operating expenses to maintain establishments for the care of such veterans; and

"Whereas a master building program of the Veterans' Home of California ultimately will provide hospital and domiciliary beds for 3,300 disabled California veterans; and

"Whereas the construction of 4 new buildings containing 800 beds for such purposes will be urgently needed in the next few years; and

"Whereas financial assistance in part will be needed from the Federal Government for construction of these buildings: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the legislature of this State respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation and appropriate moneys as proposed in H. R. 5134, 85th Congress, 1st session, which provides States with Federal aid in part for construction, modernization, additions, and improvements of State-operated soldiers' homes; and be it further

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

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 4

"Joint resolution relative to construction, operation, and maintenance of the western land boundary fence

"Whereas the livestock fence between the Republic of Mexico and the several southwestern border States is either nonexistent or is in a state of disrepair, allowing almost unimpeded crossing of farm livestock, thereby preventing detection and inspection; and

"Whereas Mexican cattle crossed the international border in Marron Valley, San Diego County, some time last summer and infested the area with Texas fever ticks which later infested California cattle, necessitating the

owner of the California cattle having to treat his cattle at intervals of 14 days for a period of approximately 1 year, thus creating great expense to this owner; and

"Whereas most of the area on the American side of the border is engaged in the livestock business, with an investment of many millions of dollars; and

"Whereas it is of the greatest importance to the American livestock industry to prevent the entrance of animals infested or infected with potentially serious pests or diseases: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to pass legislation for accomplishing the rebuilding and maintenance of the international boundary fence between the United States and Mexico, in the interest of protecting the livestock industry in the Southwestern United States against inroads of diseases and pests harbored by drifting farm animals not now subject to restraint and inspection; and be it further

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

"Assembly Joint Resolution 19

"Joint resolution relative to the maintenance of a 24-hour patrol along the United States-Mexico border

"Whereas there are periods of each day when there is no patrol guarding the border between the United States and Mexico; and

"Whereas the lack of such patrol on a 24-hour basis permits the entrance into this State of much illegal contraband; and

"Whereas this contraband includes those deadly narcotics which have become a leading cause of juvenile delinquency and crime in this Nation; and

"Whereas the maintenance of a 24-hour patrol would help the agricultural and livestock industries of this Nation by preventing entrance into this country of animals and plants infested with parasites and infectious diseases which cause enormous financial losses to our farmers and ranchers; and

"Whereas it would appear more economical to prevent the entrance of unauthorized persons rather than to spend large sums to apprehend and return such illegal entrants: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to pass legislation requiring that the patrol of the United States-Mexico border be maintained on a 24-hour-a-day basis; and be it further

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

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 8

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress with regard to lands under the jurisdiction of the United States Bureau of Land Management

"Whereas it is deemed to the best advantage of the people of the State of California that areas of substantial magnitude be developed for recreational purposes, particu-

larly in some of the more arid sections of the State; and

"Whereas much of these lands are in the public domain under the control of the United States Bureau of Land Management; and

"Whereas Public Law 387, chapter 263, 83d Congress, second session, which amends the Recreation Act of June 14, 1926, authorizes the sale of no more than 640 acres annually to the State for recreational purposes, or the lease of such lands to the State for a consideration to be determined by the Secretary of the Interior based upon the purpose for which the lands may be used, or are to be used; and

"Whereas the Secretary of the Interior is not privileged to convey lands to the State for recreation purposes through the medium of a long-term lease agreement or use permit: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to give consideration to legislation to amend the Recreation Act of June 14, 1926, as amended June 4, 1954, to permit the Secretary of the Interior, upon a determination of need by the public and upon appropriate application from an authorized State representative, to enter into lease agreements or issue long-term use permits for a period of up to 50 years, or, upon application by the State to purchase, to remove the acreage limitation and permit the State to acquire by outright purchase the lands required for recreational purposes; and be it further

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

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

Assembly Joint Resolution 11

"Joint resolution relative to funds for protection of the national forests

"Whereas the forests of California besides offering millions of acres of virgin timber also contain the largest and oldest of living things on this earth; and

"Whereas the forests of California provide not only the millions of people resident of this State but also the thousands of visitors to this State unequaled recreational playgrounds; and

"Whereas, unless proper protection is given the millions of acres of timberland in California which presently provide these benefits as well as providing billions of board-feet of lumber necessary to our rapidly growing State, forest fires can easily destroy in a single year the product of decades of growth and deprive our future generation of a priceless heritage; and

"Whereas the burning of our forests not only destroys the trees but also endangers the entire State through the loss of watershed, floods, and erosion, which can entirely devastate the areas involved; and

"Whereas the Forest Service of the United States Department of Agriculture, presently charged with protecting more than 20 million acres of forest lands, is greatly hampered by inadequate funds; and

"Whereas modern equipment has been developed which can be of immeasurable aid in combating forest fires such as mechanization of equipment, use of radio, helicopters and other aircraft, all of which require large expenditures; and

"Whereas the Forest Service is also charged with the responsibility of providing clean and sanitary facilities for use of visitors to

the forests, another needed undertaking which requires an ever-increasing amount of funds: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and Congress of the United States to increase the funds made available to the Forest Service of the United States Department of Agriculture for use in the State of California; and be it further

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

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

"Senate Joint Memorial 10

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; the Honorable Fred Seaton, Secretary of the Interior; the Honorable Ross L. Leffler, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fish and Wildlife; the Honorable James Murray, Chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the United States Senate; the Honorable Clair Engle, Chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives; the Honorable Waino Hendrickson, Acting Governor of Alaska; the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress from Alaska, and to the United States Congress:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 23d session assembled, respectfully represents that—

"Whereas when the Original Thirteen Colonies banded together to create a union of States and to formulate a Constitution, certain powers were delegated to the Federal Government, while others were retained by the States; and

"Whereas among those powers retained was the control of the commercial fish resources, which were considered to be the property of the State and to be regulated for the benefit of all the people of the State; and

"Whereas every new State entering the Union did so on an equal basis with the older States and accordingly retained control of its commercial fish resources; and

"Whereas every Territory except one was also allowed to control these resources before becoming a State, this one exception being Alaska; and

"Whereas the people of the Territory of Alaska have time and again recorded their wish for control of their fisheries; and

"Whereas repeated legislation has been introduced in the Congress of the United States asking that the people of Alaska have extended to them the same right of control over commercial fisheries as has been granted and is enjoyed by the several States; and

"Whereas the Territorial legislature has created and appropriated moneys to a Territorial fisheries department and an Alaskan Fishery Board; and

"Whereas Alaska's fisheries, in the past, have suffered alarming depletion under Federal management, while those of neighboring jurisdictions have, under local control, steadily improved; and

"Whereas the Alaska Department of Fisheries has been functioning in an efficient manner for nearly 8 years and are able to expand and assume all duties and responsibilities incident to full control of the fisheries of Alaska; and

"Whereas it is an affront to the people of Alaska that their continued pleas for the right to manage and control their major industry and resource have gone unheeded;

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska in 23d session assembled, respectfully prays that the Congress of the United States, in accordance with the mandate of the people of Alaska, act at once to transfer control of the commercial fisheries of Alaska to the government of the Territory of Alaska.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"I hereby certify that the above and foregoing constitutes a full, true, and correct copy of Senate Joint Memorial 10 as passed by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska.

"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,

"Secretary of the Senate.

"I certify that the above is a full, true, and correct copy of Senate Joint Memorial 10.

"WAINO E. HENDRICKSON,

"Secretary of Alaska."

"Senate Joint Memorial 11

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America; the Congress of the United States; the Honorable Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior of the United States; and the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress from Alaska

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 23d session assembled, respectfully represents:

"Whereas sport fishing in the Territory of Alaska for grayling, trout, salmon, and other species of fish constitutes a valuable recreation for residents and nonresidents of the Territory; and

"Whereas hunting in Alaska for moose, caribou, deer, goat, sheep, grouse, ptarmigan, and other game animals and game birds, likewise, is a heartily enjoyed recreation for both residents and nonresidents of the Territory; and

"Whereas sport fishing and hunting offers some of the most important attractions for inducing people to make their permanent homes in Alaska; and

"Whereas one of the strongest enticements Alaska has to offer its tourists is the hunting and fishing found in the Territory; and

"Whereas the sport fish and game animals in the Territory have a tremendous aesthetic value to the sportsman, nature lover, and camera enthusiast; and

"Whereas sport fish and game animals in Alaska are in need of scientific study and management; and

"Whereas the 1949 session of the Territorial legislature, realizing, among other things, the value of sport fishing in the Territory, created an Alaska Fisheries Board and an Alaska Department of Fisheries; and

"Whereas the Alaska Fisheries Board initiated a sport fish division which is staffed with well-trained and experienced sport fish biologists who have amply demonstrated their ability in sport fish rehabilitation, research, and related projects during the past 6 years; and

"Whereas the 1957 session of the Territorial legislature created an Alaska Fish and Game Commission and an Alaska Department of Fish and Game which has the Territorial administration of all the fish and game resources of the Territory; and

"Whereas moneys collected from hunting and fishing license sales cannot be used for any other purpose than the administration of the sport fish and game resources of the Territory; and

"Whereas under the present Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U. S. C. A. 669 et seq.), commonly known as the Pittman-Robertson Act, and under the present Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act (16 U. S. C. A. 777 et seq.), commonly known as the Dingell-Johnson Act, funds allotted to Alaska are not given to the Territory, but to a Federal agency; and

"Whereas in the case of every other Territory and possession (Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands) these funds are given to the local agency:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska in 23d session assembled, respectfully urges that the Congress of the United States amend the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U. S. C. A. 689 et seq.), and the Federal Aid Fish Restoration Act (16 U. S. C. A. 777 et seq.) to authorize the Secretary of the Department of the Interior to cooperate with the Territory of Alaska by allotting Alaska's share of these Federal funds for the conduct of sport fish and game restoration to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the senate March 14, 1957.

"VICTOR C. RIVERS,

"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,

"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed by the house March 21, 1957.

"RICHARD J. GREUEL,

"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"DOLORES D. GOAD,

"Chief Clerk of the House."

A resolution of the Senate of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Memorial 9

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America; the Congress of the United States of America; the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Senate of the Territory of Alaska, in 23d regular session assembled, respectfully represents:

"Whereas the extraction of Alaska's vast natural resources and the establishment of industry and commerce in the Territory of Alaska, are in their infancy; and

"Whereas the initial cost of development is always substantial, and such cost in Alaska is exceptionally high because of the long distances that most capital equipment must be shipped, the heavy Federal taxes, and because employers in Alaska are required to pay the highest rate of unemployment compensation contributions of any Territory or State in the United States; and

"Whereas the Territorial legislature in past sessions has made every attempt to attract new industry and enterprise to Alaska by enacting tax exemptions as an incentive to development; and

"Whereas, if the Federal Government would incorporate the principle of reinsurance in financing in part the employment security program, the standing rate of employers' contributions to the Alaska unemployment compensation fund could be considerably reduced and Alaska's development would be greatly hastened to the benefit of all the citizens of the United States:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Senate of the Territory of Alaska in 23d regular session assembled, respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, legislation which would incorporate the principle of reinsurance as a means of enabling the Federal Government to assume its responsibility in financing in part the employment security program and thereby aiding the development of new industry and equalizing the tax burden among the States and Territories.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

A resolution of the Senate of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Senate Resolution 7

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the Territory of Alaska—

"Whereas the members of the Alaska Legislature have been informed that a statement

is being widely circulated among members of Congress that the Territorial legislature has indicated a desire to see legislation enacted excluding residents of the continental United States from participating in the Alaska Fishery; and

"Whereas such statement is wholly false, and the Territorial legislature has never by any act, resolve, petition, or statement evidenced a desire to exclude residents of the continental United States from participating in the Alaska Fishery; and

"Whereas although one house of the 1949 legislature evidenced a natural interest in full and fair employment for qualified Alaskan residents, this interest has never been directed toward denial of employment to nonresidents and cannot be construed as evidence of the attitude of the full 1949 legislature or of more recent legislatures; and

"Whereas later expressions of Alaska residents, and especially the recent constitutional convention, are a clear and manifest denial of the charge that the Alaska Legislature of the Alaskan people have any desire to exclude residents of the continental United States from participating in the Alaska fishery; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senate of the Territory of Alaska denies the false and misleading charge that the Legislature of Alaska has a desire to exclude residents of the continental United States from participation in the Alaska fishery; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, to the honorable members of the Senate Committee on Territorial and Insular Affairs, to the honorable members of the House Committee on Territorial and Insular Affairs, to the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT, Delegate to Congress from Alaska, to the Honorable William Egan and the Honorable Ernest Gruening, Tennessee plan Senators from Alaska, and to the Honorable Ralph Rivers, Tennessee plan Representative from Alaska. "Passed by the Senate March 26, 1957."

A resolution adopted by the Board of Chosen Freeholders, of Mercer County, N. J., favoring the enactment of legislation to increase the compensation of postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF VERMONT LEGISLATURE

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I present two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Vermont, received by me from the Secretary of State of Vermont, duly signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the Senate, and the Governor. One joint resolution relates to statehood for Alaska, and the other relates to statehood for Hawaii. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolutions be appropriately referred.

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

Joint resolution relating to admission of Alaska

Whereas we believe that all citizens shall have a voice in their own government; and

Whereas both major political parties, Republican and Democratic, have passed resolutions advocating the admission of the Territory of Alaska as a State; and

Whereas we believe that the admission of Alaska as a sister State will definitely enhance its development; and

Whereas the Territory of Alaska has already voted for and elected two Senators and

a Representative to represent it, when it shall have been admitted to statehood; and

Whereas a well developed Alaska is a vital factor to the security of our country. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That the General Assembly of the State of Vermont, in accord with its tradition of respect for the basic right of all citizens to have representation in their own government, urges the immediate admission of Alaska as one of the United States of America, and respectfully requests Vermont's representatives to the National Government to give full support to this admission.

CHARLES H. BROWN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

ROBERT T. STAFFORD,
President of the Senate.

Approved April 2, 1957.

JOSEPH B. JOHNSON,
Governor.

Joint resolution relating to statehood for Hawaii

Whereas in 1898 the Republic of Hawaii voluntarily agreed to annexation as an integral part of the United States and under the Organic Act of 1900 was incorporated as a Territory with the expectation that it would soon become a State; and

Whereas for over a half century the people of Hawaii have assumed the responsibilities of American citizenship, including the payment of taxes, while being deprived of many of the privileges of citizenship; and

Whereas Vermont, since the days when this State was a Republic, has always stood unwaveringly for the principles of representative government constitutionally guaranteed to the people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That the General Assembly of Vermont, consistent with Vermont's enjoyment of a 180-year tradition of constitutional representative government, urges that the Congress of the United States grant statehood to Hawaii during the current session of Congress, and respectfully requests Vermont's representatives to the National Government to support this admission; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be instructed to transmit to our Senators and Representative in Congress a copy of this resolution.

CHARLES H. BROWN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

ROBERT T. STAFFORD,
President of the Senate.

Approved April 2, 1957.

JOSEPH B. JOHNSON,
Governor.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF NEVADA LEGISLATURE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from J. E. Springmeyer, legislative counsel of the State of Nevada, together with a joint resolution of the Legislature of Nevada, relating to the slaughtering, packaging, handling, and sale of poultry and poultry products.

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

STATE OF NEVADA,
LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU,
Carson City, Nev., March 18, 1957.

The Honorable GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: You will find enclosed one copy of Assembly Joint Resolu-

tion 6 adopted by the assembly and the senate during the 48th session of Nevada Legislature.

Very truly yours,

J. E. SPRINGMEYER,
Legislative Counsel.

Assembly Joint Resolution 6

Memorializing the Congress of the United States to establish an effective system of Federal control of poultry slaughtering, packaging, handling, and sale, in a manner similar to the successful control of other meats

Whereas there is no compulsory Federal inspection and regulation of poultry slaughtering, handling, packaging, and sale, and but few States attempt to control this important food industry; and

Whereas sick and unclean poultry is being sold widely for public consumption in the United States with the possibility of spreading such diseases as parrot fever, Newcastle disease, encephalitis, and other diseases; and

Whereas the danger is vividly demonstrated by 106 seizure actions for the removal of unfit birds from the market by the Pure Food and Drug Administration as a result of a few spot checks during 1953 and 1954; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be urged to establish an effective system of Federal control of poultry slaughtering, packaging, handling, and sale, in a manner similar to the successful control of other meats, in order that the health of our people might be further protected; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution, duly certified, be transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of Nevada to the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, and to our Senators and Congressman in the Congress of the United States.

Adopted by the senate, March 13, 1957.

REX BELL,
President of the Senate.
H. E. ROWNTREE,
Secretary of the Senate.

Adopted by the assembly, February 18, 1957.

WM. D. SWACKHAMER,
Speaker of the Assembly,
C. O. BASTIAN,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
CHARLES H. RUSSELL,
Governor of the State of Nevada.

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MINN.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted on March 25 by the Board of County Commissioners of St. Louis County, Minn., which pertains to hearings before the Federal Power Commission on applications to extend natural gas into Minnesota.

I should like to add that hearings on the applications affecting Minnesota communities have now been set for May 14, 1957. This action came as a result of an order issued by the Federal Power Commission on March 30, 1957.

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

Resolved, That all Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Minnesota, are

hereby urgently requested to use their influence to expedite hearings by the Federal Power Commission on the application of the Northern Natural Gas Co. to furnish natural gas to various communities in the State of Minnesota.

PROPOSED VETERANS MEMORIAL BUILDING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the 1956 Convention of the National Department of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States, relating to the construction of a war memorial in the District of Columbia, in tribute to those who died in the Armed Forces. This project is now being considered by a Federal commission.

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

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED AT THE 1956 CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL DEPARTMENT OF THE CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS

Whereas a memorial building can be a fitting tribute to our war dead; and

Whereas Public Law 128 adopted in July 1955 created a Federal commission to present plans for the construction in Washington, D. C., of an auditorium which would include a fine arts and music center: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Catholic War Veterans petition the Federal commission that this auditorium be built as a Veterans Memorial Building, in tribute to those comrades of the Armed Forces who made the supreme sacrifice for the freedom and liberty of their fellow Americans.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF REFUGEES—RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Nassau County, New York, Council of Churches of Christ, in support of legislation for the admission of refugees from the Communist terror, particularly the Hungarian refugees.

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

REFUGEE LEGISLATION

Whereas with the termination of the Refugee Relief Act on December 31, 1956, and the radical decrease in United States admissions of Hungarian refugees, the urgent need for positive Congressional action is obvious if any continuation of a humanitarian program for the resettlement of refugees in the United States (both Hungarians and others) is to be possible; and

Whereas the President of the United States in his special message of January 31, 1957, recommended:

(a) Permanent authorization to admit refugees—both Hungarian and others in any like emergency in the future (approximately 67,000 per year);

(b) An overall increase in immigration admissions and a more flexible and equitable distribution of the additional and of unused quotas;

(c) The elimination of mortgaged quotas (under the DP program); and

(d) Provision for the admission of orphans for adoption; and

Whereas bills in line with the President's very constructive and timely message have been introduced in the House of Representatives (KEATING-HILLINGS) and in the Senate (WATKINS and others). In addition, Mr. CELLER has introduced a comprehensive bill revising the Immigration and Nationality Act. Mr. WALTER has introduced a bill in line with his promise at the conclusion of the 84th session, and others have introduced bills also; and

Whereas it is the considered concern of Protestant and Orthodox churches that there is urgent need for refugee legislation as expressed by the General Board of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States on December 4 and 5, 1956:

(a) The general board "expresses gratification for the administrative action of President Eisenhower in making possible the provisional entry of a considerable number of (Hungarian) refugees to the United States";

(b) "Viewing other present refugee problems and the possibility that still other emergencies may arise in days to come";

(c) "The general board believes that new legislation is needed. It is convinced that there is urgent need of new and early provision for visas for our fair share of the refugees, escapees, and orphans who need migration assistance";

(d) "We hold that prompt, adequate legislation for refugees would permit the performance of a Christian service; that it would be in the national interest; and that it would be an important contribution to better international relations"; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Nassau County, N. Y., Council of the Churches of Christ go on official record in support of the legislation that will accomplish the following objectives:

1. As a nation, we should complete the Hungarian program:

(a) By regularizing the status of the Hungarian refugees admitted on parole;

(b) By taking a further share of the some 70,000 Hungarians in Austria of whom approximately 50,000 cannot be integrated in Austria;

(c) By admitting a fair share of Hungarians who have gone to other countries of first asylum (Holland, Switzerland, etc.), especially when friends, relatives, or churches in the United States are ready to receive them;

(d) By admitting a fair share of about 20,000 Hungarian refugees who fled to Yugoslavia.

Unless prompt legislative action is taken, this great humanitarian program will fail—our churches cannot assist those needing to migrate and our foreign policy will suffer.

2. As a Nation we should keep our doors open to other refugees.

Hungarian escapees are not all! With the conclusion of the Refugee Relief Act, many thousands of refugees (in Europe, the Middle East, North Africa, and the Far East) have no hope of coming to the United States until Congress acts either (1) to revise the Immigration and Nationality Act or (2) by new emergency legislation. Many of these refugees have relatives or friends in the United States; for others our churches can provide resettlement opportunities.

3. In addition to our concern for refugees we should be ready to aid people in countries of overpopulation.

These people are not refugees but a real service can be rendered to "surplus" people in, e. g., Holland, Greece, and Italy; it will be a good-neighbor policy and will serve our own national interest.

**REPEAL OF SALES TAX ON FOOD
IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—
RESOLUTION**

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Petworth Citizens' Association, Inc., of the city of Washington, favoring the repeal of the sales tax on food bought in grocery stores in the District of Columbia.

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

**RESOLUTION FOR REPEAL OF SALES TAX ON FOOD
IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

Whereas there is pending in Congress Senate bill 1590, which, if enacted into law, would amend the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act so as to exempt from tax sales of food for human consumption off the premises where such food is sold; and

Whereas it is reported that but few large cities in the country impose a sales tax on foods for home consumption, nor do the nearby States of Maryland and Virginia, and as a result much District money is spent in those States for groceries; and

Whereas such a tax has never proven very popular wherever it has been tried, in that it is looked upon as being most burdensome on people who can least afford it, and often amounts to more than 3 cents on the dollar when purchases are small, and there is no uniform system among merchants in keeping record of their sales: Therefore be it

Resolved, by the Petworth Citizens' Association, Inc., in regular meeting this the 19th day of March 1957. That it does approve of the above-identified bill for the purposes as aforesaid; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Commissioners, the chairmen of both Houses of Congress on District of Columbia legislation, to Senators JAVITS and MORSE, and the Federation of Citizens' Associations.

MARION WEAVER,
President.

Attest:

FLORENCE V. CRAVER,
Secretary.

**NATIONAL SHELTER PROGRAM—
PETITION**

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I recently received a petition signed by more than 200 residents of Portland, Oreg., and expressing this group's belief that the United States should embark upon a national shelter program to protect United States citizens from possible atomic attack. The author of the petition, Mr. James Deer, a Portland physicist, is an active leader in the civil-defense program in my State.

The petitioners, while requesting that the Federal Government provide adequate protection for the Nation's civilian populace, point out that our ultimate goal must be the preservation of peace and strengthening of the United Nations.

Because I believe the suggestions of these civic-minded citizens of Portland should receive wider readership, I ask unanimous consent that the petition, together with a brief news release, summarizing its contents, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Armed Services; and the petition, together with

the news release, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, the undersigned, desire to express to you our great concern over the catastrophic situation of our Nation's defense. Information available to us indicates the following to be true:

1. The international situation is highly unstable. It is so unstable that recently H-bomb-bearing aircraft were kept in the air at all times, ready for instant and massive retaliation.

2. The potential enemy possesses hydrogen bombs, and the means to deliver them. It has been estimated that as many as 500 enemy bombers could penetrate our defenses.

3. If a surprise attack were made on the United States there might be little or no warning.

4. The radioactive fallout from an H-bomb makes evacuation highly questionable. It is said that an H-bomb can contaminate with lethal radioactivity an area 100 miles wide and 100 miles long.

5. The potential enemy either has or soon will have H-bomb-bearing intercontinental ballistic missiles.

6. The potential enemy is far ahead of us in the construction of shelters for his personnel.

7. The possibility must be faced that when the leaders of the potential enemy have achieved shelters for a certain percentage of their people, they may be willing to sacrifice the remainder in order to deliver a surprise attack on the United States. Their past performance has shown them to be ruthless killers.

The inevitable conclusion is forced upon us that either our national leaders are misrepresenting the need for H-bombs and guided missiles, or they are guilty of a heartless disregard for the safety of this country.

We believe that in the proposed Federal budget for fiscal year 1957-58, too much money is allotted for offense and not enough for defense. We, therefore, petition that you try to secure a more sensible distribution of available funds. The sum of \$38 billion for the military and \$5 billion for the AEC is too large, compared to the ridiculously small sum of \$130 million for civil defense. Whereas the former amounts to over \$200 for every person in the United States, the latter amounts to only about 80 cents per person.

We therefore propose that \$5 billion be taken off the military budget and \$1 billion off the AEC budget, and the \$6 billion thus saved be used to provide a more adequate civil defense, including a national shelter program. We propose that the Army, Navy, Air Force, and AEC be required to supply to the Civil Defense Administration, on a loan basis, qualified experts to see that a sound civil-defense plan is worked out. Scientists of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and AEC have shown remarkable ingenuity in the design of new weapons. We have confidence they will display the same ingenuity in the design of an adequate civil defense.

We request that adequate shelter be included in any new schoolbuildings built with Federal funds.

We request these measures for the safety of ourselves and our children.

We furthermore beseech you to work, with all the strength at your command, for a more powerful United Nations, capable of removing this dread menace from over the heads of ourselves and our loved ones.

NEWS RELEASE

PORLAND, OREG.—A national shelter program to protect the United States from atomic attack is proposed by a group of Portland citizens in a petition recently completed. Signed by a total of over 200 residents, the petition is directed to Congress, and expresses their great concern over the safety of this country.

The petitioners refer to recent testimony that the Russians are far ahead of the United States in the construction of shelters, and point out that the possibility must be faced that when the potential enemy leaders have achieved shelter for a certain percentage of their people, they may be tempted to sacrifice the rest in order to achieve a surprise blow against the United States.

A shelter program of some six billion dollars is requested by the petitioners, and they propose that if necessary this amount be taken off the budget of the AEC and the military.

The petition is sponsored by a group of 20 Portlanders, and is signed by 185 others. It was prepared by Jim Deer, Portland physicist.

Deer pointed out that such a program would have the following beneficial effects:

(1) It would greatly strengthen national security by bringing about a better balance between offense and defense.

(2) If carefully and wisely done, the buildings could be an asset to the community. In addition to being shelters, they could also serve normal peacetime functions such as libraries, hospitals, schoolrooms, gymnasiums, museums, and many others. He said it has repeatedly been shown that underground buildings are no more expensive than surface buildings.

(3) Such a program would mean that more of the defense dollar would be spent in the local community, through local building contractors.

Deer said that a shelter program is not a warlike move, because you cannot take a shelter and hit a man over the head with it or dump it out of an airplane. He said he and the sponsoring group are not supernationalists, but believe America must protect herself until international law and order can be brought about through a more powerful United Nations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

H. R. 4271. An act to provide that the Delegate from Alaska in the House of Representatives of the United States may be a member of the Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission (Rept. No. 211); and

H. Con. Res. 115. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (Rept. No. 212).

By Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

S. 1412. A bill to amend section 2 (b) of the Performance Rating Act of 1950, as amended (Rept. No. 214); and

S. 1521. A bill to exempt persons appointed to student trainee positions from the provisions of section 9 of the Civil Service Act prohibiting the employment in the classified service of more than two members of the same family (Rept. No. 215).

By Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with amendment:

S. 385. A bill to authorize the training of Federal employees at public or private facilities, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 213).

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. J. Res. 12. Joint resolution to provide for transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project and payment to Crow Indian Tribe in connection therewith, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 216).

By Mr. HOLLAND, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 1002. A bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to extend financial assistance to desert-land entrymen to the same extent as such assistance is available to homestead entrymen (Rept. No. 217).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 130. A bill for the relief of Frosso Spiliotou (Rept. No. 218);

S. 973. A bill for the relief of Yun Wha Yoon Holman (Rept. No. 219);

S. 1202. A bill for the relief of Arsene Kavookjian (Arsene Kavookjian) (Rept. No. 220);

S. 1212. A bill for the relief of Evangelos Demetre Kargiotis (Rept. No. 221).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 1360. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gerladine Elaine Sim (Rept. No. 222).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. REVERCOMB:

S. 1811. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to clarify the meaning of the term "disability" and thereby to effectuate the purpose intended by the Congress in enacting the provisions of such act which relate to the payment of disability insurance benefits; to the Committee on Finance; and

S. 1812. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce the coverage requirements upon which eligibility for disability insurance benefits thereunder is conditioned; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 1813. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, providing trustees for welfare funds for workers; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1814. A bill to provide for the transportation of household goods of military personnel and civilian employees of the uniformed services at Government expense under certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 1815. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Dilles; and

S. 1816. A bill for the relief of Harry H. Nakamura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1817. A bill for the relief of Alexander John Panagiotov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 1818. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain lands as an addition to the Fort Frederica National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 1819. A bill for the relief of Aris Veloudos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 1820. A bill to provide a minimum initial program of tax relief for small business and for persons engaged in small business; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 1821. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit the estate tax on the estates of deceased farmers to be paid in five annual installments; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself and Mr. FEAR):

S. 1822. A bill to establish procedure to be followed by Secretaries of the military departments for adjustment or settlement of claims of less than \$2,500 resulting from United States acquisition of land; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT, WITH ADDITIONAL COPIES, CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS OF INTERNAL SECURITY SUBCOMMITTEE OF JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, interest in the statement made by J. Edgar Hoover before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on March 12, 1957, regarding the true meaning of the recent convention of the Communist Party of the United States is so great that I am sending to the desk a resolution calling for the printing of the statement as a Senate document.

Demands on the original printing have exhausted the 9,000 copies the subcommittee received, and I am proposing that an additional 122,000 copies be printed for use of the subcommittee. Requests now on hand will absorb more than 99,000 copies.

I am informed by the Government Printing Office that the cost of the additional 122,000 copies will be \$9.79 per thousand, or a total of \$1,194.38.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 122), submitted by Mr. JENNER, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the proceedings of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on March 12, 1957, wherein the subcommittee received a statement of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, analyzing the 16th Annual Convention of the Communist Party of the United States, be printed as a Senate document.

Sec. 2. There shall be printed 122,000 additional copies of such Senate document for the use of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, two bills to amend the Social Security Act. The 84th Congress amended the act so that persons who became totally and permanently disabled would receive social security benefits at the age of 50. However, there has been such a strict construction of that amendment of the act, which I believe was enacted in 1956, that I feel it is necessary to clarify the provision dealing with persons permanently and totally disabled at the age of 50.

The first bill I introduce on the subject clarifies the meaning of the term "disability" and is designed to effectuate the purpose intended by the Congress in enacting the provisions of the act which relate to the payments for permanent and total disability at the age of 50.

The second bill I introduce proposes to amend the Social Security Act to reduce the coverage requirements; that is, it would reduce the number of weeks that persons who are entitled to receive social security benefits must have worked and contributed to the fund established under the act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared on the two bills be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

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

S. 1811. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to clarify the meaning of the term "disability" and thereby to effectuate the purpose intended by the Congress in enacting the provisions of such act which relate to the payment of disability insurance benefits; and

S. 1812. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce the coverage requirements upon which eligibility for disability insurance benefits thereunder is conditioned.

The statement presented by Mr. REVERCOMB is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR REVERCOMB

I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills relating to disability provisions under the Social Security Act.

The first bill would amend section 223 by redefining the term "disability"; and the second, an amendment to the same section, would extend disability coverage to any permanently disabled worker between the ages of 50 and 65 who has had at least one quarter of coverage under social security.

The need for these amendments is pressing, it seems to me, if we are to alleviate the hardship and misery visited upon those who by reason of physical or mental infirmities are unable to care for themselves.

During my previous term in the Senate, I introduced a bill providing for disability payments to workers of any age who become permanently disabled. That bill was not enacted into law at the time. Nevertheless, the last Congress, the 84th Congress, saw the wisdom of extending social-security benefits to permanently disabled workers of 50 or over who are covered by this act. However, the provisions of Public Law 880 relating to disability pensions are so rigid that many totally disabled workers are unable to qualify for much-needed benefits. I do not believe it was the intent of the 84th Congress to make it all but impossible for those unable to work by reason of physical or mental impairments to obtain social-security benefits.

However, judging from reports I am receiving from disabled workers in my State, a person must be all but dead to qualify for disability benefits under Public Law 880. I could cite innumerable examples of coal miners and other workers in West Virginia who, although so disabled that they cannot obtain gainful employment, are not permitted to qualify for a disability pension. I am sure that other Members of the Senate have received similar complaints.

Let me cite briefly two cases to illustrate the injustice of the narrow interpretation governing disability payments under the Social Security Act. I quote from a recent letter from a constituent:

"I am 57 years old and am fully insured according to the social-security law. But they tell me now it does no good to be

fully insured in applying for social-security payments under the provisions of the new amendment. They require that I must have been covered 5 of the previous 10 years before I became disabled. I complied with this provision. However, they also said I must be covered 1½ years of the previous 3 years before I became disabled. In this I failed because I was self-employed, and not covered at that time. Under the same set of circumstances today I would be eligible because all self-employed persons are now under social security."

Another constituent writes:

"In my case the margin between drawing my social-security benefits now when there is a definite need for them, and waiting until age 65, is very narrow. I am told that if I had only 2 weeks more under the social-security plan I would be eligible for what they call a disability freeze, which is the first and main requirement to be met. However, I have been officially notified by the local social-security office that the decision is final and I am out."

Those are typical cases illustrating the inability of many permanently disabled workers to qualify for social-security benefits at age 50. The restrictive provisions of Public Law 880 are too broad and the interpretation given this law by social-security officials is too narrow to permit more than a few to qualify. It is my belief that any individual of 50 or over who is covered by social security and who, by reason of disability, is unable to obtain gainful employment, ought to receive such benefits.

Living as we are in a society that is highly industrialized, in which an overwhelming majority of our people must look to industrial employment for a livelihood, I feel that it is incumbent upon the people through their Government to care for those who, by reason of physical or mental impairments, are unable to care for themselves. We have rightfully undertaken to do this; but in the law as written today, certainly as interpreted today by administrative officials, many permanently disabled persons are not helped. Picture, if you will, the case of a man who has paid into social security for several years, then becomes permanently disabled, but yet, because of technical provisions of the law, is excluded from social-security benefits until he has reached the age of 65. In many instances such workers die before reaching retirement age and never receive any benefits from their payments into this program, although in their lifetimes they were totally disabled. They are forced to look to charity for a bare sustenance—a condition demoralizing in itself. Many such persons resent, and rightfully so, being forced to become wards of the State. Yet that is precisely what is happening under the rigid provisions of the Social Security Act. How much better it would be, it seems to me, to have these people qualify for disability pensions under social security than to compel them to depend on public relief.

The first amendment I propose would extend disability coverage to any workers, determined to be permanently disabled under the new definition of that term, who has had at least one quarter of coverage under social security. Under the present law, a worker must not only be fully and currently insured, he also must have at least 20 quarters of coverage in the 40 calendar quarters before the beginning date of his disability. That harsh restriction is disqualifying a great many permanently disabled workers who, in my judgment, are justly entitled to social-security benefits.

For the purpose of determining disability, the second amendment I propose redefines "disability" in these terms:

"An individual who has such a medically determinable physical or mental impairment shall, in the absence of substantial evidence to the contrary, be deemed to be unable to

engage in any substantial gainful activity if, solely by reason of having such impairment, he is unable, as a practical matter, to obtain employment."

Under the present interpretation of what constitutes "permanent disability," there are numerous cases of workers who, for all practical purposes, are unable to obtain employment by reason of such disability. Yet they are ruled ineligible to receive disability benefits under the rigid definition the Social Security Act now gives to "permanent disability."

These amendments, it seems to me, provide reasonable and practical means of making the disability provisions of the Social Security Act more workable. It is my sincere hope that the Senate will give serious consideration to these much-needed changes in the Social Security Act and will enact these amendments which I now offer.

Mr. REVERCOMB subsequently said,

Mr. President, earlier today I introduced two bills to amend the Social Security Act, and made remarks at that time. I ask unanimous consent that along with my remarks, the two bills may be printed in full in the RECORD today.

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

The bills, introduced by Mr. REVERCOMB, are as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That paragraph (2) of subsection (c) of section 223 of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(2) The term 'disability' means inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to result in death or to be of long-continued and indefinite duration. For purposes of the preceding sentence, an individual who has such a medically determinable physical or mental impairment shall, in the absence of substantial evidence to the contrary, be deemed to be unable to engage in any substantial activity if, solely by reason of having such an impairment, he is unable, as a practical matter, to obtain employment. An individual shall not be considered to be under a disability unless he furnishes proof of the existence of such disability."

Be it enacted, etc. That (a) paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of section 223 of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Such individual's disability insurance benefit for any month shall be equal to (A) \$30, or (B) his primary insurance amount for such month determined under section 215 as though he became entitled to old-age insurance benefits in the first month of his waiting period, whichever is the greater."

(b) Paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(1) An individual shall be insured for disability insurance benefits in any month if, on the first day of such month, he had at least one quarter of coverage."

Sec. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this act shall be effective with respect to monthly disability insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for months after the month in which this act is enacted.

TAX RELIEF FOR SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in order to provide a minimum initial program of tax relief for small business and for persons engaged in small business. An identical measure was intro-

duced in the House by the Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, who is a member of the House Ways and Means Committee.

I am convinced this bill offers great promise of real help toward solving some of the problems confronting small business. Representative CURTIS is to be commended for his intelligent and sound approach to these problems, and I think he is entitled to no small measure of credit for having initiated this measure.

Without attempting to delineate all of the numerous problems of small- and medium-sized businesses, I do wish to allude to those which I consider the most serious and urgent.

It is an accepted fact in the world of nature that growth is essential to life. If a living thing is stifled and not permitted to grow, it inevitably dies prematurely. This is also axiomatic in the world of business. Today, many small- and medium-sized businesses, because of the oppressive effect of income taxes, can neither grow, nor, in many cases, even hold their own. Some are forced to take one of the following steps: merge with big business, liquidate with hopes of suffering the smallest possible loss, or die on the vine with almost total loss.

Mr. President, the bill I now introduce recognizes the difficulties small- and medium-sized businesses have in retaining sufficient earnings for growth capital. It does not disturb the rates, but provides for deduction from taxable income of investment in depreciable assets or inventory during the taxable year up to 20 percent of net income, or \$30,000, whichever is lower. Thus the highest tax savings for a corporation would be \$15,600, when \$30,000 is reinvested from earnings. In my opinion, one of the most significant and important features is that it takes into account the fact that most small businesses are not incorporated. The bill applies to individual proprietorships, partnerships and self-employed persons, as well as to corporations.

The second important provision would permit a businessman to set aside earnings in anticipation of his estate tax and to pay any balance due over a 10-year period in order to obviate the forced sale or dissolution of his firm in the event of death. Our present tax laws, lacking such provisions, actually force mergers and acquisitions as the only course for a businessman desiring to protect his estate.

This bill does not propose to increase the taxes of any business and is nondiscriminatory. While it applies to all business, it will be of the greatest relative benefit to small businesses. It will help preserve small- and medium-sized businesses which are so essential to a well-balanced economy.

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

The bill (S. 1820) to provide a minimum initial program of tax relief for small business and for persons engaged in small business, introduced by Mr. POTTER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, at the request of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1074) to authorize the establishment of Inventive Contributions Awards Board within the Department of Defense, and for other purposes, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT OF 1953—EXTENSION OF TIME FOR BILL TO LIE ON TABLE

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, on Thursday last I introduced the bill (S. 1789) to amend the Small Business Act of 1953—title II of Public Law 163, 83d Congress, as amended—and at that time I obtained unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table until the close of business today so that other Senators might join in sponsoring the bill.

Mr. President, I have learned that some Senators who were out of the city over the weekend had expressed a desire upon their return to join in sponsoring the bill. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table another day so that other Senators may join in sponsoring the bill if they so desire.

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

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR MEN AND WOMEN—EXTENSION OF TIME FOR JOINT RESOLUTION TO LIE ON THE DESK

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 80) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women, introduced by me on April 4, 1957, may lie on the desk for an additional 3 days, so that Senators who so desire may cosponsor it.

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

REHABILITATION OF ORCHARDS DESTROYED OR DAMAGED BY NATURAL DISASTER—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 4, 1957,

The names of Senators MAGNUSON, IVES, JAVITS, CHURCH, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, JACKSON, and HUMPHREY were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1808) to provide financial assistance for the rehabilitation of orchards destroyed or damaged by natural disaster, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER) on April 4, 1957.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MORTON:

Address delivered by him before the Advertising Council, Washington, D. C., on April 1, 1957.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON HOOVER COMMISSION BILLS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations, of which I have the privilege of serving as chairman, I desire to announce that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, next, April 12, 1957, at 10 a. m., room 357, Senate Office Building, on S. 434—to provide for improved methods of stating budget estimates and estimates for deficiency and supplemental appropriations, as amended. The subcommittee will simultaneously consider S. 316—to provide for stating appropriations on an accrued expenditure basis.

The Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Comptroller General of the United States, and several Members of the Senate who are cosponsors of these bills have been invited to testify upon this important legislation which implements the second Hoover Commission's recommendation for the determination of appropriations on an annual accrued expenditure basis. All Members of the Senate are cordially invited to participate in the hearing or to present testimony to the subcommittee if they desire to do so.

IMPORTANCE OF CONTINUATION OF THE ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF HUNGARIAN REFUGEES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, within the past few days we have heard news about the possible termination of the program of the admission into the United States of Hungarian refugees from the Communist terror. I consider this program vital and essential to the anti-Communist struggle being waged by our country. Unless the people behind the Iron Curtain have a feeling that the great powers, especially the United States, are interested in giving them some safe places of resettlement if they deprive the Communists of their talents and support, we can hardly expect the sort of events which occurred in Hungary, and which we hope will occur in other parts of the Soviet satellite empire—events such as the one which occurred when the people of East Berlin opposed Russian tanks with their bare hands—and we can hardly hope to encourage the flickerings of independence which arise even in countries such as Poland, where there is some beginning of a glimmer of hope.

So, Mr. President, yesterday I sent to the Department of State and the Department of Justice a telegram in which I

urged that, for the present, the assistance programs be continued; and in the telegram I pointed out that if the reason for the proposed discontinuance of the program is the failure of the Congress to act upon the immigration recommendations made by the President, then, in order to make this reason valid, the President should first send to the Congress a special message strongly urging emergency action, and stating the alternatives.

Mr. President, I hope very much that the Congress will now give this matter the most serious attention; and, at one and the same time, I hope that the administration will not terminate the refugee parolee program. Termination of the program would strike a blow at the strong anti-Communist stand which the program buttresses; and without this program, I believe that our anti-Communist program would be gravely hurt.

As I pointed out in the telegram, Mr. President, immediately involved are 2,000 Hungarian refugees, particularly those whose families are already partially in the United States, and 8,000 with relatives in the United States. I also pointed out that it is important to note that 1,900 admissions were unused when the Refugee Relief Act expired on December 31, 1956. So, Mr. President, those who complain about the admission of parolees under the Refugee Relief Act program should carefully note the unused portion of the total number which Congress intended should be used in connection with the Refugee Relief Act.

Finally, Mr. President, I cannot conclude a statement on this subject without calling attention to the plight of the refugees from persecution in Egypt, who also are entitled to consideration for admission to the United States under a parole status. They are fewer in number, but they also are thoroughly deserving, in terms of the anti-Communist struggle, for it is a rather open secret that the Communists are pulling the strings, and that that is the reason for the persecutions, especially in the case of the Jewish families in Egypt.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the telegram which I sent to the State Department and the Department of Justice.

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

TELEGRAM SENT TO THE DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND JUSTICE, APRIL 7, 1957

Strongly urge continuation of parolee program for Hungarian refugees from Communist terror; also extension of program to include fair share of refugees from persecution in Egypt. Hungarian refugees have proved fully adaptable to United States resettlement and remarkably few among them here would be bad risks. Cessation of this program contrary to highest security interests of United States. Reasonable prospects for resettlement is one of the greatest attractions to those seeking freedom from behind Iron Curtain. Greatest blows to international communism are defections of such refugees and making it attractive for them to do so. United States taking of fair share has proved indispensable to refugee resettlement in all countries with minimum absorptive capacity. Situation especially critical for 2,000 Hungarian refugees, particularly of families already partially here and 8,000

with relatives in United States. Also many Egyptian refugees have families in United States. Reported administration reason for terminating refugee parolee program is that Congress has not acted on President's program for annual admittance of refugees and regularization of their status. But to make this reason valid President should first send special message to Congress urging emergency action and stating alternatives. Important to note 1,900 admissions unused when Refugee Relief Act expired December 31, last; therefore, 2,500 extra Hungarian refugee admissions not materially different from policy Congress authorized in Refugee Relief Act. Effective anti-Communist struggle is seriously at stake in this matter. I urge that program be continued for present.

JACOB K. JAVITS,
United States Senator.

THE VICE PRESIDENT'S REPORT ON AFRICA

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, it is hardly necessary to call the attention of our colleagues to the report to the President by the distinguished President of the Senate, the Vice President of the United States, on his recent trip to Africa.

I should like to state, for myself, and I feel I speak for a great many of my colleagues, my belief that this report represents an outstanding contribution to the enlightened view of United States foreign relations.

The Vice President's report was limited, of course, largely to consideration of the continent of Africa. But it was distinguished also by its tone of understanding and responsibility that gave it great meaning, in its general terms, to every other part of the world.

This report, Mr. President, is an appropriate contribution as we near the time when the Senate as a whole must review the scope, direction, and extent of our various economic and military-assistance programs, generally known as foreign-aid programs.

I point out, as has been indicated by the New York Times editorial of this morning, that the Vice President has not emphasized foreign aid or its scale. On the other hand, he has emphasized the development of understanding between our country and those of Africa. I should like to read one extract from his report:

To this end we must encourage the greatest possible interchange of persons and ideas with the leaders and peoples of these countries. We must assure the strongest possible diplomatic and consular representation to those countries and stand ready to consult those countries on all matters affecting their interest and ours.

The Vice President has provided a deeper understanding of the great fact of life for the United States in the mid-20th century—that we are inevitably and closely involved with the fate of the rest of the world; that our own security and prosperity are involved in the national security and the growing economic and social and political progress of every other nation and people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report made by the Vice President to the President regarding his trip to Africa be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE VICE PRESIDENT'S REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT ON TRIP TO AFRICA, FEBRUARY 28 TO MARCH 21, 1957

On the basis of my visits to Morocco, Ghana, Liberia, Uganda, Ethiopia, Sudan, Libya, Italy, and Tunisia, from February 28 to March 21, I submit the following observations and recommendations:

IMPORTANCE OF AFRICA

No one can travel in Africa, even as briefly as I did, without realizing the tremendous potentialities of this great continent. Africa is the most rapidly changing area in the world today. The course of its development, as its people continue to emerge from a colonial status and assume the responsibilities of independence and self-government, could well prove to be the decisive factor in the conflict between the forces of freedom and international communism.

The leaders and peoples of the countries I visited in Africa have many things in common. They cherish their independence, which most of them have only recently acquired, and are determined to protect it against any form of foreign domination. They rightfully expect recognition from us and others of their dignity and equality as individuals and peoples in the family of nations. They want economic progress for their undeveloped economies.

The great question which is presented to the leaders of Africa is whether they can attain these justifiable objectives and at the same time maintain and develop governmental institutions which are based on principles of freedom and democracy. I believe they all are convinced that they can, and that the free world has a vital interest in assisting them to do so. For the success or failure of these new members of the family of nations to realize their aspirations in this manner will have profound effects upon the development of Africa and on the world in the years to come.

Herein lies the wider significance of the emergence of the new nation of Ghana. The eyes of the peoples of Africa south of the Sahara, and of Western Europe particularly, will be upon this new state to see whether the orderly transition which has taken place from dependent to independent status, and whether the retention of close ties on a basis of equality with the British Commonwealth, will continue to work successfully and thereby present a formula of possible application in other cases. By the same token, inimical forces will be closely following the situation to see whether any openings present themselves for exploitation in a manner which would enable them to disrupt and destroy the independence which Ghana seeks to achieve.

Nor is this a situation peculiar to Ghana. The same factors are present everywhere among the independent states which I visited. Africa is emerging as one of the great forces in the world today. In a world in which, because of advances in technology, the influence of ideas and principles is becoming increasingly important in the battle for men's minds, we in the United States must come to know, to understand, and to find common ground with the people of this great continent. It is in this context that the recommendations in this report, together with others previously made to the appropriate Government agencies, are presented.

APPRAISAL OF AFRICAN LEADERSHIP

Africa is producing great leaders, dedicated to the principles of independence, world responsibility, and the welfare of their peoples. Such men as the Sultan of Morocco, Prime Minister Nkrumah of Ghana, President Tubman of Liberia, the Emperor of Ethiopia, and Prime Ministers Abdullah Khalil of the

Sudan, Ben Halim of Libya, and Habib Bourguiba of Tunisia, certainly compare most favorably with the great leaders of the world. Nor should one omit King Idris of Libya, whom I unfortunately missed seeing on this trip because of an engine failure, but whose wisdom and statesmanship I remember most vividly from my previous trip to that country in 1953. These are all men who command respect beyond the borders of their own country. They are backed up by other equally dedicated leaders who have much to contribute both to the problems of their own countries and to those which plague the world today.

RECOMMENDATION

The United States must come to know these leaders better, to understand their hopes and aspirations, and to support them in their plans and programs for strengthening their own nations and contributing to world peace and stability. To this end, we must encourage the greatest possible interchange of persons and ideas with the leaders and peoples of these countries. We must assure the strongest possible diplomatic and consular representation to those countries and stand ready to consult these countries on all matters affecting their interests and ours.

ATTITUDES TOWARD THE UNITED STATES

There is no area in the world today in which the prestige of the United States is more uniformly high than in the countries which I visited on this trip. The President is respected as the acknowledged leader of the free world. There is a most encouraging understanding of our programs and policies. These countries know that we have no ambitions to dominate and that the cornerstone of our foreign policy is to assist countries in resisting domination by others. They understand that the United States stands on principle and that this was the motivating force, for example, which led us to act as we did in the recent Suez crisis. They approve the stand which we took at that time and look confidently to us to act consistently with that stand in the future. They understand that the American doctrine for the Middle East is dedicated to the principle of assisting the states of the Middle East to maintain their independence. They know that the United States stands for the evolution of dependent peoples toward self-government and independence, as they become able to discharge the responsibilities involved.

RECOMMENDATION

This understanding of the principles for which we stand as a nation is a tremendous asset to us in this area. The maintenance of the present high prestige we are fortunate to have in Africa will depend upon whether the people of the continent continue to understand our dedication to the principles of independence, equality, and economic progress to which they are so deeply devoted. We must staff our diplomatic and information establishments in these countries with men and women capable of interpreting and explaining our policies and actions in a way which will guarantee that they are so understood.

EFFECT OF DISCRIMINATION IN UNITED STATES ON AFRICAN ATTITUDES

As a result of skillful propaganda primarily inspired by the enemies of freedom, a consistently distorted picture of the treatment of minority races in the United States is being effectively presented in the countries I visited. Every instance of prejudice in this country is blown up in such a manner as to create a completely false impression of the attitudes and practices of the great majority of the American people. The result is irreparable damage to the cause of freedom which is at stake.

RECOMMENDATION

We must continue to strike at the roots of this problem. We cannot talk equality to the peoples of Africa and Asia and practice inequality in the United States. In the national interest, as well as for the moral issues involved, we must support the necessary steps which will assure orderly progress toward the elimination of discrimination in the United States. And we should do a far more effective job than we are presently doing in telling the true story of the real progress that is being made toward realizing this objective so that the people of Africa will have a true picture of conditions as they really are in the United States.

ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

All of the African states which I visited are underdeveloped. Most of them have great economic potential. Their leaders are anxious to strengthen the economies of their countries in order to assure for their peoples a larger share of the advantages of our modern civilization. They seek economic as well as political independence insofar as this is possible in the world to today.

Their needs are great in terms of education and public health. They require roads and other communications in order to open inaccessible parts of their territory to economic development. They need agricultural development to sustain their expanding populations. They want assistance in developing their great mineral and forest resources. They foresee great opportunities for developing small industrial enterprises. In most cases, these developmental needs are beyond their capacity to finance.

All of the leaders with whom I talked expressed preference for developing their economies through encouraging the investment of private capital and through loans from international agencies such as the World Bank where feasible rather than through government-to-government grants. It can truly be said that the welcome sign is out for investment of foreign private capital in Africa. African leaders are aware of the great role that such private capital can play in the development of their countries and many of them have adopted, or are in the process of adopting, special legislation designed to create an atmosphere conducive to expanded foreign investment.

RECOMMENDATION

Consistent with the desires of African leaders, the United States Government through its agencies should, as appropriate, draw the attention of private American capital to opportunities for investment in those areas where the conditions for such investment are propitious. Strengthening the economic sections of American Embassies in this area is needed if this objective is to be carried out.

We should support applications before the appropriate international agencies for financing sound economic development projects in the area.

To the extent that our resources and the demands of other areas permit, we should extend economic and technical assistance to the countries of Africa in helping them to further their economic development.

In this connection, I think it is appropriate to place in proper context the United States economic assistance programs. These programs should be approved only when they are in the mutual interests of the United States and the recipient country. They should be administered as efficiently as possible.

But while these programs should be constantly reexamined and improved so that they can better serve the national interest, shotgun attacks on our foreign assistance programs as such cannot be justified.

In this connection, I believe a comment on what has happened in Italy is pertinent.

While my visit to Italy was not on an official basis, I did have the opportunity to discuss economic and political problems with President Gronchi, Prime Minister Segni, and other Italian officials. It was significant to me that at the time I arrived in Italy, the last American aid office was being closed. I recalled that 10 years before when I visited Italy as a member of the Herter Committee on Foreign Aid, the most dire predictions were being made as to the future of the Italian economy. It was said that American assistance would be thrown down a rat hole, that the Italian people should live within their own means, that they should work harder, and that in any event, once the economic program began, we would never see the end of it. The fact that Italy today has one of the soundest, most productive economies in Europe is eloquent proof of the validity of economic assistance properly administered and properly used by the recipient country.

While the economic problems of Italy were obviously different from those Africa now faces, I am confident that in the African countries I visited, we shall have similar success as we work in cooperation with the enlightened leaders of these nations toward the development of their great natural and human resources.

SPECIAL RELATIONS WITH OTHER COUNTRIES

Africa and Europe have much in common. To a large extent, their economies are complementary. Certain of the independent states on the African Continent maintain close ties of a historical, cultural, and economic nature with the states of Europe. The maintenance of these relationships, on a basis of equality, can greatly benefit both Africa and Europe.

RECOMMENDATION

We should encourage the continuance of these special ties where they are considered mutually advantageous by the states concerned. We should take them in account in formulating our own policies to the extent compatible with the fundamental requirement of conducting our own relations with those states on a fully equal and independent basis.

The task of providing the economic assistance which is needed by the newly independent countries of Africa cannot be done by the United States alone. We should make it clear that we desire no exclusive position in any country in that area and that we want to work with other free-world nations in providing the assistance which will build strong, free, and independent nations in this area of the world.

COMMUNISM

Africa is a priority target for the international Communist movement. I gathered the distinct impression that the Communist leaders consider Africa today to be as important in their designs for world conquest as they considered China to be 25 years ago. Consequently, they are mounting a diplomatic propaganda and economic offensive in all parts of the continent. They are trying desperately to convince the peoples of Africa that they support more strongly than we do their natural aspirations for independence, equality, and economic progress.

Fortunately, their efforts thus far have not been generally successful and, for the present, Communist domination in the states of the area is not a present danger. All of the African leaders to whom I talked are determined to maintain their independence against communism or any other form of foreign domination. They have taken steps to bring under control the problem of Communist subversion of their political, economic, and social life. It would be a great mistake, however, to be complacent about this situation because the Communists are without question putting their top men in

the fields of diplomacy, intrigue, and subversion into the African area to probe for openings which they can exploit for their own selfish and disruptive ends.

RECOMMENDATION

The Communist threat underlines the wisdom and necessity of our assisting the countries of Africa to maintain their independence and to alleviate the conditions of want and instability on which communism breeds. The importance of Africa to the strength and stability of the free world is too great for us to underestimate or to become complacent about this danger without taking every step within our power to assist the countries of this area to maintain their effective independence in the face of this danger.

TRADE UNIONISM

In every instance where my schedule permitted, I made it a point to talk to the leading labor leaders of the countries I visited. I was encouraged to find that the free trade union movement is making great advances in Africa, particularly in Ghana, Morocco, and Tunisia. The leaders of these countries have recognized the importance of providing an alternative to Communist dominated unions and they, thereby, are keeping the Communists from getting a foothold in one of their favorite areas of exploitation. In this connection, I wish to pay tribute to the effective support that is being given by trade unions in the United States to the free trade union movement in the countries which I visited. These close and mutually advantageous relationships are in the national interest as well as in the interest of developing a strong labor movement.

RECOMMENDATION

It is vitally important that the United States Government follow closely trade union developments in the Continent of Africa and that our diplomatic and consular representatives should come to know on an intimate basis the trade union leaders in these countries. I believe, too, that American labor unions should continue to maintain close fraternal relationships with the African free trade union movement in order that each may derive the greatest possible advantage of the wisdom and experience of the other.

NILE DEVELOPMENT

The Nile is one of the world's greatest international rivers. Perhaps in no other part of the world are the economies of so many states tied to a particular waterway. The river is so located geographically that whatever projects are undertaken on it within the territorial domains of one state are bound to have their effect on the economies of other states.

RECOMMENDATION

The United States must take into account the common interests of the riparian states in the development of this great river and, at such time as political conditions permit, should support a cooperative approach to its development which would accord with the common interests of all the states involved.

OPERATION OF UNITED STATES PROGRAMS

Specific recommendations as to the operation of American programs in the countries I visited have been made on a classified basis to the various interested agencies. In general, I found that our political, economic, and information programs in the countries which I visited, are being administered in accordance with our obligations to the United States taxpayer. There is, however, always room for improvement and, in the spirit of constructive criticism, I wish to make the following public recommendations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

On the political side, I believe that our diplomatic and consular missions are generally understaffed. We must assure that

these establishments have sufficient personnel to enable them to interpret our policies, to consult fully with the local governments on matters of mutual interest and to report on developments of importance to the United States. We must assure that our diplomatic and consular offices have sufficient funds to enable them to travel about the vast territories within their jurisdiction for the purposes of reporting on developments outside the major centers of population and of forming contacts with the peoples of those areas. We must recognize that the posts in this area are, in many instances, unhealthful and trying climatically to those who are raised in a temperate zone. We must, therefore, endeavor to ameliorate hardship conditions for our personnel in order to enable them more effectively to perform their tasks. We must recognize that the importance of the African area and the difficult living conditions there necessitate our assigning officials of the highest possible competence and stability. The emphasis should be on youth, vigor and enthusiasm.

Insofar as our economic programs are concerned, I believe that our technicians in the field are doing an excellent job in working alongside the African and teaching him to perform the various functions of social and economic development for himself. Obviously, the maintenance and support of these technicians in the field require a headquarters staff in the country capitals. From my own observations, I believe these headquarters staffs sometimes tend to become inflated and I, therefore, recommend that they be carefully reviewed to see whether economies in personnel could not be effected. I believe also that there is sometimes a tendency to scatter programs over a number of fields of economic and social development, whereas greater concentration of a few key projects would bring more last returns to the country concerned. Our programs should constantly be reviewed from this point of view. The same comments which I made with respect to the caliber of our diplomatic and consular representation apply as well to our economic and information personnel.

On the informational side, I believe that the most worthwhile projects are the libraries and reading rooms which we have established in a number of centers overseas and the exchange of persons programs. The funds available for these programs in the African area should be substantially increased over the present level.

To the extent that the Africans become familiar with the culture and technology, the ideals and aspirations and the traditions and institutions which combine to make up the American character, we shall have made great advances in common understanding. This can be done through books and periodicals, through student exchanges and through the leader grant program for bringing outstanding Africans to the United States for study and travel. We should also assist as we can in the development of indigenous educational facilities in Africa. In this way, we can get to know them and they to know us.

I believe that the information output from our radio and news programs in the African area have in the past not been as effective as they should be if we are adequately to counter the propaganda being disseminated by the Communists. In the studies which are currently being made of these programs by the USIA, I believe it is important that the highest priority be assigned to this area both as to improving the quality of personnel in the field and in more adequately providing information which is particularly suited to the special problems of Africa.

CONCLUSION

For too many years, Africa in the minds of many Americans has been regarded as a remote and mysterious continent which was

the special province of big-game hunters, explorers, and motion picture makers. For such an attitude to exist among the public at large could greatly prejudice the maintenance of our own independence and freedom because the emergence of a free and independent Africa is as important to us in the long run as it is to the people of that continent.

It is for this reason that I strongly support the creation within the Department of State of a new Bureau of African Affairs which will place this continent on the same footing as the other great area groupings of the world. I recommend similar action by the ICA and USIA. These bureaus, properly staffed and with sufficient funds, will better equip us to handle our relationships with the countries of Africa. But this in itself will not be enough. There must be a corresponding realization throughout the executive branches of the Government, throughout the Congress and throughout the Nation, of the growing importance of Africa to the future of the United States and the free world and the necessity of assigning higher priority to our relations with that area.

MR. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from this morning's New York Times, discussing the distinguished Vice President's report, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

MR. NIXON REPORTS ON AFRICA

One of the most important things about Vice President Nixon's report on his visit to Africa is its essential emphasis on understanding. He was cautious about recommending specific aid programs. He said that such recommendations were being transmitted, in presumably classified form, to the proper agencies. He does not urge irresponsible handouts. On the contrary, he urges an even closer scrutiny of everything that we do.

What this really comes down to is the suggestion that the main thing that we ought to spend on Africa, right now, is not merely money but brains. This makes sense. The Vice President was not merely a personable representative of his Government—and he was that—but also a shrewd analyst of basic needs and how to meet them. Typical of his reports, for example, is this paragraph:

"For too many years Africa in the minds of many Americans has been regarded as a remote and mysterious continent which was the special province of big-game hunters, explorers, and motion-picture makers. For such an attitude to exist among the people at large could greatly prejudice the maintenance of our own independence and freedom, because the emergence of a free and independent Africa is as important to us in the long run as it is to the people of that continent."

This could be called enlightened self-interest. It is also commonsense. We cannot expect to assume and continue the role of great leadership in the cause of peace and freedom unless we are accurately and adequately informed. This is not a time at which we can afford blind spots, and Africa has too long remained in that category.

A great continent is newly emerging on the world scene. It is no longer darkest. Enormous political and physical changes are now in progress. Unless we begin to try to understand them we shall pay the price of our myopia at the hands of an unscrupulous enemy. Mr. Nixon pointed this out, in so many words, but went on with an optimistic appraisal of some of the leaders in the cause of the free world whom he had met. But having done so, he returned again to

this theme of urging more knowledge and better understanding when he said:

"To this end we must encourage the greatest possible interchange of persons and ideas with the leaders and peoples of these countries. We must assure the strongest possible diplomatic and consular representation to those countries and stand ready to consult those countries on all matters affecting their interest and ours."

This suggests a new and broadened approach, and the suggestion is wise and good. In line with it, Mr. NIXON urges some strengthening of our own information services as well as our other official representation. This is based on what ought to be the correct assumption that we will be quite as eager to obtain information as to disseminate it.

This all goes back to the simple fact that we do not know enough about Africa and that Africa does not know enough about us. Africa does not know, for example, that we are really trying to do something about the cruel problem of race discrimination which, as Mr. NIXON said, remains an obstacle to better understanding. Obviously we need to do more and Africa needs to know, meanwhile, that we are trying.

We need to know, on the other hand, that Africa is not merely a place for investment and colonialism, for profit and exploration, but that it is the home of millions of persons who are coming into a different world. We can help in some phases of that transition and we should.

This report places its emphasis, in the economic field, upon private investment and effort. This seems sound, on the basis of past experience. Africa doesn't need just huge grants; Africa needs an investment of skills and imagination. If we can help to supply them this will be more important than money.

One field, for example, upon which the Vice President touched in passing was that of medicine and public health. Here is one of our greatest opportunities. Africa can be a healthy continent if there is enough will to make it so. Until it is, both the Africans and ourselves will continue to work under a dreadful handicap. Fortunately the need in this field is well known and important progress is being made.

The Vice President's trip, not only for the sake of Ghana but for all of Africa, was a good idea. He has made a good report and some sound recommendations. The Africans know us better because of him. It is now up to us to know them better and he can help us to do just that.

CANADIAN-AMERICAN RELATIONSHIPS

MR. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the news last Friday morning, April 5, 1957, of the death of the Canadian Ambassador to Egypt, the Honorable Herbert Norman, has cast a shadow over the traditionally close and friendly mutual relations of the United States and Canada.

As one United States Senator I have felt a sense of concern and responsibility over the possibility that action by one of our Senate subcommittees may have played a role in this potential weakening of close ties of mutual friendship and confidence. Nor, apparently, is the role of the Department of State, in the episode of the disclosure of the controversial testimony in question, wholly beyond criticism.

In a statement last Friday afternoon, I expressed the view that the Senate has an obligation to examine, perhaps through a special bipartisan committee,

the circumstances of the publication of old security charges against the late Canadian Ambassador Norman. The people of America rightly regard the people of Canada as their closest friends and allies, and any cause of a possible rift between us is a serious matter which certainly deserves the attention of the Senate. We have appointed special investigating committees for smaller issues than this, and issues in which the responsibility of the Senate was less directly involved.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my statement of Friday be printed at this point in the RECORD, followed by a series of editorial comments from leading newspapers in the Nation which express editorial concern over the damage which may have been done to our relations with Canada by this episode.

There being no objection, the statement and accompanying editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR NEUBERGER

Any rift between the United States and our Canadian friends and allies is such a serious matter that the top leadership of the Senate should immediately appoint a bipartisan committee to inquire into the circumstances of the publication by the staff of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee of charges against the reputation of the late Canadian Ambassador Herbert Norman, which have become the cause of such a rift.

I suggest that such a special committee consist of Senators whose detachment from the events at issue is beyond question.

I believe the Senate has an obligation to show at least this much responsibility in a tragic situation which has been precipitated by action within one of its committees, with serious implications for our foreign relations. The ties of friendship between Canada and the United States, in war and in peace, have been so close and unquestioned that nothing should be allowed to strain them.

Furthermore, an inquiry into this incident might give the Senate a useful look at the manner in which so-called security charges are processed here. It is my understanding that the charges against the late Canadian diplomat, Ambassador Norman, were long ago disposed of to the satisfaction of the Canadian Government by two thorough probes undertaken by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, perhaps the most famous law-enforcement body in the world. If the standards by which we in the Senate handle security charges are different or better than those of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, it would be valuable information for the American people to know just exactly what this difference may be.

[From the New York Times of April 6, 1957]

RECKLESS AND UNFAIR

The suicide of E. Herbert Norman, Canadian Ambassador to Egypt, has brought shame to the Government and people of the United States. Whether Mr. Norman was literally driven to his death by the actions of Senator EASTLAND's Internal Security subcommittee and its chief counsel, Robert Morris, may not be susceptible of proof. Certainly many Canadians—with understandable vehemence—hold the committee guilty of "assassination by insinuation." But Americans who believe in fair play must agree that Senator EASTLAND and his associates had no moral right to bring Mr. Norman under suspicion by the release of testimony at a congressional hearing—testimony given

under circumstances which did not allow Mr. Norman either to confront his accusers or defend himself against their accusations.

That this should have been done after the Canadian Government had cleared Mr. Norman of even the suspicion of subversion and the State Department thought it necessary to say that the United States "has every confidence in the Canadian Government's judgment in the selection of its official representatives" shows also how reckless has been the Eastland subcommittee's disregard of the first principles of civilized diplomacy.

Of course the Government agencies which are legally responsible for our national security cannot forfeit the right to investigate activities which might endanger the United States, even when a foreign official is involved. But reports of suspicious behavior—especially unproved ones—should be communicated to the proper law-enforcement authorities in strict confidence, not broadcast to the general public.

The Government and people of the United States owe a deep apology to the Government and people of Canada—most especially to Mr. Norman's family—for the un-American misconduct of Senator EASTLAND, his colleagues, and their chief counsel, Robert Morris.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 8, 1957]

DOUBLE TRAGEDY IN CAIRO

When Canadian Ambassador E. Herbert Norman committed suicide in Cairo, the tragedy was a double one. There was the death of a man who had served his country long, and to its satisfaction. And there was a severe blow to the good repute of the United States. The first is irreparable; the second can only be made good if there is a thorough appreciation of the errors that led to it.

Dr. Norman was linked to Communist activities—allegedly occurring during his student days in the United States in 1940—in testimony released by congressional investigators in 1951. At that time he was a Canadian delegate to the United Nations; the Canadian Government formally protested the publication of the material, and later reported that a double security check had cleared Dr. Norman. The allegations were revived at the appearance on March 13, during the questioning before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee of Mr. John K. Emmerson, counselor for the United States Embassy in Lebanon—although Mr. Emmerson's own testimony was to the opposite effect.

According to Senator WATKINS, a member of the subcommittee, the State Department assented to making the testimony public through an acting security chief who did not consult higher officials. When the transcript was released by the subcommittee on March 14, the Canadian Government again protested, and the State Department replied that the United States "has every confidence in the Canadian Government's judgment in the selection of its official representatives." But when Mr. Emmerson returned before the subcommittee to make corrections in the record, when the allegations against Dr. Norman were repeated (although the witness' testimony was still favorable to him), the transcript was again made public.

The public revival of the 1951 charges has been officially stated by Canadian authorities to have contributed to Dr. Norman's suicide. With virtual unanimity, Canada—in Parliament, in church organizations, and other groups—has denounced the subcommittee action. So has the press of Japan, where Dr. Norman was born, and later served. Moscow is gleefully capitalizing on what it calls the persecution of Dr. Norman.

The United States must ask itself what conceivable good the publication of the

charges against Dr. Norman could do that might offset the harm that has demonstrably been inflicted on Dr. Norman, and on America's standing with two friendly nations in particular and in world opinion generally. No responsible American can doubt the need for thorough and continuous investigation of all possible sources of subversion, domestic and foreign. As Senator WATKINS said during the hearings: "However, we certainly ought to get whatever information we can that would help our own country and its actions with another nation. What we do about it after we get that information—how we handle it, and so on—that is another matter, entirely a different matter." We are certain that Senator WATKINS, who has admitted his serious misgivings over the release of the testimony would agree that the handling of it by the State Department and the subcommittee was in this instance wholly wrong. It must never be repeated.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of April 6, 1957]

EXPENSIVE RED HUNTING

The worldwide condemnation now raining on the United States because of the suicide of the Canadian Ambassador to Egypt may be unfair. In any such case primary responsibility must rest on the individual. But unfortunately the American people cannot say that they have no responsibility for the tragic ending of a brilliant career.

For Herbert Norman was reported burdened both by work and by a sense of persecution following reports from the Eastland-Jenner Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security that he had once been a Communist. The Canadian Government, which long ago cleared him of such charges, vigorously protested the committee action.

And the hard fact now is that non-Communist peoples and governments around the world are—fairly or unfairly—laying it at the door of the American people and Government. Stanch fighters against communism in countries where it is a daily threat have been puzzled by some American Red-hunting methods. They ask why the job is not left to professionals like the very efficient FBI. "Is it just hysteria or is it politics?" Told that sometimes publicity will serve where proof is not available, they ask again: "But at the price of reckless character assassination?"

In the past the price has been high—inequality to many individuals and the advancement of demagogues to places of power. Today it is higher—anger and contempt from peoples whose friendship and respect would be barriers to communism.

The subcommittee says it was only doing its duty and will continue to do it. The Senate as a whole—and the American people—might well ask whether this kind of "duty" is worth what it costs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar under rule VIII be dispensed with.

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

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

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

INSPECTION OF POULTRY AND POULTRY PRODUCTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1747) to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, before proceeding with the discussion of the bill, I should like to propound a unanimous-consent request to make two typographical corrections in the bill, as follows:

On page 4, line 16, strike out "an" and insert "any."

On page 16, line 2, strike out "the" and insert "to."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Without objection, the amendments indicated are agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this bill provides for, first, compulsory poultry inspection, second, maintenance of sanitary poultry processing facilities and practices, and third, correct and informative labeling of poultry and poultry products. It thus extends to poultry and poultry products, provisions similar to those long in effect for meat and meat products.

The desirability of legislation to assure that American poultry products are of the highest quality and purity is generally understood and agreed upon. Last year the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry held extended hearings on two bills, S. 3588 and S. 3983, and unanimously reported S. 4243, a clean bill incorporating the best elements of both the bills considered by the committee. That bill was reported too late in the session to be passed by the Senate, but was widely distributed and considered.

This year the committee had before it three bills, S. 313, S. 645, and S. 1128. The committee held hearings on these three bills; and consideration was given by the committee to each of the differences between the bills and to all the views that were presented at the hearings. On March 20, the committee delegated to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], who is one of the sponsors of S. 313, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], who is the principal sponsor of S. 645, and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the principal sponsor of S. 1128, the task of working out a bill which would meet as nearly as might be the objectives of all the three bills that had been introduced.

As I recall, those 3 Senators spent 2 afternoons discussing the bill among themselves. They had the assistance of the Office of the General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture and others interested. The pending bill is the result of the work of these three Senators, assisted by the Department of Agriculture and the Food and Drug Administration, both of which were very cooperative with the committee and furnished many sug-

gestions for improvement of the bill. The bill reported was unanimously agreed upon first, by the three Senators I have mentioned, and, subsequently, by the full committee; and its enactment is favored by both the Department of Agriculture and the Food and Drug Administration.

The bill which was drafted and is before the Senate provides for the inspection of all poultry and poultry products processed for sale in interstate commerce or in designated major consuming areas. Poultry, as defined by the bill, is restricted to domesticated birds and does not include commercially produced game birds. The breeders of game birds are usually small operators; slaughtering either is done by hand or may require special adjustments in equipment; the market is a seasonal one and comes at the peak processing season; and the committee felt for these and other reasons they should not be covered by the bill.

A consuming area can be designated under the bill for regulation only if the volume of poultry or poultry products marketed in it is such as to affect, burden, or obstruct the movement of inspected poultry or poultry products in interstate commerce, and then only after public hearing. In any State which has a State agency responsible for the administration of State poultry inspection law, the hearing can be initiated only upon the request of such State agency. Where there is no such State agency, the request must come from an appropriate State or local official, or from an appropriate industry group.

The bill provides for both ante mortem and post mortem inspection. It requires such ante mortem inspection as the Secretary deems necessary, and carcass by carcass post mortem inspection. Products and parts found unwholesome or adulterated are to be condemned, subject, of course, to appeal. Reinspection, quarantine, and segregation are also provided for.

Processing plants would be required to conform as to premises, facilities, equipment, and operations with sanitary regulations issued by the Secretary of Agriculture.

In order that consumers may be fully informed about the poultry products they purchase, each immediate container must identify the processor, the product, the ingredients, any artificial flavoring or coloring or chemical preservative, and must show the quantity of the product contained and that it has been inspected.

The bill prohibits false or misleading labeling; marketing of uninspected or unlabeled products; sale for food purposes of unwholesome or adulterated products; and the movement, except between official establishments or in foreign commerce, of "New York dressed poultry," as well as other acts, the prohibition of which is necessary to assure the wholesomeness of American poultry products and the proper enforcement of the act. "New York dressed poultry" is poultry which has not been eviscerated. Some witnesses objected to the movement of uneviscerated poultry, even between inspected establishments. How-

ever, the committee felt that this movement should be permitted, since the product would be inspected at the receiving plant as well as at the originating plant. Many small plants do not now have eviscerating equipment and may not be prepared at this time to purchase such equipment, which is rather expensive. By permitting them to ship their product to plants with eviscerating equipment, the bill will permit these plants to continue operating and still afford complete protection for the consumer.

The Secretary is authorized by the bill to exempt from specific provisions of the act—poultry producers who sell directly to household consumers; retail dealers who cut up poultry products; any person where inspection is impracticable; and persons slaughtering in accordance with religious dietary laws. These exemptions are contained in section 16 of the bill, which describes the permissible extent and limitation of such exemptions.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Am I correct in my understanding that the problems connected with the ritualistic slaughter of poultry are taken care of in the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. Such a provision is contained at page 20 of the bill, and that provision gives the necessary authority to the Secretary of Agriculture, as I understand.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; that is in section 16.

Mr. JAVITS. That provision deals with those problems?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. That is the intention of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. Instead of defining the subject in the act, we thought it best to leave it to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture to make such rules and regulations as in his opinion would be most effective.

Mr. JAVITS. Was that provision satisfactory to the witnesses who appeared before the committee on the subject?

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand it was not, at least not to all of them. Some of them wanted Congress to spell out the exemption in detail. The committee felt that this was a matter to be left to the Secretary. It might develop that the language submitted to the committee would be sufficient to meet the requirements of some religious groups, but not others. On the other hand, the language submitted by some of the witnesses might meet their problems, but also open the door to evasion of the act by others. The committee felt, therefore, that this matter should be left to the Secretary, who should be able to modify the exemption as may appear necessary.

Imported poultry products are covered in the same manner that imported meat products are now covered by law, and the Department of Agriculture has advised that it expects to issue regulations for

imported poultry products similar to those for imported meat products.

The bill would be effective immediately to permit the Department of Agriculture to begin planning its operations. Any processor will be able to subject himself to the provisions of the act and thereby obtain the benefits of inspection at the cost of the Government after January 1, 1958. The act will be mandatory for all processors subject to it after January 1, 1959.

It is not contemplated that the act will require any expenditure in the current fiscal year. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, it is estimated that expenditures will amount to about \$4,750,000. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, it is estimated that the cost will range from \$7,750,000 to \$10 million. For succeeding years, when the program is in full operation, the cost is estimated at \$10 million annually. These estimates do not include expenditures which might be required as a result of the designation of consuming areas for regulation, since that cost would depend on the number and size of the areas to be regulated and the additional inspection which would be required as a result of such regulation.

The bill would be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture and would be handled by such employees and agencies of the Department as the Secretary might specify.

Mr. President, in connection with my statement, I wish to have printed in the RECORD at this point a section-by-section description of the bill appearing in the report of the committee on pages 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and a part of page 7.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 195) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION EXPLANATION OF BILL SHORT TITLE

Section 1 provides a short title "Poultry Products Inspection Act."

LEGISLATIVE FINDINGS

Section 2 contains legislative findings as to the necessity of the inspection and regulation provided by the act to protect interstate and foreign commerce in poultry and poultry products.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Section 3 declares the congressional policy to provide inspection of poultry and poultry products to prevent the movement in interstate or foreign commerce or "designated" major consuming areas of unwholesome or adulterated poultry products.

DEFINITIONS

Section 4 defines terms used in the act. The definition of the terms "unwholesome" and "adulterated," as contained in this bill, cover all points as contained in the definition of "adulteration" in the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. The definition of "unwholesome" makes it clear that carcasses or parts thereof or poultry products produced under unsanitary conditions whereby they may become contaminated or injurious to health will be subject to condemnation. Under the definition although poultry suffering from diseases which systematically affect the bird would be unwholesome, poultry having a localized condition not affecting the wholesomeness of the remainder of the bird would not be classed as "unwholesome" upon removal of the affected area, leaving the remainder wholesome and fit for human consumption. "Inspectors" may be Federal or State employees.

DESIGNATION OF MAJOR CONSUMING AREAS FOR REGULATION

Section 5 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture after hearing called upon application of a State agency, responsible for the administration and enforcement of State poultry inspection laws, or if there is no such agency, then upon application of any appropriate State or local official or of any appropriate poultry industry group, to designate major consuming areas where poultry or poultry products are marketed in such volume as to affect, burden, or obstruct the movement of inspected poultry products in interstate or foreign commerce. Exemptions would also be authorized under this section. Designation would be made by notice in the Federal Register, specifying an effective date not less than 6 months after such notice. The Secretary of Agriculture under this section has full discretion in determining whether a major consuming area shall be designated, taking into consideration the views, evidence, and other data submitted at the hearing and such other information as may be available to him.

ANTE MORTEM AND POST MORTEM INSPECTION

Section 6 (a) requires such ante mortem inspection as the Secretary deems necessary. Section 6 (b) requires a post mortem inspection of each carcass processed in official establishments processing poultry for poultry products for interstate or foreign commerce or in or for major consuming areas designated under section 5. Poultry products and parts thereof found upon inspection to be unwholesome or adulterated are to be condemned and destroyed for human-food purposes under supervision of an inspector, provided that if reprocessed under such supervision so as to be not unwholesome or adulterated they need not be destroyed for human-food purposes. Provision is made for appeal against condemnation. "Official establishments" are establishments at which inspection is maintained under the authority of the act.

REINSPECTION, QUARANTINE, SEGREGATION

Section 6 (c) makes provision for reinspection of slaughtered poultry and poultry products as often as the Secretary deems necessary to insure wholesomeness. Section 6 (d) makes provision for the quarantine and segregation of live or slaughtered poultry under rules and regulations as prescribed by the Secretary.

SANITARY REGULATIONS

Section 7 requires official establishments to have premises, facilities, and equipment, and be operated in accordance with sanitary practices required by regulations of the Secretary for the purposes of the act. It will be the duty of the inspection service to enforce these regulations and inspection services will be refused establishments failing to meet the requirements of this section.

LABELING REQUIREMENTS

Section 8 (a) requires shipping containers of poultry products inspected and found wholesome under the act to be labeled with the official inspection mark and approved plant number of the processing plant. Each immediate container is required to bear, in addition to the material required on the shipping container, the name of the product, a statement of ingredients if fabricated from two or more ingredients, a statement of any artificial flavoring, artificial coloring, or chemical preservative it bears or contains, the quantity, and the name and address of either the processing plant or the distributor. The Secretary may permit variation or exemption from the requirements of this subsection not in conflict with the provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

FALSE OR MISLEADING LABELING

Section 8 (b) prohibits false or misleading labeling. Subject to administrative and

court appeal, the Secretary may direct the modification of any label so that it will not be false or misleading. The Secretary has the same authority with respect to established trademark or names which are usual to such products as he presently has with respect to red meats under the Meat Inspection Act.

PROHIBITED ACTS

Section 9 prohibits—

(a) the processing, sale or offering for sale, introduction, delivery for introduction, transportation, or receiving for transportation, in interstate or foreign commerce or in a designated major consuming area, of any poultry product not inspected and labeled in accordance with the act;

(b) the sale of or other disposition for human food of any poultry or poultry product found unwholesome or adulterated under the act;

(c) forgery and similar specified actions with respect to inspection certificates, marks, and devices, and misrepresentation of products as inspected;

(d) using in interstate or foreign commerce or in designated major consuming areas of false or misleading labeling;

(e) improper use of containers bearing official inspection marks;

(f) refusal to permit access at reasonable times to establishments processing poultry or poultry products for interstate or foreign commerce, or in or for designated major consuming areas;

(g) refusal to permit access to and copying of records as required by section 11;

(h) improper use, or revealing of, information acquired under authority of the act concerning trade secrets;

(i) delivering, receiving, transporting, selling, or offering for sale or transport, in interstate or foreign commerce or designated major consuming areas, poultry slaughtered for human food unless the blood, feathers, feet, head, and viscera have been removed in accordance with rules prescribed by the Secretary. Transport between official establishments or to foreign countries pursuant to rules prescribed by the Secretary would, however, be permitted, provided that poultry for export complies with the laws of the importing country. This would specifically prohibit the movement of New York dressed poultry in commerce or in a designated major consuming area or from an official establishment, except between official establishments and under exemptions under section 5 as authorized by the Secretary. The committee realizes that this provision may cause some problems and that some exemptions may be necessary. In making any such exemptions the Secretary should take all reasonable precautions to assure that only wholesome poultry or poultry products are marketed.

COMPLETE COVERAGE OF OFFICIAL ESTABLISHMENTS

Section 10 prohibits any establishment processing poultry or poultry products for interstate or foreign commerce or in or for a designated major consuming area from processing any poultry or poultry product except in compliance with the act. This would prohibit any such establishment from processing any poultry or poultry product without inspection.

RECORDS

Section 11 requires persons processing, transporting, shipping, or receiving poultry slaughtered for human consumption or poultry products in interstate or foreign commerce or in a "designated" major consuming area, or holding products so received, to maintain records for a period of 2 years following such transactions, and to permit access to and copying of records, showing the movement in such commerce or area, or holding, of any such poultry or product and the quantity, shipper, and consignee thereof.

INJUNCTIONS

Section 12 provides for injunctions to restrain violations.

PENALTIES

Section 13 provides penalties for violation of sections 9, 10, 11, and 18, with increased maximum penalties for second and subsequent offenses. The degree of proof with respect to violations subject to the penalties is the same as in the Meat Inspection Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. It is a program for the protection of the public health comparable to these two acts and, therefore, knowledge or willfulness on the part of the person concerned in a violation is not an element of the violation and need not be established by the Government in enforcement proceedings. In exercising his discretion under section 14 with respect to the reporting of minor violations, however, it is expected that the Secretary will take into account evidence that the violation was unintentional. Common carriers are exempted from the penalties of the act other than the penalties for violation of section 11 (maintenance of records and availability thereof) with respect to their usual course of business as a carrier of slaughtered poultry products owned by another person unless they have knowledge of facts indicating that the poultry or product was not inspected or marked as required by the act.

REPORTING OF VIOLATIONS

Section 14 provides that before institution of any criminal proceeding, the accused shall be given an opportunity to present his views and gives the Secretary discretion regarding the reporting of minor violations for the institution of criminal or injunction proceedings.

REGULATIONS

Section 15 provides for regulations.

EXEMPTIONS

Section 16 authorizes the Secretary by regulation and under such conditions as he may prescribe to exempt, in certain circumstances, from specific provisions of the act—poultry producers, retail dealers, processing as required by recognized religious dietary laws, and instances where the Secretary determines that it would be impracticable to provide inspection and the exemption will aid in the effective administration of the act, provided that such last exemption shall not be continued on and after July 1, 1960.

VIOLATIONS BY EXEMPTED PERSONS

Section 17 imposes penalties on persons exempt from other provisions of the act under section 16 for selling products which are unwholesome and adulterated.

IMPORTS

Section 18 (a) provides that slaughtered poultry, parts, and products for import must be wholesome, unadulterated, and comply with regulations of the Secretary to assure that they meet the standards provided for in the act. After importation they are subject to the provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act as well as this act. The Department contemplates issuing regulations similar to those for the importation of meat under the Imported Meat Act (19 U. S. C. 1306).

Section 18 (b) authorizes the Secretary to make rules and regulations dealing with the destruction of slaughtered poultry, parts, and products which have been refused admission to this country, unless they be exported by the consignee within the time fixed by rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

Section 18 (c) provides that all costs, such as storage and cartage, shall be paid for by the owner or consignee for slaughtered poultry, parts, and products thereof refused admission under this section.

EXEMPTION FROM FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

Section 19 (a) provides the same exemption for poultry and poultry products from the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act as presently applies to red meats.

COOPERATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES

Section 19 (b) provides for cooperation between Federal and State agencies.

INSPECTION COSTS

Section 20 provides that the cost of inspection, except overtime performed in official establishments, shall be borne by the United States. Overtime may be paid to employees by the Secretary, but the Secretary will be reimbursed by the establishment in which the overtime occurred. This reimbursement shall be available to the Secretary without fiscal-year limitation to carry out the purposes of the section. This will provide continuity in the availability of funds to meet the overtime demands of industry at the beginning of the fiscal year. Appropriations for regular inspection will not be augmented by this provision.

APPROPRIATIONS

Section 21 authorizes appropriations necessary to carry out the act.

SEPARABILITY

Section 22 provides for separability in case any provision is held invalid.

EFFECTIVE DATE

Section 23 makes the act effective upon enactment, but provides that no person shall be subject to the act prior to January 1, 1959, unless such person applies for and receives inspection under the act after January 1, 1958. However, any person who applies for and receives inspection after January 1, 1958, shall be subject to all of the provisions of the act. Between the date of enactment and January 1, 1958, the act would be effective only to permit the Department to work out administrative plans, hire personnel, and perform other functions prerequisite to beginning inspection under the act on January 1, 1958. Processors receiving inspection under the present voluntary program would not be entitled to have inspection costs borne by the Government under this act until January 1, 1958.

COST OF THE PROGRAM

The Department of Agriculture has estimated the initial cost of the program provided by the bill as \$4,750,000 for fiscal year 1958, and the cost for fiscal year 1959 as \$7,750,000 to \$10 million.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. The exemptions which are noted on page 19 of the bill seem to be perfectly clear. However, in order that they may appear in the legislative record, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator a question.

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall be very happy to yield for a question.

Mr. COOPER. This bill does not apply at all to live poultry. Is it correct to say that a farmer or farm wife who desires to sell slaughtered poultry to a consumer may continue to do so, if this bill should become law?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. The only requirement is that the poultry be grown on the farm of the person asking for the exemption.

Mr. COOPER. The farmer or farm wife could slaughter and sell poultry raised on the home farm but could not buy dressed poultry from other farmers and sell it?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. I also wish to make it clear that the processed poultry must go directly to the consumer, and not to a retailer.

Mr. COOPER. Could a farmer sell slaughtered poultry to a retail store?

Mr. ELLENDER. Not without inspection. Any poultry coming under that category must be inspected. The only exemption is with respect to poultry which is grown by the farmer on his own farm and sold by him directly to the consumer.

Mr. COOPER. Do you mean that a farmer who has been selling a few slaughtered chickens to a retail store could not continue to do so? Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. If the poultry does not go into interstate commerce, and is not to be marketed in an area designated under section 5 of the bill, it would not be covered by the bill.

Mr. COOPER. In other words, if the farmer sells poultry to a store, and the store has a local trade, the farmer would be exempt from the provisions of the bill. Is this correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. If it is sold locally; yes.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to ask the Senator another question. Am I correct in saying that the retail dealer who sells dressed poultry to consumers in the local trade would not come under the provisions of the proposed act. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct, assuming either that interstate commerce or a designated area is not involved or that the only processing operation performed by the dealer is the cutting up of poultry products on the premises.

Mr. COOPER. The bill provides also, as I understand, for marking the poultry passing into interstate commerce, as having been inspected.

The bill also provides that a carrier cannot accept for transportation any poultry or poultry products which are not marked as having been properly inspected and approved. Does the Senator believe that a small processor in a small community may be harmed by this bill? What I have in mind is that the inspectors might tend to direct their inspection to the larger processors, from whose businesses most of the poultry would enter interstate commerce. If the inspectors should devote their inspection to the larger processing plants, the smaller processors might be put out of business because they would not be able to ship. Would that be the practical effect?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not quite understand the import of the Senator's question.

Mr. COOPER. Perhaps I can clarify it. The bill provides that poultry cannot be transported in interstate commerce or into designated areas unless it has been marked as having been inspected and approved.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COOPER. As the Senator knows, there are hundreds of small processors in many communities throughout the country. Does the Senator believe that

it would be possible to have the necessary inspections made at all of these small plants? What I am worrying about is that the inspectors would not be stationed almost exclusively in the large processing plants, and that small processors would not be able to have their poultry inspected and therefore could not ship in interstate commerce.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, the Secretary of Agriculture would have to furnish the inspection service to all processors covered by the act, both large and small. If it is not practicable to furnish inspection to some processors, the Secretary may exempt such processors from the bill until July 1, 1960.

Mr. COOPER. Is it true that all the provisions of the act will not become effective for 3 years?

Mr. ELLENDER. Insofar as the Department of Agriculture is concerned, the act goes into effect immediately to permit it to work on a program; but no one can obtain the service provided under the bill, that is, have the Government pay for the inspection service, until January 1, 1958. It is made mandatory after January 1, 1959, and then, I may say, the exceptions to which I have just referred can be maintained by the Secretary of Agriculture where necessary until July 1, 1960. That provision appears in section 16 (a) (3).

Mr. COOPER. What I am trying to find out is whether there is a possibility that if the bill is passed the difficulties of inspection to the large processing plants would be so great—that inspection there being simpler at larger plants—their product would more easily pass into interstate commerce. On the other hand, if prompt inspection could not be furnished to small dealers they could be forced out of business, whereas it will be difficult for the small processing plants throughout the country to obtain the services of inspectors, and, as a result, they will not be able to have their products marked, and thus not be able to sell them, in which event they would have to go out of business. Did the committee consider that the bill, worthy as it is, might have the practical effect of making the large producers even more powerful and perhaps causing the smaller ones to go out of business because they could not get inspection? Is there any possibility of that situation occurring?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I may say to the Senator from Kentucky that that question was raised in the testimony before the committee. The representative of the Secretary of Agriculture gave assurance to the committee that the bill would not have that effect. The Department will be required to provide inspection service in the small plants, so the bill would not have the effect of putting small processors out of business.

This is a mandatory inspection bill. The small plants would be forced to comply with the inspection requirements and the Department must likewise furnish poultry inspection. Therefore, as we pass the mandatory inspection re-

quirement, we pass also the requirement that the Secretary of Agriculture shall provide adequate inspection facilities for the small plants, so that their operations may continue on a normal, functional basis.

Mr. COOPER. I am certain, then, that the chairman of the committee would say that the purpose of the committee was to require that the Secretary of Agriculture should make inspection facilities available in time and equality both to the small and the large processors.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator is correct.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The bill is one of considerable importance to many persons in my State. I am interested in it not only from the standpoint of my State, but also from the standpoint of the country at large. I am sorry I did not hear the earlier discussion of the bill by the Senator from Louisiana, but this thought occurs to me: To what extent is the inspection of live poultry to be required?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is to be left entirely to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, in the making of rules and regulations for ante-mortem inspection.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The thought which at once arises is that there are people throughout the country, principally farmers, who have considerable flocks of poultry, such as turkeys and chickens. Where would the inspection of the live birds take place?

Mr. ELLENDER. The discretion is left entirely to the Secretary of Agriculture. The inspection of a flock may be made on a farmer's farm, or it may be made when the farmer takes the poultry to the plant, for sale.

The Senator from Delaware is well acquainted with the situation which prevails in his own State. I understand that auction sales of poultry are held from time to time. Many thousands of chickens from a farm are sold. In that case, the Secretary could, if he saw fit, determine by rules and regulations whether the inspection should be made on the farm or when delivery was made to the plant which purchased the poultry. It is left entirely to the Secretary of Agriculture to promulgate the rules and regulations which may be necessary. Ordinarily inspection would take place at the plant.

If the Senator will turn to page 8 of the bill, he will notice the following:

Ante mortem inspection: For the purpose of preventing the entry into or flow or movement in commerce or in designated major consuming area of any poultry product which is unwholesome or adulterated, the Secretary shall, whenever processing operations are being conducted, make such ante mortem examination and inspection of poultry about to be slaughtered as he deems necessary.

Mr. REVERCOMB. We have revealed here the very danger that I foresee in the bill. The purpose of the bill is a splendid one; namely, the inspection of food. But if it is proposed to inspect live chickens or live turkeys in the hands of the farmer

or the processor, or wherever the inspection may take place, I think we shall be building up a practice which will involve quite a danger in Government oversight and control of the production of poultry. I think it would be perhaps a very good thing to inspect dressed poultry, but when we go to the point of inspecting live birds, I think we will have gone very far in establishing Government control over the production of poultry.

Mr. ELLENDER. I would say that inspection would ordinarily take place at the plant, but there could be occasions, such as cases of epidemics, where inspection at some other point might be advisable. That is why the discretion was left with the Secretary of Agriculture. In that way the rules can be changed or modified to meet different situations. It may be entirely possible that all the poultry will be subject to ante mortem examinations at the plants. If that is the practical way to conduct examinations, the Secretary of Agriculture will have the right so to provide.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the poultry expert, the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This question was raised in the committee. It is one of the major points, and it was considered last year and again this year. Both the committee and the Department of Agriculture recognized the utter impracticability of ante mortem inspection of poultry, bird by bird. Likewise, the impracticability of inspecting the poultry at the farm was recognized. At the same time, the committee and the Department felt it was necessary to give to the Secretary of Agriculture discretionary authority to make ante mortem inspections. The situation could arise wherein a lot of chickens are brought in from a farm and as they started to come through the line in the processing plant they could be found to be diseased. Certainly the inspector should not sit at the end of the line and let all the diseased poultry run through. The inspector should have the authority, if he felt it to be necessary, to make ante mortem inspections under such circumstances.

Mr. ELLENDER. I call the attention of the Senator from West Virginia to page 8, line 21, where the last phrase reads: "inspection of poultry about to be slaughtered as he deems necessary."

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct. The inspection would not be on the farm. The committee ruled against adopting an at-the-farm inspection policy for the reason which the Senator from West Virginia has just raised. But, as I pointed out before, there are times when a flock of poultry consigned to a processing plant may be found to be diseased. We recognized the impracticability of inspecting poultry by individual birds. It is physically impossible to do so.

Only 3 pounds of poultry meat are examined on each inspection. That is an entirely different situation from the inspection of livestock. On the inspection of a steer, from 1,500 to 1,800 pounds of meat are involved. But it is necessary to make 500 inspections to cover 1,500 pounds of poultry meat. So, it

was recognized that the bird-by-bird ante mortem inspection was not practicable. Neither was ante mortem inspection at the farm intended.

Mr. REVERCOMB. This discussion has revealed the authority which will be granted to the Secretary of Agriculture to inspect live poultry. A very wide power is given to the Secretary of Agriculture as to when he will inspect, how he will inspect, and where he will inspect live poultry. It seems to me that the very purpose of the bill, namely, to provide pure food, would be accomplished if the inspection were applied to the dressed poultry, and the people who raise poultry were left alone. Most of them are individual farmers who raise small flocks of poultry which they sell, and which mean so much to them in terms of income. If we provide anyone with broad discretion to determine whether those flocks of poultry shall be inspected, I think we provide for a possibility of causing damage to the small farmers. Furthermore, by having the dressed birds inspected, we shall achieve our purpose of having good food placed on the market.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORNONEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The ante mortem inspection would only be made on poultry as it starts through the line and then only under the conditions previously outlined.

The income of poultry farmers is improved as the consumers are given assurance that they will receive a better product and this improved protection certainly will increase the sales.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. On page 8 of the bill I see no provision dealing with the poultry as it is about to go through the assembly line to slaughter. I should like to have the distinguished Senator from Delaware state how long a time is meant by the word "about."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana will yield further to me—

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree with the Senator from Nebraska that various interpretations could be made of that provision. All we can state here is the intent of the committee. I believe that from the legislative background, as established both by the hearings and by the discussion on the floor of the Senate here today, Senators will readily be able to determine what the committee intended to have done.

Likewise, our intentions will be clear to the Department of Agriculture. The passage of this bill will be a major step forward for the industry. Later, if the Secretary should go too far afield in administering the law we can take action. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has pointed out that the Secretary of Agriculture already has similar author-

ity in the case of livestock. I should like to have the Senator from Vermont comment more on that point. I think it is clear that to a large extent we must rely upon the administrative intent of the Secretary.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President—

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in the case of the ante mortem inspection of poultry, the bill will give the Secretary the same authority which he now has in the case of livestock, such as cattle, sheep, and hogs. The Secretary now has such authority in the case of red meat inspection, although the post mortem inspection is what really counts.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There have not been abuses with respect to their administration of the other programs, so we have no reason to expect that there will be abuse in this case.

Mr. CURTIS. But under the bill we would be giving the Secretary power to abuse the authority; would we not?

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is the point.

Mr. CURTIS. We would be giving a Government agency authority to inspect on the farms—which could mean every chicken coop and farmyard in the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is not my intention as a supporter of this bill and as one member of the committee which reported it.

Mr. CURTIS. That could happen if the farmers wished to sell to processors who would handle the poultry in interstate commerce.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to point out that the language appearing on page 8, in line 21, is specific. It will not give the Secretary of Agriculture the right to inspect every poultry yard throughout the country. He will have that right only in cases where the poultry is about to be slaughtered.

One point which has not been brought out thus far is that many poultry diseases can better be discovered by ante mortem examination, rather than post mortem.

In addition, there was testimony to the effect that those who work in the slaughterhouses may catch diseases by handling diseased poultry. For their protection, also, this provision for ante mortem inspection has been included in the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield, so that I may ask a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the word "about," as used in line 21, in the phrase "about to be slaughtered," refer to poultry after it has arrived at the place of slaughter?

Mr. ELLENDER. I would not say so, not exclusively. It could be poultry that was about to be shipped by the farmer to the slaughterhouse. Conceivably it could include poultry which the farmer has agreed to sell to the slaughterer, because it states that the poultry is about to be slaughtered. It is poultry for which slaughter is imminent. Ordinarily it would be poultry which has arrived at the slaughtering plant; but inspection at some prior point is not precluded, so long

as the poultry is about to be slaughtered. I do not think there can be any doubt about that. The language is plain.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to read from the United States Code, on page 2815, title 21, section 71, the paragraph which is headed "Inspection of Meat, Meat Food Products; Examination of Cattle Before Slaughtering; Diseased Animals Slaughtered Separately and Carcasses Examined."

It reads as follows:

For the purpose of preventing the use in interstate or foreign commerce of meat or food products which are unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or otherwise unfit for human food, the Secretary of Agriculture, at his discretion, may cause to be made, by inspectors appointed for that purpose, an examination and inspection of all cattle, sheep, swine, and goats before they shall be allowed to enter into any slaughtering, packing, meat canning, rendering, or similar establishment in which they are to be slaughtered.

Then the paragraph provides for separation of the sheep from the goats, so to speak—and for separation of the sick from the well—and for other purposes.

I have read that simply to show that the pending bill does not provide anything at all which is not already provided in relation to the inspection of livestock.

Witnesses who appeared before the committee apparently had very strong ideas in regard to having inspectors go to the farms and inspect poultry there. But the committee did not agree with them. The committee reported this bill unanimously, as I recall.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me, to permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for that purpose, provided I may do so without losing the floor.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator from Vermont said witnesses before the committee urged against inspection on the farms, and the Senator stated that the committee took a different viewpoint. Where in the bill is that different viewpoint set forth? Under the language of the pending bill, does the Secretary of Agriculture not have authority to send inspectors anywhere, to make the inspection? His inspectors could make inspections on the farms, could they not?

Mr. AIKEN. Certainly, the same as in the case of cattle, swine, or sheep, if they are offered for slaughter. I am not sure that under the provisions of the pending bill the inspectors would have the right to go onto a farm unless the poultry on the farm were being offered for slaughter. I do not think the Secretary of Agriculture would have such authority.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the way I interpret the language to which I referred. It is very plain.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield further to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I think the purpose of the bill is good; I wish to make that statement.

But will the Senator from Louisiana, the chairman of the committee, who is in charge of the bill, not be willing to have it provide that the inspection shall be an inspection of the dressed poultry; and will he not be willing to leave out of the bill any reference to inspection of live poultry? I think that would make the bill much more definite.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a poultry inspection bill was under discussion during the last session of the 84th Congress; and last year the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry devoted a considerable amount of time to this problem. We did so again this year. We held hearings; and we held additional hearings on almost similar bills. A number of able Senators introduced three separate bills. We had them, 3 of the principal sponsors of these 3 bills, get together, work out a bill which would be acceptable to them, as well as to the Department of Agriculture and to the Food and Drug Administration.

As I said in my previous statement, personally I was surprised but pleased to note that they came out of conference with a unanimous agreement. In addition, both the Food and Drug Administration and the Department of Agriculture have approved this measure.

There was much give and take on each side. The distinguished Senator from Georgia had his own bill. The distinguished Senator from Minnesota had his own bill, as did the Senator from Vermont and many other Senators. There was a unanimous report among them. It is true that the bill may not meet exactly the views of some Senators, but it is the best that can be obtained. I am saying to the Senate that I believe every safeguard possible has been placed in the bill. As the distinguished Senator from Delaware has just stated, if there should be any abuse for the authority proposed to be given to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Congress could take further action at almost any time.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me ask the Senator if it would not serve the purpose of insuring healthy meat to remove completely from the bill the provision for the inspection of live poultry, and thereby strike from the bill the unlimited power given to a department of Government to make an inspection of live birds anywhere it wants to, if it is so desired to do? Could not the purposes of the bill be served by deleting the provision for inspection of live poultry, and merely provide for inspection of dressed poultry? Will the Senator not concede that is a correct statement?

Mr. ELLENDER. That proposal was considered by the committee, I may say to my good friend from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I may say to my good friend from Louisiana there are a number of us who would like to vote for the bill, but he is making it impossible for us to do so.

Mr. ELLENDER. The bill was considered in the light of the objection which the Senator is now suggesting, and, as I stated, all those factors were considered. As chairman of the committee—and the committee agreed with me—I suggested having the proponents of the three bills sit together with the attorney from the Department of Agriculture, the Deputy Administrator of the Food and Drug Administration, and others interested in the bill. The result was the bill which is now before the Senate. I really believe it is a good bill. It will serve the purposes for which it is sought to have it enacted.

May I say to my good friend from West Virginia that a number of amendments may yet be proposed to the bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am looking forward to them.

Mr. ELLENDER. If there are any abuses by the Secretary of Agriculture, I will be one of the first to try to correct them. As I stated, the provision in the bill to which reference has been made does not, in my humble judgment, give the Secretary of Agriculture the right to go on any farm and inspect individual flocks unless they are about to be slaughtered. In my humble judgment, the Secretary will find it convenient to have the inspection made at the place where the poultry is brought to slaughter. That is my personal opinion.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Georgia, who is a poultry expert from his State, and the author of one of the bills. I am sure he can shed light on the subject.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the Senator, but I do not pretend to be a poultry expert. However, I am proud and happy to represent in part a State that produces about one-ninth of all the broilers produced in America, to the extent of something like 234 million chicks a year.

I should like to say to my distinguished friend from West Virginia that when we drafted the bill we were trying to keep in mind a piece of legislation that would be fair to the consumers and provide for them adequate and nutritious meat. We tried also to keep in mind the processors and not to place on them undue hardships or burdens in their efforts to process poultry and make it available to consumers. We tried also to keep in mind employees who work in plants and handle birds which may be diseased. We tried also to remember the farmers who produce the birds, and attempted to make the bill fair to that great mass of people.

For those reasons, we provided great discretionary authority in the Secretary of Agriculture. Because we are undertaking a program which heretofore has not been mandatory, but purely permissive, we thought it was necessary to draft legislation that would place discretionary power in the Secretary of Agriculture, so that the situation could be adjusted from time to time to meet the needs as they might arise.

With reference to ante mortem inspection, sometimes, though not often, flocks of birds become diseased. I believe in recent years there have been instances of

poultry becoming affected with the disease called psittacosis that has adversely affected the consumer, and, I believe in some cases, employees in the plants affected.

If I am correctly informed by the authorities, psittacosis can best be diagnosed prior to the time a bird is slaughtered. If the processor discovers a diseased flock, the Secretary of Agriculture, or his inspector, who would be his agent, is given authority to inspect live birds. Normally, the inspection will take place at the premises of the slaughtering plant, where the farmer delivered his birds to be slaughtered. But if a flock is found to be infected, there is no reason why the inspector should not go to the farm of the man who raised the particular flock and inspect the birds there.

That is the reason for providing the ante mortem inspection, and the sole reason therefor.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana for yielding to me.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The statement of the able Senator from Georgia was very informative and enlightening, but I put the question to him: Cannot the needed protection be afforded to persons who consume poultry by providing inspection of dressed poultry, instead of regulating flocks and interfering with the farmers who raise chickens and turkeys, and giving this broad power to the Secretary of Agriculture? I have the greatest respect for the Secretary of Agriculture, but I question giving such broad authority to any administrative officer. Does the Senator not realize the harm which could result from an abuse of such power when the Congress hands it to an administrative officer? I put the question again: Cannot the consuming public be protected by inspection of dressed birds, rather than by regulating the farmer who raises the birds?

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield so that I may answer the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. As I understand, some ante mortem inspection is necessary for two reasons. First, some diseases in birds can be best ascertained prior to death rather than by inspection of the carcass after death. Secondly, if there is no provision made whatever for ante mortem inspection, then the persons who are employed in processing plants would come in contact with the birds without having an opportunity to become aware of the fact that the birds are infected, until they are actually processing them. Therefore, employees of processing plants would not be protected.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me for one more question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I put this question: To what extent have persons working in processing plants been disabled by or have contracted diseases?

Is that occurrence widespread or is it de minimus?

Mr. TALMADGE. In answer to the question, some of the witnesses who appeared before our committee contended that it was widespread. I do not think it has been very widespread.

But certainly I do not think we ought to pass an inspection bill which does not give the Secretary of Agriculture some authority, so that when it is made apparent that birds may be diseased there may be some degree of inspection prior to the slaughter of the birds.

It is not expected that such authority will be very widely used, because we do not think the Secretary of Agriculture will abuse his discretion in this matter. Certainly with regard to the red meat industry, where the same type of discretion has been permitted, there have been no complaints on the floor of the Senate that such discretion has ever been abused.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I stated a moment ago, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry heard much testimony in June of 1958 on a similar bill which was reported to the Senate.

Among the witnesses who testified—only one of many witnesses—was Shirley W. Barker, director, poultry department, Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of North America, AFL-CIO, of Chicago, Ill.

I quote from Mr. Barker's testimony, as found on page 99 of the hearings:

Only 3 months ago, the Portland, Oreg., area was in the throes of a severe psittacosis, or parrot fever, epidemic caused by turkeys. Two persons died and 62 became extremely ill. Many of these men and women were members of the AMCBW who work in poultry plants.

The entire poultry industry suffers because of the lack of regulatory standards of sanitation and wholesomeness.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to make a comment on the question of the Senator from West Virginia.

My understanding is that there have been but two outbreaks of such poultry diseases in this country, one in Oregon and one in Texas.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Only two?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Only two. However, this is a disease which is communicable to human beings and may be injurious to them. That was the information we received from witnesses before the committee. One never knows when the disease is going to break out again. The Secretary of Agriculture felt that, in order to protect employees and all concerned, some ante mortem inspection authority is necessary.

I agree with that; however, at the same time I do not intend that the authority granted should be misused.

I may say, in connection with psittacosis—the disease which occurred in Oregon and Texas—that there are two bills relating to this subject, pending before the committee now, both of which I understand are supported by the De-

partment of Agriculture. One was introduced by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the chairman of the committee, and the other is a bill I introduced several days ago. These bills provide separate authority to the Secretary of Agriculture whenever there is an outbreak of psittacosis—anywhere in the country, whether it be Oregon, Texas, Delaware, West Virginia, or anywhere else, to go into the area, quarantine it, condemn and kill all the poultry on any farm affected, and compensate the farmer for the destroyed birds. In other words, the program would be handled in the same manner in which the program covering the hoof-and-mouth disease, which affects the cattle industry, has been handled.

It is the intention of both these other bills to give the Secretary of Agriculture adequate authority to eradicate this disease before it becomes more prevalent. Both bills would compensate the farmer for any condemned or destroyed birds.

I am confident the committee will report to the Senate some such proposed legislation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I heartily agree that where there is an outbreak of psittacosis or any other such disease in poultry, which becomes dangerous to mankind, there ought to be the power to control it. I should think perhaps there should be provided direct power to enable the Secretary to step in, quarantine the whole area, and destroy the diseased birds.

That is not the point here. One cannot argue on the basis of two occurrences in the country, as to which some provision certainly ought to be made, that we should place in an administrative officer of the Federal Government unlimited power, virtually to control by inspection the poultry on a man's farm.

It is argued that the inspection is to be made at the plants. There is nothing in the bill to require that. The discretion is broad enough to permit the Secretary to go anywhere to inspect poultry. That is why I urge the able Senator from Louisiana to remove this broad power, from the bill and, if necessary, write another provision in the bill, whereby where psittacosis, or any other such disease of poultry, is found, the Secretary of Agriculture shall be given authority to quarantine and condemn the poultry of the area involved.

But that is not the question, if I may so state to the able Senator. We have here a question of broad discretion, which is unlimited, which permits the Secretary of Agriculture, if he so wishes, to go to the farm of the poultry raiser and control his flock.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I may say to my good friend from West Virginia that, as I stated before, there were three bills before the committee for consideration. One of the bills contained a provision which made it absolutely compulsory on the part of the Secretary to make the inspections. Some

people have even suggested that there should be a bird-by-bird inspection.

The pending bill is a happy compromise reached by those who are interested in legislation on this subject.

I refer again to the language on page 8, line 21, which refers to "poultry about to be slaughtered." It does not require the Secretary of Agriculture to do the inspection bird by bird, but only "as he deems necessary."

Mr. CURTIS and Mr. WILLIAMS addressed the Chair.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I regret to say I disagree a little bit with the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. I am inclined to think that if the bill is to pass it ought to provide for ante mortem inspection.

I am wondering—and I ask this as a question—what protection the consumers will be deprived of if the inspection is made at the point of processing and slaughtering. I believe it is correct to say that poultry diseases can appear very suddenly. A flock under contract to be purchased can be inspected, found not to be diseased, and yet be found to be diseased by the time the flock is run onto the line of slaughter.

Why not remove this entire area of concern by having the ante mortem inspection at the point of slaughtering? I ask that question.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield so that I may answer that question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Would the Senator from Louisiana be willing to write language into section 6, subsection (a), which would definitely provide for ante mortem inspection at the plant, and would that meet the purpose of the able Senator from Nebraska?

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

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I think the language would be superfluous. I do not believe that the Secretary is going to promulgate rules and regulations which will require agents to go about the country and inspect each poultry flock. It is my humble judgment that all of the inspection will be done at the plant. I do not think there can be any question about that.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say to the Senator that if he would accept the amendment suggested, which would definitely provide that the inspection should be at the plants, certainly he would remove a part of the objection which is being voiced on the floor of the Senate today.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would have no objection to such an amendment.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I suggest that if there were an epidemic in the community, the inspection ought to be made before the birds reached the plant. Otherwise the

entire plant might be quarantined, and the producers of sound birds, as well as the producers of unsound birds, would lose their market or be compelled to go to a more distant market. Possibly they would not even be permitted to do that.

The bill has been worked over by the various poultry associations and the farm organizations, including the National Grange and the Farm Bureau. As I understand, the representatives of those organizations hoped that no amendments would be made to the bill—not that it would turn out to be a perfect bill, because there will probably be some flaws in it. That frequently happens in legislation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. We are trying to cure the flaws now.

Mr. AIKEN. If the representatives of the various farm organizations are all happy, let us keep them happy.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not know of any objection to the bill as it was presented to the Senate, by any of the witnesses who appeared, except a few who desired bird-by-bird ante mortem examination. We objected to that. We thought that not only would it be too expensive, but that possibly it would involve an infringement on the rights of the farmers to some extent.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator will recall that some of the witnesses who desired bird-by-bird inspection, even on the farm, also wanted the inspection work to be transferred to the Food and Drug Administration, and taken away from the Department of Agriculture altogether.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I know that there is almost universal support for the bill. We were trying to get it through without amendment. However, I would not be concerned over the proposal of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], because it was clearly my understanding that that was the manner in which the inspection would be made, and that the bill did not contemplate farm-by-farm inspection. I believe that in the case of an epidemic, a different situation would exist. Such a situation will be dealt with in the bill which is now pending before the committee, and which was introduced by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], as well as in the bill introduced by myself, which would give the Secretary of Agriculture, when such a situation arose, authority to quarantine an entire area. Pending the lifting of the quarantine, during which time the Secretary would be authorized to destroy diseased birds at the farm and compensate the farmer for them, there would be mandatory ante mortem inspection at the farm for every flock. That inspection would continue until the quarantine was lifted, or until the disease could be eradicated.

Mr. REVERCOMB. No one could object to that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think such a situation would be handled under the terms of the next bill. However, I have no objection to the suggestion of the Senator from West Virginia. It was definitely my understanding that that would be the manner in which the inspection

would be done. Of course, it is up to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, of course the chairman of the committee has no authority to agree to any such amendment. The bill comes from the committee with a unanimous report. I shall be glad to consult with other members of the committee with respect to any amendment suggested, as to whether or not it should be accepted.

As was stated by the distinguished Senator from Delaware, during the discussion last year and again this year—particularly this year—it was felt that under the rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Agriculture the inspection would be made at the plant. That is the practical place to make it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this time to permit me to offer an amendment to the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the Senator's privilege. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I offer an amendment in section 6, subsection (a), in line 21 on page 8, after the words "of poultry about to be slaughtered" to insert the words "at the processing plant," so as to read: "of poultry about to be slaughtered at the processing plant as he deems necessary."

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. If the bill proposed by the Senator from Louisiana at the request of the Department of Agriculture and the bill proposed by the Senator from Delaware were in effect, there would not be the slightest objection to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia. It would be wholly in keeping. However, the legislation which has been proposed has not yet been reported by the committee. If it were to become law, it ought to be possible to quarantine diseased poultry, in the same manner as diseased livestock are quarantined.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course, we can never say with certainty what proposal will become law. Nevertheless, I know that the Department of Agriculture has endorsed the principle referred to, and has sent word to the chairman of the committee to that effect. I have every reason to feel that the proposed legislation referred to will become law. Such a provision could be offered as an amendment to the pending bill. However, I believe that two separate problems are involved, and that they should be handled separately. It is my intention that the law should be administered as indicated by the Senator from West Virginia. Therefore I have no objection to his amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. My understanding is the same as that of the Senator from Delaware. However, it was felt by some that it would be best to give the Secretary of Agriculture as much leeway as possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8, line 21, after the word "slaughtered," it

is proposed to insert "at the processing plant."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB].

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have just consulted with our counsel, and he suggests that if an amendment is to be made to that section, it would be best to insert it in the same line, after the word "inspection."

Mr. REVERCOMB. I have no objection.

Mr. ELLENDER. So as to read: "make such ante mortem examination and inspection at any official establishment of poultry about to be slaughtered as he deems necessary."

Mr. REVERCOMB. I agree to that modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB].

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on another point?

Mr. ELLENDER. On what point?

Mr. CURTIS. Who is to do the inspection? Will it be the Federal Government or the State government?

Mr. ELLENDER. It will be done under the supervision of the Federal Government.

Mr. CURTIS. Who will pay for it?

Mr. ELLENDER. It will be done by Federal or State employees under the direction of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CURTIS. Is a fee to be charged, or will the cost be met by appropriation? Who will bear the expense of administering the law?

Mr. ELLENDER. The entire cost will be borne by the Department of Agriculture. There is only one exception. In case of overtime, the overtime will be paid for by the establishment requesting it.

Mr. CURTIS. In any instance will there be any expense on the part of the States?

Mr. ELLENDER. There will be none.

Mr. CURTIS. Then what is the meaning of the provision that the inspector must be an employee of the State or Federal Government?

Mr. ELLENDER. Inspection will be performed by either State or Federal inspectors as authorized by the Department of Agriculture. The committee decided that State inspectors could be used, if authorized by the Department of Agriculture. In other words, the Federal Government will have charge of designating the rules and regulations for the inspection, and the Department of Agriculture will have jurisdiction over all inspectors, whether they be State or Federal.

Mr. CURTIS. If the distinguished chairman will yield further on that point, would any State be called upon to furnish more State employees to administer the law?

Mr. ELLENDER. Not unless the Secretary of Agriculture deemed it necessary. All inspections are to be under the

authority of the Department of Agriculture, and must be done under the supervision of the Department by inspectors who are designated by the Department of Agriculture. The Department may designate State employees pursuant to cooperative arrangements with the States involved.

Mr. CURTIS. If the Senator will yield further, I should like to say the reason I bring up the point is that at the present time classifying someone as a State employee involves a little more than it used to involve. It not only involves certain supervisory expenses and bookkeeping expenses and payroll expenses within the State, but also employment taxes, whether they be for social security or for civil service retirement purposes. All those matters come into consideration. Therefore I would be inclined not to favor making the inspectors State employees, but rather provide that they should be Federal employees even though they had other employment for the State.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say to my good friend that I indicated a moment ago that this whole inspection service will be under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture and that whenever State employees are used they will be under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture, and the State government will be reimbursed for their salaries and expenses by the Department.

Mr. CURTIS. Including their employment taxes?

Mr. ELLENDER. All costs.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. On page 22, line 15, I call the Senator's attention to the wording:

The cost of inspection rendered under the requirements of this act shall be borne by the United States.

That is what I was trying to emphasize. Of course any arrangement has to be satisfactory to the State, or the State will not enter into the arrangement. Are there any further questions?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished Senator a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. COOPER. I call attention to page 19 of the bill, particularly to section 16 (1).

Previously I asked the distinguished Senator if a farmer would be permitted to sell directly to a household consumer, and the Senator pointed out that the bill permitted such sales. I should like to ask whether a farmer could sell to a processor or to a retail store.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator refer to live poultry?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course he could.

Mr. COOPER. I call the Senator's attention to page 19, which contains a very specific provision. The Secretary is authorized to exempt from specific provisions of this act "(1) poultry producers with respect to poultry of their own raising on their own farms which

they sell directly to household consumers only."

Does the section permit sales to retail stores or to processors who are engaged in interstate commerce?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no restriction at all with respect to selling live poultry. The bill applies only to slaughtered poultry. The exception provides that poultry which has been raised on a farm by a farmer may be killed on the farm and then sold directly to the consumer.

Mr. COOPER. I understand that as an exception.

Mr. ELLENDER. He cannot sell it in interstate commerce for resale or to a store. He can sell live poultry if he wants to, but the restrictions apply to slaughtered poultry.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to ask a further question. As I understand, an amendment was adopted a very short time ago which provides that inspections shall be made at the place of business of the processor. What is the objection to a farmer cleaning his own poultry and selling it to a processor if the inspection is to take place there?

Mr. ELLENDER. That might destroy the act, I say to my good friend. The inspection of slaughtered poultry must be done at certain plants whose functions are regulated by the Department of Agriculture. They must meet certain standards of sanitation, and things of that kind.

Mr. COOPER. I understand the reason for the provision. But I wanted to ask the questions so that the matter will be clear. These questions have been directed to me by farmers in my State, and I wanted to have the answers in the RECORD. So far as dressed poultry is concerned, a farmer can sell only to a household consumer. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct, that is, without inspection. Any farmer of course can obtain inspection and sell in interstate commerce to anyone.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the present budget embrace an item of \$4,750,000 for the fiscal year 1958 to cover the cost of the operation if the bill is passed?

Mr. ELLENDER. All of the expenses will be borne by the Federal Government. The money will have to be supplied through appropriation. This will be a new appropriation item since the present appropriation provides only the administrative costs of inspection, while the cost of the inspection itself is now borne by the processors.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I refer the Senator to page 7 of the committee report:

The Department of Agriculture has estimated the initial cost of the program provided by the bill at \$4,750,000 for fiscal year 1958, and the cost for fiscal year 1959 as \$7,750,000 to \$10 million.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I stated in my opening remarks, the Department of Agriculture can start immediately, but a processor cannot come within the purview of the act for the purpose of obtaining free inspection service until January 1, 1958.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That will be within this fiscal year.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct, within the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1957.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Six months of it will be within the present fiscal year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; within the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1957. Thereafter, when the program becomes effective and all the plants come within the purview of the act, the cost will range, as the Senator has indicated, from \$7½ million to approximately \$10 million. I may state also to my good friend from Ohio that it is entirely possible that the service may cost even a little more than \$10 million, depending on the number of areas which may be designated under section 5 of the bill.

Under the bill the Secretary of Agriculture has the right to designate areas for regulation. Whether the inspection costs will increase or not will depend on the number of areas which are authorized.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Am I not correct in saying that the provision of the bill will be in effect mandatorily for one-half of fiscal year 1958, and that, according to the figures contained in the report, the minimum expense during that time will be \$2,375,000, and that that money is not included in the budget?

Mr. ELLENDER. The mandatory inspection provision will not take effect until January 1, 1959. Therefore, it is hard to state what the cost will be, because poultry producers can come under the law prior to that date if they desire to, but need not do so. The figure in the committee report was the Department's best estimate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I may suggest that it is not a good Government policy for Congress to establish a program which will entail an expense of \$7,750,000 in 1959, while saying to itself, "It is not our responsibility to provide the money. We will establish the obligation; let the Congress of 1959 worry about where the money will come from."

Mr. ELLENDER. The Congress in 1959 can take the act and throw it through the window, if it wants to. It does not even have to appropriate the money, if it does not want to.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have observed in my experience that very frequently legislative bodies fix a responsibility upon the Government to spend money and then try to escape the odium of their act by saying, "Let a future Congress appropriate the money needed to finance the act." I do not think that is good governmental policy. If Congress enacts a law, it ought to make certain that the money will be provided, or else abandon the project.

Mr. ELLENDER. The reason for postponing the effective date, if the Senator will read the report, is that the industry is not ready to have poultry inspection made compulsory. It will take some time to do that. That is why there is the postponement. That is the sole reason for it. As I said, the bill is only an authorization, nothing else.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not only is the industry not ready for compulsory inspection, but the Department of Agriculture is not ready for compulsory inspection. The Department does not even have the number of trained personnel it will need for the poultry-inspection program.

The bill provides that those who wish to come under the law as of January 1, 1958, may do so; and if they so volunteer, then all the provisions of the act will apply. We have no way to know how many will come under the act. That is as the Senator from Louisiana has explained the bill.

Then the Senator pointed out that by January 1, 1959, the Government will be prepared to undertake its inspection, the industry will have had adequate notice to prepare itself for inspection, and the act will then come into full force.

We cannot appropriate money at this session of Congress for the 86th Congress. This is the 1st session of the 85th Congress. We cannot appropriate money this year for a program 2 years ahead. Congress makes annual appropriations. What Congress is providing this year is appropriations for fiscal 1958, not for fiscal 1959. Practically every statute on the books has an authorization which is a kind of moral commitment for a future Congress to make the appropriation, but there is nothing mandatory.

Congress could cancel the Federal Highway Act tomorrow morning if it so desired. No Congress can bind another Congress except in terms of what seems to be a good plan or a moral commitment.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The distinguished chairman of the committee will recall that during the hearing on the bill, or the series of bills, there appeared the secretary of the legislative poultry interim committee of the Florida State Department of Agriculture, backed by several representatives of our poultry industry. They expressed a complete willingness to cooperate with the Federal Government in any proper inspection law. They expressed, as I recall, the feeling that Federal inspection would, in many instances, cheapen the cost of the inspection service now rendered by the State of Florida, which begins when the poultry shipped into our State comes to rest.

The only thing they requested was that the State poultry inspection agency, where there is such an agency, shall have the responsibility of making the applications for hearings by the Secretary to determine areas to be designated under the bill.

Because so much of our poultry, especially in the vacation season, comes from other States, in order to safeguard our visitors, as well as ourselves, we have had a very active and a very capable inspection service for many years. The point made by these officials was that before any area should be designated as an area affecting interstate commerce under the bill, it should have some consideration in the matter. It was thought that the best way to handle that would be that the application should be made

by the State agency itself, if there was a State agency. I understand the bill as redrafted by the committee has embodied that feature.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. That provision appears in section 5, beginning on line 18, and reads:

The Secretary is authorized, upon application of the State agency, if any, having responsibility for administering and enforcing State poultry-inspection laws—

It then continues to cover other situations where there is no State agency.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. In my opening statement, I pointed that out very plainly. We have covered the situation which was discussed by the Senator, as well as by the persons who came from Florida as witnesses.

Mr. HOLLAND. It appears to me—and I did not sit in on the redrafting of the bill—that the request of the Florida Inspection Service and the Florida poultry industry has been completely met. Is that the understanding of the distinguished chairman of the committee?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, the Senator from Florida is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I can reassure the Senator from Florida that that is exactly why this language was included in the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I believe the language was submitted to the Senator from Florida before the Senators who had charge of the bill and who redrafted it took action.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the action of the subcommittee and the full committee. I may say there is no disposition on the part of the Florida Poultry Inspection Service to interfere with the setting up of the Federal service. On the contrary, as I have already stated, if the inspection takes place at the point of origin and the point of preparation of the poultry to enter into interstate commerce, their costs might very well be reduced. Also, there would be the assurance, before the heavy transportation cost was added, that the poultry had met the most rigid standards of inspection, which is what we have applied in our State, and very necessarily so, as Senators can understand.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I merely wish to comment on the previous point raised by the Senator from Ohio although I think the Senator from Minnesota has pretty well answered his question.

Under existing law we do not have mandatory inspection; we have voluntary inspection programs, under which the inspection fees are paid by the industry.

Representatives of the Department came before the committee and testified to the effect that they wanted the inspection mandatory and transferred to the Federal Government, with the Government paying for the inspection, the same as it does in the case of the other meats. This was on the basis that those men who make the inspections are now on the payroll of the industry and there-

fore more subject to industry orders. The Federal Government wanted the inspectors to be employees of the United States Government and not to be employees of the plants. It was pointed out to the committee that with respect to all food inspection, both as to red meats and other types of food inspection, the Federal Government itself insists that the inspectors be Government employees or State employees, paid by the Government, and not subject to being fired by the private industry.

Therefore, the bill was drafted on that basis. It regulates food inspection activities from the standpoint of the consumer, rather than from the standpoint of the industry.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield, to permit me to make a statement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to say to my colleagues that I have not received from anyone in Ohio connected with the industry any communications in which the passage of a bill of this type is requested.

One agency has asked for my support; it is the meatcutters union.

In Ohio we have inspection. What bothers me is this: After the Federal Government has inspected in the processing plant, what insurance will there be that the consumers will be sold healthy food which is free from pollution or contamination which might occur after the food left the processing plant, but before it reached the hands of the consumers?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield, to permit me to make a statement at this point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I may say that in our State, for instance, we do not propose to abandon our Florida pure-food inspection service, which has the right to inspect any food destined for human consumption, and which does do so when there is any question at all of spoilage or anything of that kind. Likewise, we do not propose to abandon our Florida inspection of the operations of our poultry producers, who are many, and who in the off seasons of the year produce nearly enough to supply our own market.

But we feel that Federal inspection at points of large production, points at which large quantities of poultry enter into interstate commerce, will, first, guarantee that our poultry sources will not be diseased sources and will not be sources which should never provide products entering into human consumption, and will also simplify our problems of inspection within the State. We shall still have the right to inspect after the poultry comes to rest and is being offered to consumers. But we feel that in the last analysis the consumer will be much better protected and we will be much better protected, because no matter how carefully we inspect at the Florida end, we do not know the condition of the poultry at the time of its preparation in the evisceration plants.

So we are strongly in favor of Federal legislation, without having any intention at all of abandoning either our own State inspection service or our own pure food inspection service; and we think there is adequate assurance that the public will be better protected and that there will be better protection for the shippers, at the point of origin. Let me say that I see on the floor at this time the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and I have in mind the large quantities which come into our State from, let us say, his State of Georgia; and I believe that his State of Georgia is one of the largest, if not the largest, producers of poultry. From our experience we believe that it is in the interest of his State, as well as in the interest of our own State, that the inspection be broadened, so as to assure us, at least, of the proper condition of the poultry at the time when it was prepared for shipment and at the time when it entered into interstate commerce.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from Florida very much.

Then I understand that there will be a duplication. I understand that in order that Ohio may make sure that its consumers will obtain healthy food, Ohio will have to have inspection made, in order to make certain that from the time when the food left the processor until the time when it reached the consumer, it did not become contaminated.

Mr. HOLLAND. I would not go that far, because I think probably in Ohio, as well as in Florida, the principal problem in the case of poultry which has passed Federal inspection will be in regard to how it has been transported and whether it arrives in good condition.

As the Senator from Ohio knows, no matter how carefully the poultry is prepared, if the freezer, for instance, happens to fail to function, or if anything else which would result in spoilage happens, the pure food inspectors have a job to do.

But so far as the poultry processors themselves are concerned, they say they can be surer of the soundness of the poultry at the time when it was prepared if there is on duty there a Federal inspector who will issue the certificates from time to time.

Therefore, we believe there will not be a complete duplication. The pure food inspection occurs now. Our inspectors do not function only at the level where the food is offered, but they function for the benefit of our own poultry producers at the places where the poultry enters into commerce; and they will continue to do so.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. I should like to say to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], that we have food and drug laws; and as soon as the inspected poultry leaves the official establishment, it comes under the jurisdiction of the pure food and drug laws. If any contaminated food goes into Ohio, Oregon, California, or Georgia, it then becomes subject to the Federal food and drug laws; and, in addition, if it comes to rest in the State of Ohio, it is also subject to the jurisdic-

tion of the laws of the State of Ohio regarding the subject. So there is dual protection of the consumers; there is the protection afforded by the Ohio laws, and there is the protection afforded by the Federal food and drug laws.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I should like to ask a question in regard to the pending measure. I have received two telegrams—one from Dr. Roy L. Cleere, the executive director of the Colorado Department of Public Health, and one from Mr. J. Robert Cameron, the director of the division of environmental sanitation, in the Denver Department of Health. The telegrams are in regard to the subject now under discussion by the Senate.

If the Senator from Louisiana will permit me to do so, I should like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]; and in that connection I should like to read the telegrams.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for that purpose, if I may do so without losing the floor.

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

Mr. CARROLL. One telegram reads as follows:

S. 1747, committee report 195, by Senator ELLENDER, dealing with poultry inspection, embraces some undesirable features not acceptable to this department.

This is the telegram from the Colorado Department of Public Health.

I read further from the telegram:

It urgently solicits your support in opposing passage. This is marketing, not inspecting legislation. Urge your support S. 1128, by Senator HUMPHREY.

I may say to the Senator from Louisiana that the telegram arrived only 15 minutes ago.

I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota for his comments. What is the difference between the pending measure and Senate bill 1128? I will not ask which bill is the better; perhaps that would not be a fair question. But what could be the objection by the Colorado Department of Health to this measure?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President—

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me respond to the inquiry of the Senator from Colorado by stating that I think there is as much misunderstanding, on the part of the correspondent from whom the Senator from Colorado has heard, in the case of Senate bill 1747 and its provisions, as there was on the part of some persons who expressed their opposition to Senate bill 1128. As a matter of fact, the departments of health all over the country have been deeply concerned over the inspection provisions of any poultry inspection bill, and justly so—not only as to the inspection provisions as they relate to the producer and processor, but also as to what will be the effective inspection in protecting the health needs and standards of the people. It was to this point that the Senator from Ohio

[Mr. LAUSCHE] directed his attention a moment ago.

Senate bill 1747 provides for compulsory post mortem inspection, carcass by carcass. That is about as much inspection as can possibly be written into a law. It provides for ante mortem inspection at the official establishment, as the Secretary deems necessary; and that was all that was provided by any of the three bills which were before our committee at the time when the new committee bill was prepared.

Ante mortem inspection is desired by some in a much broader sense than that provided for by the pending bill.

But it is my view that the inspection services of the Department of Agriculture will wish to protect the public health just as much in poultry matters as they have done in matters relating to other edible products, such as red meat. Therefore, I think this bill gives protection to the consumer. It surely is to the benefit of the producer, and it surely places the processor under much more definite standards of preparing a wholesome product, than those which previously have existed.

So I think the fears of the Colorado Department of Public Health are somewhat unfounded.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I should like to ask a further question, if the Senator from Louisiana will permit.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. CARROLL. In the telegram coming from the Health and Hospital and Sanitation Section, in Denver, it is stated:

Inspection should be placed in meat-inspection bureau by law.

Evidently that was a provision of Senate bill 1128.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, it was not.

Mr. CARROLL. It was not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No.

As a matter of fact, the argument on the part of witnesses before the subcommittee and the full committee related to whether or not an inspection service pertaining to poultry would come under the meat-inspection service or whether it would have a separate identity of its own. Many of those who are opposed to S. 1128, the bill introduced by the junior Senator from Minnesota, felt that I was trying to put the inspection under the red-meat division, which was not true. What the bill does is provide the Secretary with authority to establish, as he, again, deems fit or necessary, an inspection service for poultry products.

My personal view is that it would be better for the inspection service to come under what is known as the agricultural research services of the Department. Some persons feel it ought to come under the agricultural marketing services of the Department of Agriculture.

Be that as it may, two things are clear. One is that the poultry inspection will not be under the red-meat division. Red meat will have its own inspection service. No. 2, it is equally clear that the poultry inspection division will be a separate inspection service. Whether it be under the agricultural marketing division or under the agricultural research services

division is not of such importance as some persons seem to think it is. I think the most important thing is that there be a poultry inspection service.

I believe the chairman of the committee will agree with me that is what the bill does.

Mr. ELLENDER. The poultry business has grown to such large proportions that I am satisfied it will be necessary, as the Senator from Minnesota has suggested, for the Department to establish a section having to do with poultry inspection.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think it will have to.

Mr. ELLENDER. It will have to. Poultry inspection cannot be put under marketing or red-meat inspection. In my humble judgment, poultry inspection is going to have to have an administrative section of its own. The Department of Agriculture has full authority, under the bill, to put poultry inspection under any section it desires, because it will come under the general jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CARROLL. If the Senator from Louisiana will yield, I desire to thank the Senator from Louisiana and the junior Senator from Minnesota for this very excellent explanation. I intend to vote for the bill. I know the Denver and Colorado health and sanitation authorities will appreciate the explanations given this afternoon and I feel sure that perhaps they did not fully understand the real intent and purpose of the bill. They had very little time to study S. 1747, having received it from me only a few days ago.

Does the junior Senator from Minnesota say, in view of this discussion, that although the bill does not incorporate all the provisions of S. 1128, Senate bill 1747 is a desirable bill and will protect the health of the Nation's consumers?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think it constitutes very good legislation, and it does incorporate all the provisions of the three bills which were designed to protect the welfare of the consumer and the legitimate interests of the producer.

I will add that the Department of Agriculture's special research personnel in the field of poultry marketing and inspection, as well as public health personnel from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, as well as Food and Drug Administration representatives, all sat in the subcommittee, which consisted of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and myself, when we worked out what we call the committee bill. I think it is fair to say there was no objection on the part of any of these health or departmental representatives to the provisions of the bill, and that it represents the purposes we have in mind and the methods we have outlined.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for yielding to me. I should like to associate myself with the remarks made with re-

spect to S. 1128 by the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. I was a cosponsor of that bill. While there were 1 or 2 provisions of that bill which I would have preferred to certain provisions of the bill which was reported by the committee, they were controversial matters, and I think the subcommittee and the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry have made a distinct contribution and have brought forth a bill which can be wholeheartedly supported. That, of course, has been the result of careful consideration and many hours of work.

I am sure, Senators, that we are in general agreement as to the need for a compulsory Federal poultry-inspection bill. Hearings held by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, both in 1956 and during the present session of Congress, have amply demonstrated the need for a bill that will best serve to protect consumers, farmers, processors, and poultry workers, and at the same time prove meaningful and workable.

We in Pennsylvania have a great concern in this proposed legislation. Pennsylvania is one of the largest poultry-producing States in the Nation. It is estimated that more than \$190 million in gross farm cash income was received by Pennsylvania farmers last year from poultry and eggs, which is approximately one-fourth of all gross income derived from Pennsylvania agriculture.

Unhappily, our poultry and egg farmers are suffering a bit of depression. I am hopeful that a Federal inspection act, which will prevent the importation into Pennsylvania of diseased poultry products, will at least give Pennsylvania farmers an opportunity to market their products, under our State inspection laws, in competition with sound poultry products from other States.

Nine of our counties are among the top 100 poultry counties in the United States, and Lancaster County in Pennsylvania ranks third in the Nation in the value of poultry and poultry products.

One of the principal reasons for our outstanding record in the production of poultry for consumption has been the high standards established through Federal and State poultry inspections. We now have 14 poultry processing plants under Federal or State inspection.

Nevertheless, while the major part of the poultry processing industry is doing an excellent job, and Pennsylvania's State inspection program is a good one, it is necessary that there be compulsory Federal inspection. The United States Public Health Service has attributed one-third of all food-poisoning cases to poultry products. We need to be certain that consumers are protected from unwholesome poultry that may be shipped from other areas. Compulsory Federal inspection will, in addition, provide encouragement to the whole poultry industry—which in Pennsylvania at this time certainly needs encouragement.

For these reasons I am happy to support S. 1747. I am hopeful that under the provisions of the bill, as the Senator from Minnesota has said, the Secretary of Agriculture will see fit to make the inspections which he is no longer required to make, but which he is privi-

leged to make. In the same vein, I think the concept of the program would be improved were we to make certain that the departmental agency within the Department of Agriculture responsible for the program were equal in rank and yet separate from the Meat Inspection Branch. However, it is not considered a serious defect in the bill, and so I am happy to support the bill, and I hope many other Senators will support S. 1747.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to thank my good friend from Pennsylvania for his kind remarks, but credit for the preparation of the bill goes to the distinguished Senators I named in my opening statement, namely the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE]. I held the hearings, but I acted only in the capacity of chairman. I am only too glad to report the fine bill, and I hope the Senate will adopt it unanimously.

Mr. CLARK. I am sure what the Senator from Louisiana has said is true, but I am confident the Senator from Louisiana played a full part.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, I am happy to support S. 1747. I cannot feel it is necessary to plead at length the cause of the broad principles of compulsory inspection of poultry and poultry products. This principle has the support of leaders within the poultry industry, as well as the full endorsement of those who are turning their efforts toward consumer protection.

Actually, compulsory inspection of poultry and poultry products is simply another step in the direction of the movement started 50 years ago when the Federal Government passed the Meat Inspection Act. Following the disclosures that unsanitary conditions were threatening the red-meat industry, the Federal Government stepped in to protect the consumers and the producers of these meats. Although the actual problem of inspecting poultry and poultry products varies greatly from the inspection of red meats, the bill the Senate is considering today carries an established principle as an additional step.

Certainly the poultry industry of the United States, by and large, has given the American consumer poultry that is second to none. We need make no apologies for the quality of poultry sold to the American public. But in any large industry there are marginal producers who must cut corners in order to stay in business. When those short-cuts result in possible endangering of the health and welfare of the American public, the Federal Government has not only the right but the duty to step into the breach. The Hoover Commission recognized this fact when it stated recently that because of the size of the poultry industry, some States could not handle the task of inspection and regulation. The Hoover Commission consequently suggested Federal legislation.

I should like to call attention to two facts regarding S. 1747. First, this bill would fill a gap that has existed for

half a century. When the Meat Inspection Act was passed, poultry and poultry products were not included in the regulatory provisions, because at that time the poultry industry was relatively small. In the last half century, however, great strides have been made in that industry. Today poultry is the third largest source of gross farm income in the Nation. The per capita consumption of poultry for every man, woman, and child in the Nation now exceeds 35 pounds a year. The frozen poultry industry has grown in a truly remarkable way in the last several years. It is only reasonable that certain safeguards should be taken to insure the wholesomeness of the product that is so much in evidence on the dining room tables of the Nation.

The second fact to which I should like to call attention today is the provision of the bill that allocates the responsibility for regulation and inspection to the Department of Agriculture. For 50 years the Department has been conducting the program of the inspection of red meats. I believe I am safe in saying that the handling of this program has been very efficient. The Department of Agriculture has rendered outstanding service in the interests of both the producer and the consumer, not only in the program of red meat inspection, but also in the voluntary poultry inspection program. The Department has the organization, the trained personnel and an established procedure, that will enable it to take over these new administrative duties with a minimum of disruption to the flow of interstate commerce. In these days, when we are making every effort to economize in Government, and to avoid the cost of duplicating programs in the various agencies of Government, it is both logical and wise to keep the regulatory responsibilities for meat and poultry inspections in the same Department. By delegating the duty of inspection the Department of Agriculture, as the pending bill does, we are meeting the goals of efficiency and economy.

Mr. President, the bill we are debating today is needed by the consumer in order to protect the quality of poultry and poultry products he feeds to his family, and it is needed by the producer to safeguard the consistently high quality of the industry itself that has prevailed in the past. I sincerely hope the bill will be passed by the Senate today.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, inasmuch as I was presiding over the Senate during much of the discussion of the poultry inspection bill, I did not take an active part in the debate.

However, I desire to express my approval of the bill, and to thank the able chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee [Mr. ELLENDER] and his associates who have brought the pending proposal before the Senate.

On other occasions I have described to the Senate and to the committee the urgent conditions in Oregon which have made such a bill necessary. So that a few details of the situation in our own State may be brought to the attention of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that an informative article entitled "Operation Quarantine," from the June 1956

issue of the Agriculture Bulletin, of the Oregon State Department of Agriculture, appear at this point in the RECORD.

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

OPERATION QUARANTINE

Somehow I never seem to forget one of the stories my dad, who often doubled as country editor and volunteer fireman in those days, delighted to recount. It was about a fire on the edge of our small town.

He'd give us a buildup on the fire call, the volunteers dashing from everywhere to scramble onto the old fire engine and then running madly to the fire scene.

"And what do you suppose was the first thing we saw when we got there?" he'd always preface his punch line. "Why, there was the house in flames and Ol' Jack tearing up the yard with a big, frosted cake in his hands."

"And that's all Ol' Jack saved from the fire," dad would add. Then he'd chuckle and chuckle as though, having seen, he still could not believe.

LET'S SEE

Now that little story may not seem to have any application to Operation Quarantine. But let's see.

Suppose we call a quarantine a device to put out a fire. Or to keep it from spreading.

Oh, of course Jim Short, M. E. Knickerbocker, Frank McKennon, Kermit Peterson, or the other officials who may sign quarantine orders for the State department of agriculture don't call them fire stoppers. They would tell you a quarantine is a restraining measure, with the power of law behind it, to prevent the introduction or spread of a contagious or infectious disease affecting plants or animals and, directly or indirectly, man.

That is a bit more in line with the dictionary definition. You'll probably prefer it to the fire idea—but we'll get around to that later.

WHEELS THAT RESOLVE

The purpose of this article isn't to be facetious about quarantines. Rather, it is to show you the wheels that revolve when the department finds it necessary to bring quarantine action, and why.

The forces that lead to quarantine sometimes operate like the brakes on your car when you come to a leisurely stop at a red light. For example, the department may get word that the XYZ bug (purely mythical), which has a history of wicked destruction of potatoes in a State on the eastern seaboard, is traveling westward. In fact, it has jumped to just outside the eastern border of a western State.

That's too close for Oregon comfort.

So Frank McKennon, our plant division chief, calls his counterpart in the westernmost State in which the bug has appeared to verify. Yes, it's there all right, and has been for some little period. But it doesn't look like it will come on west—no potatoes around to eat on and they are the only plants on which it feeds. Looks like it has reached its western limits.

SIGNS OF RELIEF

McKennon breathes a sigh of relief. He doesn't want to see the XYZ bug travel into Oregon, because we've got a \$10 million potato industry that pest could damage a lot if it got a foothold.

Six weeks later McKennon gets a wire from the neighboring State: the XYZ bug has been found in 6 potato fields in 2 counties. A fast survey shows it apparently has not reached Oregon.

So our plant chief, already armed with exhaustive information about the bug and the damage it can do, draws up an official order. This says Oregon won't permit potato

toes from those two counties to come into Oregon unless they are treated under stipulated conditions and with specified dosages; and treatment must be certified to by plant officials in the State of origin. This order goes into effect 10 to 30 days after published. We've just cited the normal course of interstate quarantine—or what you might call routine procedure to protect a phase of our agricultural industry. (The neighbor State probably took a similar step to protect other potato-growing counties within its own borders.)

EMERGENCY

On the other hand, the events that lead to quarantine action sometimes operate like the brakes on your car when you come to a sudden halt to save your life. This is emergency quarantine. It, too, may be applied against wide areas, a State, a county, or even a single piece of land or premise.

The March cases of ornithosis in two Oregon turkey flocks offer an excellent and current example of emergency quarantine.

Now few people are happy when an emergency quarantine is ordered; it's bound to hurt those immediately concerned—probably in the pocketbook as well as otherwise.

UNPLEASANT TASK

And it's an unpleasant task for quarantine officials to walk onto a person's lands or into his buildings and say, in effect, "You have a serious situation here; we'll have to require that you do not move anything from this place until we permit you to do so."

The effect, immediate or long run, on the owner involved in emergency quarantine is one thing. What might happen to an entire industry—both within the State and as a result of bans which other States might impose—is another, and even bigger thing. And if human health is involved, that naturally must become the very first consideration.

And in that paragraph above you have the primary considerations involved when word came on March 9 that ornithosis had been positively identified in two turkey flocks in Oregon, one on Sauvie's Island and the other at Scappoose.

You'll recall we gave a home-made definition of a quarantine as a device to put out a fire or keep it from spreading.

FIRE ALARM

Well, to carry the idea along, when Dr. K. J. Peterson, State veterinarian, received the laboratory reports March 9 that ornithosis was diagnosed in two turkey flocks here, it had just about the same effect in your State department of agriculture as a fire alarm.

Almost simultaneously, these things happened in the department:

(1) The two flocks were placed under emergency quarantine, which means the order was effective immediately. All turkeys alive and dead were required to remain on the premises, with dead birds to be buried three feet deep and covered with lime. About 12,000 hens, toms and pouls were involved.

(2) All veterinarians in the State were informed that the disease had been diagnosed here, that humans were infected and that two persons who handled turkeys died; although not confirmed, the turkey disease was suspect as cause of the deaths. (The State Board of Health investigation of human illnesses and deaths first pointed the finger at turkeys as the possible cause.)

MORE ACTION

(3) Tracers were started on pouls and turkeys which had left the two ranches before the quarantine.

(4) States into which Oregon pouls and eggs were shipped were notified of the situation.

(5) Department staff veterinarians were instructed to start checking every breeding

flock in Oregon. Dr. A. G. Beagle of the USDA disease eradication branch also assisted. (By April 5, all of the 80 breeding flocks in the State shipping to Washington and Utah had been examined with no sign of the disease in any flock other than the original two.)

(6) Processing plants were notified.

(7) Rending plants were asked to report any unusual poultry losses.

(8) Contact was made with outstanding authorities in the United States to determine the best and most logical course to follow in handling the birds. Five other States had previous experience with the situation which had just hit Oregon.

TELEPHONES JAMMED

For the next week, department telephone lines were jammed with calls, both outgoing and incoming. Turkey growers had questions; other officials in Oregon and elsewhere had questions and information; newspapermen called with pertinent questions. Processing plants wanted information and so did feedmen and practicing veterinarians. Other States wanted to know this and that. M. E. Knickerbocker, animal division chief, Dr. Peterson and Director Jim Short could not have been busier if they'd been on a fire-fighting line.

On March 12, the State of Washington notified the Department it had placed an embargo on shipments from Oregon of turkeys, pouls, and eggs. (Eight days later this was modified to permit entry of these products if Oregon officials certified freedom from contact with the infected birds within the last 90 days.)

UTAH REQUEST

On March 29, Utah began requiring all poultry and egg purchasers in that State to obtain a health certificate for the originating Oregon flock.

Washington's action alarmed Canada and officials there frequently called Dr. Beagle, head of the federal veterinarians in Oregon, to learn current conditions. As result of Dr. Beagle's assurance that the matter was under control, no Canadian embargo was placed on Oregon shipments.

Finally, things began to settle down. Dr. Peterson left for San Francisco to attend a conference to formulate plans for control of ornithosis on a nationwide basis. By a stroke of good fortune, Dr. C. D. Van Houweling of the United States Department of Agriculture's Agriculture Research Service was in the West; he called the conference. Dr. Beagle also attended from Oregon. Representatives of the California department of agriculture and public health officials were there, too.

DISEASE IS CURABLE

This group drew up a control program to offer to all States. It is based on present knowledge which indicates that the disease is curable and birds properly treated with antibiotics are safe for human consumption.

Dr. Peterson, grounded in the South for a day, flew back to Oregon just in time to present the uniform control program to a called meeting March 22 of the department's poultry disease advisory committee. Interested turkey growers, health officials, feed representatives and others concerned attended.

The Oregon industry leaders approved the program set up in San Francisco and the department immediately announced its adoption to handle the ornithosis situation here in Oregon.

The control program involves (1) treatment procedures for infected breeder and market flocks and the handling of pouls and eggs; (2) an exchange of pertinent information between the State board of health in Portland, the diagnostic laboratory in Corvallis, the private practitioners over the State, and the State department of agriculture in Salem; and (3) prompt relay of

information to the industry, allied industries and the public.

FEATURES OF PROGRAM

Under the control plan, market flocks must be treated with a tetracycline drug at rate of 400 grams per ton of feed for 2 weeks, then at 100 grams for 2 more weeks. If no evidence of the disease is then found, birds may be moved to processing plants under veterinary inspection; plants must follow procedures approved by public health officials.

Breeder flocks are treated the same as market birds. Eggs from such flocks can be hatched on the premises; or they may be hatched in outside hatcheries used for no other purpose, if disinfected in approved manner. Pouls from eggs produced in infected flocks before or during antibiotic treatment must be returned to the original premise and kept under surveillance for 6 months.

Pouls hatched from eggs produced after antibiotic treatment may go any place in the State, there to be maintained also under surveillance for 6 months.

All pouls from infected flocks must be started on and fed a ration containing 200 grams of tetracycline drug for 3 weeks. Pouls from eggs of infected flocks prior to treatment can be held for breeding purposes only upon approval of the Department.

CONTROLS FOLLOWED

In line with the program outlined, on April 22 all birds in the two infected flocks were slaughtered. The Department conducted ante mortem inspection of birds and released for slaughter only those fully recovered during the course of inspections. Our veterinarians condemned 84 toms and 535 hens as result of ante mortem and post mortem inspection procedures, and the State paid owners 80 percent of appraised value for all birds ordered destroyed.

Some pouls were hatched on the quarantine places and one owner hatched a setting at an unused hatchery near Junction City. These pouls will be kept under State watch for 6 months; if at the end of that time no indication of disease appears, they will be retained for breeding purposes.

So there you have Operation Quarantine, with special emphasis on use in emergency situations. And, somehow, what could have happened in the turkey incident—but don't—may remind you of dad's yarn about Ol' Jake fleeing from a fire with only a cake in his hands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 1747) was passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had

disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4813) to extend the life of the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MORRISON, Mr. MULTER, Mrs. GRANAHAN, Mr. KEARNS, and Mr. BROYHILL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

DEFERRED GRAZING

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 202, Senate bill 511.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 511) to establish a deferred-grazing program and a protein-feed program as parts of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which has been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in connection with any major disaster due to drought determined by the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, as amended, the President is authorized and directed as part of the assistance provided pursuant to such act to formulate and carry out, through the facilities of the Department of Agriculture, a deferred grazing program, which shall include nonuse or limited use, or any needed combination thereof, in any county affected by such disaster in which the Secretary of Agriculture determines grazing of native rangeland is a substantial factor in agricultural production, and finds that limited or deferred grazing is necessary and appropriate for the reestablishment or conservation of grass for grazing. Such program shall be applicable only to nonfederally owned land which is normally used for grazing. Within 30 days (1) after the date of enactment of this act, or (2) after any subsequent designation of any such area as a disaster area by the President, the Secretary shall designate the counties in any such area in which this program shall be available, and the program shall remain available in each such county for a period of not more than 5 years after the date of enactment of this act.

Sec. 2. The program shall provide for payment for deferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at such rate or rates determined by the Secretary but not more than the estimated fair rental value of the land for the normal grazing use withheld under the program and which will induce sufficient participation in the program to accomplish its objective, taking into consideration the normal grazing capacity of the land, the funds available for carrying out the program, and any other relevant factors. No payment shall be made under the program if it is determined that a shift of livestock from the deferred areas to other land results in overgrazing nondeferred areas. Payment to any person for deferred grazing on land in any one county or land in more than one county operated as a single unit shall not exceed \$5,000 for any one year.

SEC. 3. The program authorized herein may include such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically provided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate its purposes and to facilitate practical administration. The program authorized herein for any county shall be supplemental to the agricultural conservation program, and not in substitution of, other programs in such county authorized by any other law, except that no payment shall be made concurrently on the same land for deferred grazing under this and any other program.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of Public Law 875, 81st Congress, such funds as are necessary to carry out the program authorized herein.

MR. HOLLAND. Mr. President, Senate bill 511, introduced by the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas [MR. JOHNSON], would require the Secretary of Agriculture to provide a program in the drought area under which farmers and ranchers would receive payments for deferred grazing. The Subcommittee on Agricultural Production, Marketing, and Stabilization of Prices of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry held 2 days' hearings on this bill and other bills relating to drought relief. Eight or ten bills have been introduced on this subject, and they were all considered by the committee at its hearing.

The evidence before the subcommittee was that the present drought, which covers portions of 15 States, is the longest and most severe in the history of that area, and that a deferred grazing program to prevent excessive grazing and give the grass time to reseed is urgently needed. The committee was advised that, even with such a program, much of the land will require a number of years to be restored to productivity. On that point, of course, the situation is not uniform, but there are some lands in the area which have suffered a sustained drought for as long as 5 years.

The evidence before the committee indicated that in such places of extreme disaster not only had the grass completely disappeared and the roots died, but the more permanent growth, which usually survives most droughts, was entirely dead. There were places in which such sturdy plants as the mesquite, for example, were dead and had been dead for a long period. In such areas it was obvious that when the return of the turf began it must be protected for a period of months, or even years, in some cases, before there could be any real reestablishment of grass sufficient for grazing purposes.

The subcommittee and the committee carefully considered the views of the Department of Agriculture and the testimony of the witnesses at the hearings, and made a number of changes in the bill, which are incorporated in the committee amendment.

As revised by the committee, the amended bill contains a number of safeguards to assure that the program will be effective, and also restricted to the situations in which it is needed. Some of the safeguards are as follows:

First, the bill would be effective only in major disaster areas, declared to be

such under Public Law 875, because of drought, that is, areas in which the disasters were so great that, upon recommendation of the government of the State and of the Secretary of Agriculture, the President would have declared such areas to be disaster areas.

Second, it would be effective for only 5 years after its enactment. If continuation of the program after that period should be found to be necessary—and, of course, we all hope that the drought will have been broken and the entire situation cleared up earlier than that—Congress could act to continue the program. However, the program would not continue indefinitely without further consideration and enactment by the Congress. That is one of the changes made in the original Senate bill 511, which provided that the operation of the bill should be for not less than 3 years. However, that bill did not set any maximum time of operation. The committee felt that, in both directions, this change was necessary. There should not be any minimum time of operation, because the evidence was clear that there were different stages of disaster, some of which might easily be corrected in much less than 3 years; and it was also recognized that there were other stages of disaster which would run the full 3 years, and might run longer than that.

Third, the bill would be effective only in counties in which the grazing of native rangeland is a substantial factor in agricultural production, and then only if a limitation of grazing is necessary to reestablish or conserve grass for grazing. A finding to that effect would in each case be required by the Secretary of Agriculture—that is, that native rangeland was a substantial factor in agricultural production in the particular area, and that limitation of grazing was necessary to reestablish or conserve grass for that purpose.

The Senate will understand, I am sure, that we are talking about native rangeland. We are not talking about improved pastures, where outside grasses have been brought in and established under some kind of special care.

Fourth, the program would provide for limited use as well as nonuse. The original bill—in general a very good bill—covered only nonuse for periods of time. From the testimony it was quite clear that even on the same ranch there would be some special spots where limited use rather than nonuse would be required, and that it would be to the economic advantage of all concerned to have such a finding made and a responsive program put into effect. In some cases complete deferment may not be the best solution from the standpoint of range conservation.

In these cases partial limitation of use would mean lower Federal payments, use of the land to meet needed feed requirements, and avoidance of unnecessary herd liquidation with consequent downward pressure on prices.

On that point I should like to elaborate only with respect to lower Federal payments, because that is a subject, of course, in which everyone is interested. Of course it will require less money if

the Secretary prescribes limited use as the proper treatment for a particular tract or a part of a tract, because, obviously, the value of the use withheld would be less if only a part of the use were withheld than it would be if the entire use were withheld.

Fifth, no payment would be made under the program if livestock were shifted from deferred areas to other lands, and the shift should result in overgrazing nondeferred areas. This, too, is believed to be a great improvement over the original bill. This concept was contained in the bill as introduced, but it covered only shifts from one part of the farm or ranch to another. The committee felt, and provides in its amendment, that this particular part of the bill should cover shifts not only to lands on the farm, but also to lands off the farm. Therefore, the committee amendment is somewhat tighter than the original bill.

Sixth, payment to any person for deferring grazing on land in any county, or on land in more than one county if operated as a single unit, is limited to \$5,000 for any year. Here again the committee amendment has tightened up the provision of the original bill by extending this limitation to land in more than one county when operated as a single unit.

On that point I should like to say that the original bill provided for limitation of \$5,000 in any one county, without regard to the concept that a single ranch operated as a single unit might lie within two counties, or in even more than two counties. Therefore the modified wording reported in the committee amendment provides that the limit shall be \$5,000 per county, with the additional limitation that if a single unit of ranch land lies in more than one county, the limit of \$5,000 shall apply to the entire ranch unit.

In addition to the safeguards which are specifically contained in the bill and which I have just enumerated, the President is given authority to impose such additional reasonable safeguards as he may deem necessary to assure proper administration and the accomplishment of the objectives of the program.

For instance, he may require fencing of the deferred areas at the expense of the program participant, where that appears necessary to proper administration of the program. The authority and duty to provide such additional safeguards as may be necessary is inherent in the direction to the President to formulate a program.

The committee knew that there would be many details which would vary in different areas, and that there would be requirements which could not be foreseen at this time, no matter how hard the committee or Congress might try to foresee all of them. So that while foreseeing and making provisions for a great many details in the original bill and even to a greater degree in the committee substitute, the committee bill would also leave much regulatory power to the administrators of the act, and would give to the President the authority to formulate regulations.

For instance, under the committee amendment, payment rates would be

fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture at not more than the fair rental value of the land for the grazing use withheld.

I ask Senators to follow this point very carefully because, in my judgment, this is perhaps the most important change in the bill, and I should not want to have any misunderstanding about it. The committee feels that this language is a great improvement over the provision of the bill as originally introduced, which provided for rates not less than the average annual rental value of grazing land in the entire county. Such a provision would have encouraged participation by the owners of the poorest land in the county and made participation unattractive to the owners of better lands. The provision recommended by the committee proposes to treat everyone fairly; that is, on the basis of actual value of his own land, and achieves more conservation for the money spent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. First of all, Mr. President, I wish to express my deep personal thanks to the Senator from Florida for the very fine work he has done on the pending bill and for the many hours he has spent in an attempt to bring before the Senate some workable legislation in this field. I know that all of us in the drought-stricken States owe him a deep debt of gratitude. I agree with the comments he has made respecting the various improvements contained in the bill over the original draft of the bill as introduced by me on January 10.

Whenever the senior Senator from Florida works on any measure for very long an improvement always results. The provision to which he has just referred, on page 5, section 2, of the bill, reads as follows:

The program shall provide for payment for deferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at such rate or rates determined by the Secretary, but not more than the estimated fair rental value of the land for the normal grazing use withheld.

As I recall, and as the senior Senator from Florida just stated, the original bill provided for such rate or rates not less than the average rental value of grazing land.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. The Senator from Texas, in his bill, provided for a minimum, but not for a maximum, and based that minimum on the fair value of the average of all grazing lands in the county.

Witnesses pointed out—and it was also pointed out by representatives of the Department of Agriculture who were kind enough to sit in with us at some length—that such a provision would be highly attractive to owners of submarginal grazing land, but would not be attractive at all to the owners of excellent grazing land, and would be a kind of leveling factor which would make of this legislation quite a different kind of act from what the Senator from Texas had in mind.

In fact, when I talked to the distinguished Senator from Texas about it, I found him completely ready to turn to

the value of the land itself which was being dealt with in any particular case.

On the point with respect to the concept of the committee, the committee in its report makes it very clear by using the following language:

Payment rates under the committee amendment would be fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture at not more than the fair rental value of land for the normal grazing use withheld.

This language reflects the committee's recommendation that limited use as well as nonuse may be provided for.

When we say "grazing use withheld," it may mean limited use, or it may mean complete withholding of all use.

The committee also felt that payment at not less than the average annual rental value of grazing land in the county, as provided by the bill as introduced, would make the program unduly attractive to the poorer lands in each county.

At a matter of fact, we felt that, worse than that, it would be a kind of leveling off factor, which would not meet the need of the average rancher, who has always had a difficult problem to solve.

Then I call attention particularly to this sentence:

The fair rental value, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, for the grazing use withheld, based on periods of average precipitation when grazing is normal, appeared to the committee to represent a fair standard, and it is the committee's intent that payment rates should be fixed at that amount.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate what the distinguished Senator has said. I wonder if he would have any objection to our writing that intent into the bill itself. I have discussed it with the committee staff, and I think they have the text of an amendment which will accomplish the purpose.

The language now in the bill would allow for exactly the type of rental payments which this amendment would provide. The committee report on page 2 declares the committee's intent to be exactly that. It states:

The fair rental value, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, for the grazing use withheld, based on periods of average precipitation when grazing is normal, appeared to the committee to represent a fair standard, and it is the committee's intent that payment rates should be fixed at that amount.

The language of my amendment simply carries out this intent with full statutory authority. It is of great importance to the success of the deferred grazing program that the Congress itself assure disaster-stricken ranchers that they will receive the compensation for land withdrawn from grazing which they are entitled to and which can afford them the real chance to utilize the provisions of the bill. Unless the payments to each rancher represent the fair rental value for his land, he simply could not be induced to place his land under the program, with serious loss both to him, the land and our economy resulting.

The amendment is at the desk. If it would be agreeable to the Senator from

Florida, I should like to have the amendment stated, so that consideration may be given to it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, the Senator from Florida has no control over that, and would be glad to have the amendment stated. If the Senate wishes to accept the amendment, that would be all right. But I may say that a great deal of work has been done in drafting the bill in an effort to have it in such shape that all members of the committee would approve it. I believe that all members of the committee have approved it. It may be that some Senators were not present when the bill was ordered reported, so I would not like to make an unqualified statement that all members of the committee have approved it.

I see on the floor the distinguished Senator from Vermont, the ranking minority member of the committee. As I recall, only 9 or 10 members of the committee were present, but all of us approved the bill in the form in which it was before us.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I may say that although I was called to another committee meeting before the vote was actually taken, I expressed myself as being in favor of the bill, and left my proxy with the Senator from Florida to report the bill.

I am well aware of the problem which confronted the committee, and with which the Senator from Texas is concerned. The committee realized that if we used the language "average rental value for the county" or even "percentage of the average rental value for the county," a large amount of land having the lowest value for grazing purposes and probably very little of the land of the highest value for grazing purposes would come into the program.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator recall the number of members of the committee who actually voted to report the measure? As I recall, it was 10 or 11, instead of the full 15.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator from Florida will permit me to do so, I wish to state my amendment. On page 5, beginning in line 13, the amendment proposes to strike out beginning with the word "such" through the period in line 20, and to insert in lieu thereof the following: "rates equal to the fair rental value of the land for the grazing use withheld under the program, as determined by the Secretary on the basis of the normal grazing capacity of the land during periods of adequate precipitation."

Mr. HOLLAND. So far as I am concerned, that is what we meant in the report on the bill. Therefore, I would certainly have no objection to placing that language in the bill. The distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has just assured me that he would have no objection to it, either.

I wish to call this point, if I may, to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Texas. While I am perfectly willing to support his amendment, if it be adopted on the floor, the provision of the Senate bill would then be more like the

provision of the House bill, and the matter would not allow as much latitude in conference. I call that to the attention of the Senator from Texas simply because I am extremely anxious to have the Senate pass a bill which will be approved and become law. I have been working hard toward that end.

It seems to me that it might be the part of wisdom to leave the bill in the form in which it is, and to let this proposal be worked out in conference. At that time we can get some positive assurance that the signing of the bill will be recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture, which will be as nearly complete assurance as we can ever have that the bill will become law.

I am perfectly willing to go along with the amendment of the Senator from Texas, if he thinks that is the better policy, but I call attention to the fact that we have an informal memorandum from the Department of Agriculture, submitted only this morning, in which there is no assurance that the Secretary approves the bill. I quote the final two paragraphs in the memorandum which cause me the only concern I have:

The changes enumerated above—

The memorandum enumerated all the changes the committee made—will result in an improvement of the bill. In its present form—

That means the committee amendment—the bill could be administered in a satisfactory manner.

So much for the workability of the bill. The memorandum continues:

Since the Department already has authority to operate the program under the agricultural-conservation program, which would be substantially identical with the program described in the present bill, we do not believe enactment of S. 511 is essential. If Congress will act favorably on the request for appropriation, which is now pending before the Congress in House Document 115, which would provide funds for carrying out a deferred-grazing program under the agricultural-conservation program, the Department can deal effectively with the problem involved.

I personally do not agree with the comment contained in the memorandum that the making of an appropriation for this year would be as adequate as the passage of the bill, because the bill will require some years in which to operate and to deal properly with this question. But I am somewhat concerned with the statement, which is a lot less than full endorsement of the bill, and indicates that officials of the Department think that with appropriations from year to year they can handle the program, and that "we do not believe that the enactment of S. 511 is essential."

For that reason alone, I say to my distinguished friend, it seems to me that it would be the part of caution for us to have a little leeway with which to go into conference. There will be a full conference on the matter, because the Senate bill is quite different in detail from that of the House. In the meantime we can ascertain what should be done in order to provide legislation on the particular subject we are now discussing.

I have worked hard on the bill. I am perfectly willing to continue to work on it. If the Senator from Texas will allow the bill to go to conference as it is, I shall do my best to get the approval of the Secretary of the identical objective the Senator has in mind.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I would not care to find myself in opposition to the distinguished Senator from Florida. He has done most commendable work on the bill, and has improved it from the way in which it was originally introduced. I commend the Senator from Florida upon the many improvements he has made.

I simply suggest that we include in the bill what the Senator has put in the report. I do not see any reason why that should not be done. I had the feeling that it would be agreeable to all concerned. The language that is proposed to be placed in the bill is not the language of the House bill; it is not the language of the Senate bill, which provides for an average annual rental value. All the amendment proposes is "rates equal to the fair rental value of the land for the grazing use withheld under the program, as determined by the Secretary on the basis of the normal grazing capacity of the land during periods of adequate precipitation."

Mr. HOLLAND. As I understand, the Senator proposes to change the wording of the amended bill so as to make it clear that what has been stated in the report is the meaning of the Senate when it passes the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Precisely. We will not have "any more than" or "any less than." We will have, "equal to the fair rental value." I understand that is what the distinguished Senator wants to have done.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is completely correct. So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to accept the amendment and to support it in every way. But I felt that there was at least a point which I should call to the attention of my distinguished friend. There would be more leeway for us in conference to meet any recalcitrance we might encounter on the part of the Department of Agriculture, which has not had time to give us a complete yea or nay answer, and has not done so, with reference to the committee bill.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I personally do not find the amendment suggested by the Senator from Texas objectionable in any way. I think what it proposes is what is intended by the committee. I believe the conferees who will be appointed on the part of the Senate will be well justified in simply declining to accept the language of the House bill, which requires the average rental value for the county to be paid, because that obviously would make the bill unworkable.

The Secretary of Agriculture has pointed out in his communication to the Senator from Florida that the proposed legislation probably is unnecessary to accomplish his purpose, provided the

Committee on Appropriations will make adequate provisions for carrying out the program under existing law.

However, if the Congress passes the bill in the form now suggested on the floor and if the bill as thus passed is enacted into law—and it seems there could hardly be objection to it by the administration—then it would seem evident that there would be direction to the Appropriations Committee to proceed to report the necessary appropriations required in order to proceed with the program.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in response to the statement which has been made by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who speaks so frequently and so correctly in regard to the position of the administration, I withdraw the objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that my amendment to the committee amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair). The amendment of the Senator from Texas to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 5, beginning in line 13, it is proposed to strike out "such rate or rates determined by the Secretary but not more than the estimated fair rental value of the land for the normal grazing use withheld under the program and which will induce sufficient participation in the program to accomplish its objective, taking into consideration the normal grazing capacity of the land, the funds available for carrying out the program, and any other relevant factors," and to insert "rates equal to the fair rental value of the land for the grazing use withheld under the program, as determined by the Secretary on the basis of the normal grazing capacity of the land during periods of adequate precipitation."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

DISPARITY IN SIZE OF COUNTIES—THE FAIR VALUE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I wish to add to the statement by the Senator from Texas that especially in some of the Western States, where the counties are almost as large as some of the States in other parts of the country.

Therefore, the conditions in the Western States are not the same; there are widely varying conditions within the counties.

The amendment of the Senator from Texas to fix this fair value takes care of that situation.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. First, I wish to thank the Senator from Florida for the hearings which were held on the bill and for reporting the bill to the Senate.

Early in January, I introduced S. 885 a bill on this subject, for consideration by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I stated that the subcommittee which conducted the hearing, did so on 10 bills, all dealing with the same subject matter. I wish to assure the Senator from Kansas that one of the bills was his.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the Senator from Florida very much.

I wish to be certain that I understand the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas to the committee amendment. As I understand, it would strike out certain words which were inserted by the committee, and as to which there was some difference of opinion. So I understand that, as a result of the amendment of the Senator from Texas to the committee amendment, the words "but not more" in line 14, page 5, are now out of the bill.

In that connection, let me state that my bill used the words "but not less." The committee, however, included in the amendment it reported the words "but not more." The words "but not more" have now been struck from the committee amendment, as I understand.

Mr. HOLLAND. The amendment strikes out those words, and makes the meaning clear. As I understand the amendment of the Senator from Texas to the committee amendment, it provides that the exact fair rental value of the land deferred, or limited, shall be the measure of the Federal compensation, which the Secretary shall determine on the basis of the normal grazing capacity of the land during periods of adequate precipitation.

Mr. CARLSON. Then I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Florida whether the committee members had in mind some specific instances or whether they considered only the normal or average basis in connection with the making of payments for the land in these areas. It has been stated that some areas allow 4 acres per head for grazing and some allow 12 or 12 acres per head. Were there any specific figures to show what the payments might be to the individual landowners based on the grazing capacity of the land for deferred grazing?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; 85 cents an acre and \$1 an acre were mentioned. I remember that both figures were mentioned in the hearings. I am sure there is variation above and below those figures. I am speaking now of annual payments.

Under the concept of the committee amendment, the exact value of the particular land for the use that is deferred or limited will be determined as of the time when normal conditions prevailed. That price will be the price required to be paid to those who bring the land into this program.

It was the feeling of the committee that the Nation itself has a very great stake in restoring the cover to these lands, so much of which is now in very poor condition, and may become almost a desert unless there is provided some program whereby they may be restored to a reasonable good growing condition.

It is our concept that in order to obtain the cooperation of the landholder who is required to cut down his herd, and as Senators know, is required to find feed where he can—and the Federal Government has as another program to help him get feed at about half price—this should be required, too, as a condition and as an objective eminently worthwhile to the Nation, the State, the grazer, and all others concerned. He should receive at least payments amounting to the normal grazing value of the land which he is eliminating from grazing or which he is limiting in grazing.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield further to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to point out that the conditions for grazing and the value of grazing differ in various parts of the Nation; they even differ within a State. For instance, in Kansas we have some areas where as many as 10 acres per head is considered necessary. Then we have the great blue stem area, to which hundreds of thousands of cattle are shipped from Texas every grazing season. This area has gone through a severe drought for the past 4 or 5 years. It will be very helpful if we can obtain a deferred grazing program which will allow some of the grassland to reseed itself and thereby rebuild a firm growth.

I wish to be sure that we provide for the making of payments for deferred grazing, in order that the grass will be built up for the future, but also make sure that the payments will not be so high as to encourage the liquidation of herds.

This proposed legislation can be of permanent value to the grazing areas of the Nation.

Mr. HOLLAND. A moment ago I referred to 85 cents an acre and \$1 an acre. Those were the figures I recalled as having been used in the hearings. But I have just been advised, by counsel for the committee, that in conference with the regulatory agencies of the Department of Agriculture, which already have had experience in this field with lands that are good, lands that are medium, and lands that are very poor, they have told him that the normal grazing values, in their experience, go from a minimum of 20 cents to a maximum of about \$1 an acre a year. I personally have no information in that field, because in my State the grazing situation is so different that it is not applicable at all.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me? I should like to address myself to the question which was asked a moment ago.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand that the Senator from Kansas is anxious to know what rate will be paid for various types of land in his State. The answer to that question is that the fair rental rate will be paid. In the case of some of the land, it may be 25 cents an acre; in the case of some of the land it may be \$2.25 an acre. That will depend on the rental factors related to that land.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes, after expressing the hope that in the dryland States there is some grazing land that is worth \$2.25 an acre. In my State we have some; but I have been told that if the native range land areas have land that has a value of \$1 a year, it is very good grazing land.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I did not intend to state that \$2.25 or \$1.25, either, was the value. I merely intended to state that the value would be the fair rental value.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Texas is correct. The value will be the fair rental value either for full grazing, or, if limited grazing is all that is required in order to meet the need in the case of the particular land, then that value will be fixed, which of course will be less than the total grazing rental value.

Mr. CARLSON. In the blue stem region in Kansas we have some land on which they are receiving agricultural conservation payments of \$1.75 an acre. There is no question that under the conservation program, payments going as high as \$1.65 an acre have been received.

Unless this program is carried out on the basis of the agricultural conservation program I think it would result in great confusion and in some instances in an injustice to the landowner.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to say to the distinguished Senator that one of the changes made by the committee, in its amendment—which probably was not necessary, and probably would have been made anyway—was to provide that this program shall be supplemental to the normal conservation program, and shall be administered by the same group.

So if the distinguished Senator has found that group willing to fix a value as high as the one he has stated for excellent grazing lands in his State, all I can say to him is that the same group will be dealing with the drought situation in his State, which may or may not apply to the same preferred grazing lands.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. At the outset, I wish to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Florida for his explanation of the bill; and I wish to say that in my judgment he has improved the bill considerably from its condition at the time when I appeared before the committee and made a suggestion in reference to the use of the Federal land in the Western States.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, but I have not quite finished the explanation of the bill. I may say to him that we certainly took full cognizance of the suggestion made by the Senator. If he has had a chance to read the report, and if he will bear with me so that I may complete my opening statement, he will find we have made complete allowance for the point which he so ably made before our committee.

Mr. BARRETT. I shall be glad to yield, but I have read the report and

have studied the matter very carefully. I am fearful the committee has not protected us adequately, and I wish to discuss that point with the distinguished Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be very happy to discuss it. If the Senator will wait until I read the second paragraph following the point where I stopped a moment ago I shall come to the point he has made, and I shall then yield.

Continuing with my opening statement:

The committee amendment makes it clear that the program would be restricted to nonfederally owned land.

I call to the attention of the Senator from Wyoming the fact that we are beginning to deal with federally and non-federally owned land. I repeat, the committee amendment makes it clear that the program would be restricted to non-federally owned land. The Departments administering public lands have adequate authority to deal with the conservation of such lands. Indian lands, in which the Government does not have the beneficial ownership, would, of course, be eligible for the program.

In the case of Indian lands, while the title is held in the Government, the equity is really in the Indian users.

Continuing, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], in testifying before the subcommittee, ably pointed out the desirability of some provision to protect farmers and ranchers participating in the program from the permanent loss of their permits to graze on public lands.

The committee considered this problem and ascertained that the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior have authority to enter into nonuse arrangements with grazing permittees, whose base properties are, in whole or in part, placed in the program, and thus preserve the qualifications of such properties for grazing permits. The committee report recommends that this be done, and the committee felt that no further provision was necessary to take care of this problem.

Now I yield to my friend from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. I appreciate the statement the distinguished Senator has just made. I am concerned with the language in the report, on page 2, at the end of the first paragraph, which I now read:

The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture should—

And I emphasize the word "should"—enter into nonuse arrangements with grazing permittees whose base properties are, in whole or in part, placed in the program in order to preserve the qualifications of such properties for grazing permits.

It seems to me the committee should have used the word "shall" instead of "should."

I take it, from the statement the distinguished Senator has just made that, it was the intention of the committee to require the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to take into consideration the fact that a permittee has entered into an agreement with the Secretary of Agriculture to cut down his herd or to dispose of his herd completely.

Accordingly the rancher could use the Federal lands only partially if at all.

As I explained, a man may own base property, sufficient to run 100 head of cattle. He may have an agreement with the Secretary of the Interior whereby he can run 100 head of cattle on Taylor land a part of the year and a permit with the Secretary of Agriculture to run the same 100 head of cattle on Forest Reserve for another part of the year.

My question is this. Surely if he reduces his herd by say 50 percent on his basic land the Secretary will not penalize him for not running the full number on the Federal lands.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. The committee so understands, and we were in conference with the various representatives of the Department of Agriculture who have charge of that particular activity. Both the committee and the officials understand the situation clearly.

It is rather hard to state, in a fixed way, what will happen, because the whole program will be variable. One man's land will be deferred entirely. Another man's land will be partly deferred, and partly not deferred. Another will have his land subjected to limited uses. The different situations will require different reductions in the size of the herd, and different situations will result. We thought it was adequate to say, and I shall be glad to amplify it for the RECORD, that it is the committee's clear intention and full belief that the affected agency, whether it is in the Department of Agriculture or in the Department of the Interior, should and will see that a fair handling of this matter shall operate so as to protect completely the holder of any permit or lease from the Government affecting public lands, so that he will not be penalized by reason of only partial use of the lands, or even nonuse of the lands, if the problem is such a drastic one in his particular case.

Mr. BARRETT. I appreciate the statement the Senator has just made. I take it that it is the intention of the committee to permit the appropriate agency or the Department of the Interior to handle the leases or the permits in such a fashion that the man who complies with the provision of the law will not be prejudiced in any way because of partial use or nonuse of the Federal land.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is exactly right. We felt that any other conclusion would be completely unreasonable. Here is a government, interested in the restoration of land for the Nation's good, proposing a program. If one of the citizens who is very badly hurt by a prolonged drought, which is a major disaster, brings his own land, necessarily or wisely, or both, under this program, and if he has, as a supplement to his own land, which is his base operation, grazing leases on public land, we certainly do not want him to be hurt in any way. It would be inconceivable that the same government should then penalize him because of his inability to fully graze the lands which belonged to the public when that inability results from both the disaster and from his entering into the program which his

government provides to overcome the disaster to the extent it may be overcome.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator. I have a few other questions.

First, I should like to ask the Senator about the limited-use program. Let me state the case in this fashion: Suppose a man owns 10,000 acres of grazing land, the normal capacity of which is such that, let us say, 200 head of cattle could be grazed on the land. The drought has been of such character that the man is obliged to cut his herd down to 150 head of cattle. Do I understand correctly that the man could use the entire 10,000 acres to run 150 head of cattle, and thereby comply with the provision here, let us say, for a 25-percent payment, provided, of course, it was approved by the Secretary of Agriculture and his committees?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am not at all an expert in this field, but that was not my understanding. My understanding from the comments made by the agents of the Department of Agriculture, who sat with us, was this: Let us assume we are considering a large ranch, much of which is denuded, which is in such shape it is going to take a period of years to bring back the grass. Suppose, running through the ranch, there is bottom land which is not so denuded of grass and on which it would be idle or foolish to stop grazing entirely. Suppose the grass there is available on a full-time basis, or suppose it is available on a part-time basis, as the facts themselves may indicate. It is my understanding that the use of the words "limited use"—which are in the bill at the suggestion and I might say insistence of the agents of the Department of Agriculture, who sat with us—was to cover cases where the land is not identical throughout its entire extent, but is of different character, or grade, and thus calls for different treatment.

I would much prefer to have one of the Senators on the committee who comes from the arid lands comment on this matter, because he may have a sounder idea about it than I have. My idea is as I have stated.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I should like to make another comment. This is a very important matter so far as the West is concerned. Our opportunities to participate in this program are extremely limited, in my opinion.

I have talked to Mr. Wheeler and Mr. Bradley, of the Department of Agriculture, and their interpretation of that language was as I have just explained it. If the committee intends that limited use shall apply to specific lands, it will be almost impossible for any livestock man in the West to comply with this provision of the law.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. It is on that particular phase of the matter that I desire to make a comment.

Usually the range, consisting of many thousand acres, is not fenced, and a man could not afford to fence it if he wished to.

Mr. BARRETT. The Senator from Minnesota is eminently correct.

Mr. THYE. For that reason a problem is presented. There may be some draws or hollows, as the distinguished Senator from Florida has mentioned, which would permit a small percentage of the normal herd to graze on the vast area, which would support the entire herd if there were normal rainfall and a good stand of grass.

The problem with which we are confronted here is that it is not possible to take all the cattle off the range, because then we would be wiping out the foundation stock of cattle which might exist there. Therefore, it would only be practical to limit the grazing.

The cattle themselves would select the area to be grazed, because an animal is quite wise when it is looking for forage or grass. It will go where the grass is. It will not be found on the dry knolls. So the cattle would naturally migrate to the water pockets or waterholes or lowlands where the grazing is possible. That would permit the tufts of grass out on the higher ground to go to seed, and the seed would naturally fall and be there to regerminate and grow grass on the area which had been long denuded of any forage because of drought.

So there is a commonsense solution to the question involved here. If the farmer were limited to a certain percentage of the number of head of cattle which the area normally could carry, just in order to keep the foundation herds intact, a man would not be completely destroyed, and when the grass came back after 1, 2, or 3 years he could make another start.

There has been good moisture in the areas in the States where there was such a problem, and it is very possible that the drought is completely broken. However, there are no plants on a vast acreage of that land. There are a few tufts of grass here and there. There is a large root system that may come to life, but it will take several years before that vast area is again in grass which will permit a man to graze the number of cattle he had when there was normal rainfall.

The whole problem here is one of taking a commonsense approach, in an attempt to limit the cattle and at the same time compensate the man for loss of the vast acreage—upon which he is paying taxes—that he is supervising, or from which he is attempting to earn a livelihood. We should try to compensate him for the fact that there has been no grazing on that area, and then make sure that when the grass has reestablished itself there will be a foundation herd there which will rebuild the livestock industry of the vast Plains area, whence most of the feeder cattle come to fill up the feed lots in Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, and all other States where we grow corn and are accustomed to feeding cattle.

I support the proposed legislation, because I think it is the only commonsense way by which we can afford any immediate relief to the vast Plains area and at the same time keep the Plains from being overstocked, preventing the destruction of every plant before it has a chance to go to seed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I certainly appreciate the very practical and very wise remarks of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. His experience is not new to me. I have discovered that in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry he frequently demonstrates his knowledge derived from his long acquaintance with agriculture. I believe the Senator from Minnesota served as a commissioner of agriculture in his own State. He knows agriculture in the West and the Middle West up and down. He has certainly made an important contribution to the discussion of this bill.

Before leaving the item we have been considering I may say that while I am sorry I cannot put into the RECORD the memorandum we have from the Department, I wish to state it was drawn up under the best circumstances possible, taking into account the haste required in this matter. Though it does not bear the signature of the Secretary, it does constitute the considered judgment of the officials of the Department who sat with us during several conferences. I believe there were three conferences.

This is what is said as to that particular point, and I quote this, because I think it is pertinent for the RECORD:

The original bill provided for deferred grazing only. The amended version would provide opportunity for better grassland management and utilization through non-use, limited use, deferred grazing during the period of plant growth, or any needed combination thereof.

I suspect that is about as fair a statement as could be made, briefly, on the matter.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I have another question to ask the Senator along the same line, if he will permit.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield further to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. I should like to ask the Senator if it is the intention of the committee to permit a livestock operator to qualify who has already limited his herds or completely disposed of his herds because of the drought in previous years.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is the opinion of the Senator from Florida that it is certainly the intention of the committee in such a case, where the man has already suffered the maximum disaster possible from the drought, to give him a chance to bring his lands back into shape.

Mr. BARRETT. Assuming that a man is required to ship his cattle out of the State for feeding purposes for a winter—or we shall say for 6 months—and does not use his base ranch properties at all, would that be a compliance, in the opinion of the distinguished Senator?

Mr. HOLLAND. If he does not overgraze the lands where they are put, he could certainly be held to comply by following that process.

Mr. BARRETT. He has not reduced his herd, but he has taken his entire herd off the range for half the year. I assume that would amount to the same thing as a 50 percent reduction, for that year, at any rate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Again, let me say that the Senator from Florida does not possess the very close knowledge which other Senators possess of actual operations in the great and fine area of the

country affected by drought. He would not like to state his opinion as being the final word. His idea has been that this provision would apply in a situation in which the farmer is in distress and the condition of his land has forced a reduction of grazing on the land. He may reduce his herd or move it elsewhere. If that is not the correct explanation, I should like to be corrected. I see my distinguished friend from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] still in the Chamber. I see other Senators from that great and fine area of the country, who know much more about the subject that I do. As I understand, this is not a program to enable a farmer to maintain full operation, full steam ahead. He will have to reduce his cattle numbers or find other grazing or feed for them.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming spoke about taking a herd off the range for half the season, or half of the year. That is a possibility. Frequently in the dry plains area it is possible to cut a crop of native hay only every other year. If the amount of rainfall is limited it must be allowed to stand and develop a root system, and come back the second season, if there is to be actual growth. If grazing were continued for the entire 12 months of the year, the grass, growing slowly as it does, would be kept down to the root. The vitality of the plant would constantly be weak, and its growth would be so limited that there would be little opportunity for the prairie land to hold itself against ruination. If the cattle are removed from the range for 6 months, there is a reestablishment of the grass. It develops a firmer root section. There is more vitality in the plant, and the plant is safeguarded against ruination, or an absolute kill.

I think the Senator from Wyoming is correct in asking these questions, because only here do we establish the legislative history of the bill, so that the solicitor may be guided by it when he is endeavoring to place an interpretation upon the intent of the entire act.

In asking these questions the distinguished Senator from Wyoming is establishing the legislative history. I think there is commonsense to the idea that a rancher may move his cattle off the range for 6 months at a time. Whether he puts them in a lot for feeding on dry feed is a question to be determined. But if they are off the range for 6 months, the grass will have greater vitality, and will definitely show improvement, even under drought conditions.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is quite possible that if grazing were available in a distant State, or at some other place, sufficient to support the entire herd, the procedure suggested by the Senator from Wyoming might be applicable.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. THYE. One reason I made mention of the fact that the cattle might be removed from the drought area for a period of time is that in the drought of

1934, and again in 1936—but primarily the 1934 drought, which was severe in much of the plains area—many truck-loads of cattle were hauled from the plains area to northern Minnesota, because the grazing in the woods area was ample to furnish feed. Thereby herds of cattle were kept from complete extinction. That is what I have in mind.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. What the Senator from Minnesota has described is common practice in the years when we have extreme drought in the West. I hope it is the intention of the committee that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior, in administering the provisions of the bill, will take into consideration all these factors in arriving at the regulations, so as to give the people of the West an opportunity to participate in the benefits of the bill, if it shall become law.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Secretary of Agriculture will be administering the act. I am sure that the Senator, in referring to the Secretary of the Interior, is speaking only of that portion of the public lands over which the Secretary of the Interior has jurisdiction.

Mr. BARRETT. That is correct.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I agreed to yield to the Senator from Illinois next.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to understand the bill. Am I correct in my understanding that the bill provides for Federal subsidies to cattle growers and sheep raisers, so that they will not overgraze their land when the land has been damaged by drought?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; with one addition, namely, that it must have been so gravely damaged by drought that the area would have been declared a disaster area under the provisions of Public Law 875.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I further correct in my understanding that the Department of Agriculture estimates that the cost of a 2-year program of this nature will be approximately \$30 million?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Department of Agriculture has furnished us that figure, and we have included it in our statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida if he has any fears that the proposed legislation would undermine the initiative and self-reliance of the cattle growers and sheep raisers in this area?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have not, because I have found them to be about the most independent and resourceful group of agriculturists in the Nation. In the course of our hearing 2 years ago on price-support legislation, even in those areas where most of the tillers of the land were for high price supports, without a single exception at any hearing the Senator from Florida attended, the cattlemen came forward and very firmly and vociferously stated that they wanted no part of any price supports.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois remembers that very well. He remembers that the cattlemen of the West, and of the Great Plains area, objected

to any protection of consumers, on the ground that if that were done it would undermine the independence and self-reliance of the cattlemen. I wonder if the Senator has discovered the same zeal for independence and self-reliance on the part of the cattlemen when it comes to a Government subsidy.

Mr. HOLLAND. Very few cattlemen appeared before us on the pending measure. We heard witnesses from the Department of Agriculture, the Weather Bureau, and many other agencies. They assured us that this was the greatest drought disaster that had befallen a large area of our Nation in the history of the Weather Bureau. Unless means are provided to combat the disaster, we shall not only find some good people out of business, which would be deplorable enough, but we shall find great areas of our country denuded and unproductive. The feeling in our committee was unanimous. I do not recall that any objection was raised. Some of us come from States where, thank the Lord, we do not have this particular problem to contend with. We felt that an important issue of conservation affecting the natural resources of our country far transcended the personal interest of any user of grazing land.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say that the Senator from Illinois intends to vote for the bill as presented by the chairman of the subcommittee. However, in view of the fact that cattlemen and sheep raisers have insisted so strongly on protecting their independence and self-reliance and individual initiative, I wondered whether the Senator from Florida had any fear that we would undermine the independence upon which the cattlemen have insisted so strongly. I say that because initiative can be undermined in a very insidious fashion. A program may begin with very laudable purposes. However, if we destroy, ultimately, both self-reliance and initiative, as we heard the cattlemen say so many times might happen under certain circumstances, would not the consequences of such action be disastrous? I wonder whether the Senator from Florida and the cattlemen themselves have thought enough about the possibility or danger of undermining the moral qualities of the cattlemen.

Mr. HOLLAND. I may say to my friend from Illinois, in good humor, because he always preserves good humor, that I do not believe that such a result would come about in this instance. We are confronted with a great national disaster. It is just as much a national disaster as is a ravaging flood or a great fire or a great earthquake. We are trying to deal with it from that point of view. I may say also that most of the agricultural industries which I represent in part as one of two Senators from the State of Florida are just as strongly against price supports as are the cattlemen. I refer to the fruit growers and vegetable growers in my State. With one voice, everyone whom I have heard speak on the subject has said, "Here is a disaster so tremendous that only the Nation, with all its strength, can help relieve it." Therefore I do not believe the cattlemen would be affected at all in their traditional feeling and point of view against price supports.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator does not believe that their character would be undermined?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not think the character of the cattlemen would be undermined any more than a home lover would have his character undermined if his home had been washed away by a flood and the Red Cross or some governmental agency had come forward to help him reestablish his little home. I do not believe his character would be undermined by restoring the home of his little family. To the contrary I believe he would show considerable intestinal fortitude by coming back to restore his home. When victims of drought can see the well-watered plains of Illinois not far away, or the verdant fields of Florida or California not far away, and other places which have not been hit by terrific drought disasters, there is a temptation, I am sure, for one who is weak to say, "This is all I can take. Let me go to Illinois or to Florida or to California, or somewhere else, and rebuild in a safer and more secure agricultural atmosphere."

I believe that the people who are fighting for their very lives in this situation are deeply attached to the soil and are deeply attached to the cattle industry, and are deeply attached to independence, and would not think that they were losing their independence by letting their great Government help them retain their land. I did not find such sentiments expressed, or any such great concern expressed, by anyone who appeared before us in our hearings.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very much reassured by the statement of the Senator from Florida. I am very glad to hear that our stockmen feel that way about this proposal. As I say, I shall vote for the bill. Of course, the Senator from Florida realizes that catastrophes are not solely natural catastrophes, and that there are also social catastrophes as well as climatic catastrophes. I imagine that the Senator from Florida believes, therefore, that people should be protected against such things as urban blights, and that character is not destroyed by the Federal Government assisting people who are injured by calamities aside from those of nature.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is, of course, correct. From the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee over which the Senator from Florida has the responsibility and honor of presiding as chairman, there has come each year for several years a provision of funds more generous than that provided by the other body in its wisdom, for the redevelopment of areas that had been hurt by some situation outside of their ability to control, but not of a serious natural nature.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the Senator's statement. May I ask whether the Secretary of Agriculture has approved the program?

Mr. HOLLAND. That I am unable to answer categorically. Let me say that before the distinguished Senator came to the Chamber I explained to the Senate that we had had specialists and experts and heads of divisions of the Department of Agriculture sit with us on three occa-

sions. They have been very helpful, and the changes which are reflected in the committee amendment largely reflect the suggestions and the wisdom of those people.

We also received this morning an informal memorandum. It does not have the standing of a report, because it had not had time to clear through the Department. At the same time I feel that the memorandum, from which I have quoted several paragraphs, does represent the thinking of the heads of those divisions in the Department of Agriculture who sat with us in drafting and later when we had worked out the bill, and who, after a couple of days in which to study the language more carefully, wrote the memorandum as representing their reflections. They are all complimentary.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is my understanding that the Secretary of Agriculture at a press conference a few days ago criticized the idea of price supports for farm products. His basic objection, of course, is that they undermine the independence of the farmer in his reliance on such programs. Am I to understand that the Secretary of Agriculture does not have the same objections to subsidy payments for stockmen and sheep-raisers?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sorry to say that I am unable to answer that question. However, I must say that the Secretary of Agriculture is not alone in his feeling that reliance on high price supports has, in some instances, sapped the independence and self-reliance and initiative of some of our farmers. No one regrets that more than does the Senator from Florida, who dislikes to see it. There are some things, entirely proper, which we can do that will not entail such an unfortunate result. However, I believe that we have had just such an unfortunate result from some aspects of the very high price-support program which was allowed to follow the war.

My opinion and the opinion of the Senator from Illinois are not always the same, although we are equally interested in agriculture and agriculturalists. I am sure that the Senator from Illinois is an ardent patriot and wants to bring good to all the people of his country. The Senator from Florida shares that attitude also.

Therefore, there can be differences of opinion on some of these subjects, but I am sure we think alike when we try to deal with a terrible national disaster which not only affects hundreds of our people disadvantageously but, if carried to the extreme, might conceivably destroy the effective productiveness of our land and thus diminish our national strength.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the kind words the Senator from Florida has said about the Senator from Illinois, and I wish to reciprocate those feelings so far as the Senator from Florida is concerned.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my good friend from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Florida and the Secretary of Agriculture are alert to the dangers of natural catastrophes such as drought. However, are there not some catastrophes which hit millions of city people, which disasters

are not caused by nature, and to avert which the individual city dweller is as helpless as is a stockman or cattleman to avert natural disasters?

Mr. HOLLAND. There are certainly disasters of one kind or another which hit us that are not natural disasters. The Senator from Illinois offered some words of commendation to the Senator from Florida when he was handling a measure to liberalize greatly the Farmers' Home Administration Act by trying to meet the situation, in part, at least, of farmers of limited means or farmers who were farming submarginal land.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Florida is very kind. I hope he will permit the Senator from Illinois to ask one more question.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The cattlemen and stockmen from these regions have constantly emphasized what they term "States rights." They say that the Federal Government should not intrude upon the States in matters relating to the States. They say that the States should assume the major portion of economic activity, and that the Federal Government should, in the main, stay on the sidelines. Does the Senator from Florida feel that States rights are being interfered with by these Federal subsidies?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not feel that States rights are being interfered with at all by the measure we are here considering. On the contrary, I think the States where the massive droughts have been sustained are already carrying, so far as the public units are concerned, the greatest part of the load. There is no way to avoid that. The tax rolls show it; their volume of business shows it.

There is not a State institution in any State which has been terribly hit by the drought which has not been badly hurt. Therefore, the States will have to carry the principal part of the load. Nevertheless, all the States help to make up our great Federal Government, and one of the fine things about the Federal Government is that both officially and unofficially, through governmental means and through such private means as the Red Cross, and many similar agencies, the people of America like to think of themselves as united when disaster strikes any part of our Nation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate those remarks. I am in favor of the grazing bill. I want to make that perfectly clear.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am grateful to the Senator from Illinois; I thought he would be in favor of it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am struck by the fact that the people recognize the force of the Federal Government when they are in trouble and when they want an appropriation. But when it is a question of the Federal Government protecting someone else and possibly interfering with them a little, then some of the same people take refuge in the doctrine of States rights and say, "This is not a proper function of the Federal Government." The endeavor of the Senator from Illinois, as undoubtedly the Senator from Florida has discerned, has been to make certain that there is as much con-

sistency in this field as is perhaps desirable.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Illinois, as always, has been courteous and kind in his remarks concerning this matter. I should like him to realize that, so far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, there is not an acre in his State—and I am happy that that is the case—which would be affected by the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand that.

Mr. HOLLAND. I found no disposition on the part of any Senator on our committee from a State which was not hit by this disaster to fail to give all his attention, thoughts, and planning to trying to draft a workable bill.

I do not believe there is anyone who desires to put disaster relief, whether Federal or State, as to the individual, on a strict, technical basis of States rights or individual rights.

So far as I am concerned, I think I am about as ardent an advocate of States rights, along with State responsibilities, as can be found in the Senate. I hope to be so. Yet I find no trouble at all, either for myself or from my State, which is not affected, in doing the utmost toward trying to have passed a workable bill for some 8, 10, or 12 States which are affected in varying degrees, and which are a great part of our fine country, and which will be left in a desperate position unless some program is provided for rebuilding the fertility of their soil.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I quite agree with the Senator from Florida. There have been some droughts in southern Illinois, and I think some counties should have been declared disaster areas which were not declared to be disaster areas. In the main, of course, my State has not suffered to the degree the Western States have suffered. Nevertheless, I am very glad to support the proposed legislation, because I think it is needed. It is needed to prevent the Dust Bowl from developing once again.

My hope is that the citizens and the representatives of those States that desire Federal aid when they suffer natural catastrophes will realize that other sections of the country can suffer not merely natural, but also manmade catastrophes, which are equally devastating in their total effect.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my distinguished friend. He is always a real humanitarian. I never expected anything else than that he would be strongly in support of the bill.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida for the very able presentation he has made, although he does not come from the drought areas of the Nation.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois, genuine humanitarian that he is, was, I think, justified in putting his question about what would be done with respect to other sections of the country which may not be stricken with a drought, but which may sustain some economic catastrophe.

Coming as I do from a drought-stricken area, he may rest assured that I will support all such measures, because

we are not talking about cattle, we are not talking about land, but we are talking about people. As the distinguished Senator from Florida has said, it is the people who are suffering.

I should like to inform the Senator from Florida and other Members of this body that only recently this very area was in the midst of a triple blizzard. For 7 years the people of this area have suffered from hailstorms, or from wind, or from the sun which has dried out their land. Now, at this very point, there comes before us a very minor bill, a grazing bill, a part of the purpose of which, as I understand, is to extend the provisions of Public Law 875, which is disaster legislation which the President himself can activate only if, in turn, the governor of a State activates it.

Heretofore Colorado has had 36 counties under the disaster program. As a result of the recent blizzards, 10 additional counties have been added.

Cattlemen, whose basic herds may have been smothered by the snow, are not asking for grants of money; they are simply asking that the Government not foreclose, but extend credit to them. That is what first brought my attention to the deferred grazing bill.

It is very clear to me what the purpose of the bill is. Although it deals with the conservation of grass and of land, it fundamentally deals with people. At a very insignificant cost it will be most helpful to the Nation.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Florida for his clear presentation, at the same time recognizing that the distinguished Senator from Illinois was using a little of the needling process to awaken our own consciences to the facts which may exist in the other parts of the Nation.

The Senator from Illinois has said he will support the bill. For that we commend him. I do not see how any Senator could, in good conscience, vote against the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida has not felt that the needling on the part of the Senator from Illinois was at all unkind.

Before I close this part of the discussion, I call attention to one other matter. My friend, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], is really the chairman of the subcommittee which conducted the hearings. He was so burdened with other hearings that he asked the Senator from Florida, who is one of its members, to act in his place. The Senator from Florida is the chairman of another subcommittee which is somewhat related to this subcommittee. The Senator from Florida agreed to conduct the hearings as requested by the Senator from South Carolina.

When the time came to make a report on the bill, the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Florida, who sometimes do not see eye to eye on the subject of price supports, were going down the road hand in hand. Neither of our States is affected at all by the drought. Nevertheless, although our philosophy about price supports is as different as it can be, I do not believe there was any expression of difference

about the details of the bill. Certainly, we were both found supporting it heartily in every way we could.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida for the remarks and references he has made concerning me. When I was looking for a Senator to hold the hearings, I immediately thought of the Senator from Florida, knowing that he would go to the bottom of the matter and develop all the necessary facts in order to reach a proper conclusion. I had no doubt in my mind that the proposed legislation was needed, and that the Senator from Florida would do the spade work of digging out the facts and getting the bill ready, not only for the subcommittee, but also for the full committee.

I commend him for the work he has done, because he and his committee have produced an excellent bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate very much the remarks of the Senator from South Carolina.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to say, if the Senator from Florida will permit me, apropos of the debate between the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Florida, that one of the things about which the livestock men have complained, although not very loud, has been not the failure of Congress, but the holding of the prices of feed—corn, barley, and other feed—at a support price higher than that for which it can be fed to the livestock, the livestock can be sold on the open market, and the cattlemen can break even.

CANNOT FEED THE CORN, BARLEY, AND OIL CAKE
AT SUPPORT PRICE AND SELL STEERS ON OPEN
MARKET

If the support price is paid for corn, and fed to the steers, there will be a loss of about 50 cents a day on each steer sold on the open market even if they make the usual gains.

The cattle and sheep men have taken the brunt of it for several years, and it has broken a lot of feeders, and the feeders furnish the market for the small ranchers and the farmers, when their livestock is ready to ship off the range.

When certain areas are placed in a disaster area, a special price is established for the feed (corn, barley and oil cake), and that reduces the cost to a point where the farmers and ranchers can at least break even, by feeding the corn and the barley at such reduced prices.

That operation alone, however, disturbs the business where it is not dependable.

Mr. HOLLAND. And by cutting the herd to the basic herd.

Mr. MALONE. I may add, by cutting the basic herds and borrowing money to feed the cattle for the market.

They have just about reached their limit, however, in trying to feed corn, barley and oil cake at the support price, when there is no support price for the cattle. So far they have stayed away from it and argued against it, but the end is near.

As the distinguished Senator from Florida has so ably stated, they have been very vociferous in stating that they want no help, or regulation; but some of these days they will come to the end of the rope, if the Congress continues to keep up the support price of the feed they must have to market the beef.

ARBITRARY REDUCTION OF THE RANGE PART OF THE
LIVESTOCK UNIT

Let me explain to the distinguished Senator from Florida the tendency on the part of both the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior to reduce the range for the livestock unit 10 percent on transfer or non-use.

The Department of Agriculture supervises the forest reserves which generally are the summer grazing areas, because they are the higher elevation areas on the western ranges; and the Department of the Interior supervises the regular public land areas under the Taylor Grazing Act, initiated in 1934 and now under the Bureau of Land Management. There has been a tendency to cut the grazing rights of any grazer who may have more than what they call a subsistence unit—enough for an average family.

I wish to explain to the distinguished Senator from Florida, inasmuch as I know that the areas in his State are entirely different from the western areas, that what counts in the West is the balancing of the range with the feed producing ranches.

There are three parts to a grazing unit. First, there is the feed-producing ranch area, where there is enough water to raise hay or grain or both to feed a certain number of cow units—cow and calf—or sheep units—ewe and lamb. A ton of hay to a cow or unit is about the average in the West, for wintering a cow unit.

Then there are the spring, fall, summer and winter range lands—public or privately owned lands which form one part of the three-part unit. The water rights on the range and the feed-producing ranches form the third unit. If any part is taken away or reduced, to that extent the carrying capacity of the range unit is destroyed.

So the tendency has been to cut 10 percent, whenever there is a transfer, or whenever there arises an occasion for so doing. The authority to do this has never been relinquished so that the "range unit" is never stable or salable.

I wish to refer to page 2 of the report, where the language is very clear—namely, that—

The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture should enter into nonuse arrangements with grazing permittees whose base properties are, in whole or in part, placed in the program in order to preserve the qualifications of such properties for grazing permits.

I ask the distinguished Senator from Florida if there is an understanding with the Government department in charge of the public lands that there will be no arbitrary cut in the range affecting the carrying capacity of these range units, during this period.

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me say to my distinguished friend from Nevada that the

various agencies which handle the programs for the public lands and the leasing of those lands to the permittees were consulted by the committee about this matter. They say that ample authority already exists, and I think that they certainly should insist upon the handling of their present regulations under their present authority in such a way as to work no hardship or forfeiture upon the holders of permits who graze the public lands supplemental to their own lands, as the Senator has explained the matter.

Mr. MALONE. If the distinguished Senator from Florida will permit me to continue, I wish to say that I know they have that authority. They also have authority under certain conditions to cut the range under lease 10 percent on sale or transfers; and what we need to know now, have they committed themselves to protect such range utilized with the livestock unit during this period?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is the understanding of the Senator from Florida and the committee. While the Government is with one hand extending aid to a rancher to revitalize his land in its productive capacity, it would be completely inconsistent for the Government with the other hand to take away some right that was based upon the rancher's full herd being in existence and being grazed. When the farmer has to limit grazing he simply cannot live up to the full requirements of his grazing permit as to how many head he would have on the publicly leased part of his total grazing facilities.

STATES RIGHTS

Mr. MALONE. I appreciate very much the statement of the distinguished Senator from Florida.

I should like to add—because the matter of States rights has been brought into the debate—that in my opinion the States rights are in no way affected one way or another by any action which Congress may take in connection with any relief or any other projects under a Congressional policy, such as that of flood control, irrigation or reclamation, drainage or through appropriating money for other purposes.

The States rights are not affected in any way whatever, unless by deliberate action taken by an administration or by a bureau head operating under the laws so passed, and taking advantage of such Congressional action. The bureau heads are only empowered to conform to the policy laid down by Congress, not to create policy.

Congress is not taking away or affecting the States rights by such action. But unfortunately for many years the policy of encroaching upon States rights has been a policy of bureau heads and of administrative action.

I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from Florida will agree with me that the harm is not done by the laws passed by Congress to carry out projects within a State or States, but the harm is done by the bureau heads who operate to establish policies which usurp and nullify such constitutional rights of the States.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sure the Senator from Nevada and I understand the matter exactly alike. I think the Congress passes legislation of that type in an effort to increase the national wealth and the national productivity. The Congress is not thinking of any particular individual or any particular groups of individuals. The purpose is to build greater wealth and greater productive power for the Nation. When a disaster comes and when there is necessity for giving relief, I think all that the Congress endeavors to do in regard to the citizens and the communities and the States affected is to enable them to receive aid from their other brethren who happen to live in places which are not affected by such disasters.

Mr. MALONE. Then I understand the Senator from Florida agrees with me that when Congress passes an act for relief that action has nothing to do with basic States rights under the Constitution.

Mr. HOLLAND. Not at all, any more than it tends to destroy personal or States rights when the Senator out of his generosity makes a donation to the Red Cross at a time of disaster, when he wishes to have relief given to someone or some area which has been greatly hurt by a flood or some other disaster. That is not a deprivation of rights. To the contrary, it is a showing of interest on the part of one American in the distress of other Americans who happen to be adversely affected.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Morton in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator from Florida inform me whether I am correct in understanding that this is a special bill to provide special aid for livestock grazers, and will make available for their help the sum of \$25 million if they qualify in accordance with the provisions of the bill?

Mr. HOLLAND. When the Senator from Ohio refers to \$25 million he refers to the special message of the President, which has been printed as House Document 115. He will find it printed on page 19 of that document. The \$25 million is requested this year as a first appropriation.

The Department of Agriculture, in its report to us, says—and I have not quite reached that part of my introductory remarks—that this program, as embraced in this measure, will cost, in the opinion of the Department of Agriculture, approximately \$30 million for the next 2 years.

Mr. LAUSCHE. For the next 2 years?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then it is a special bill to provide special aid for a special condition, apart from all of the other bills we have to give aid in a disaster?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Secondly, House bill 4249 was passed early in this session, and

that gave \$25 million to the same cattle growers, for the purpose of aiding them in buying feed.

My question is, Was that not a special bill to give special aid in a special condition, and does not the bill which we have before the Senate today cover the same situation?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct in that that special measure was to give assistance to largely the same group of people that would be affected by the pending measure; but it had to do with emergency feed assistance, allowing them to buy emergency feeds at 50 percent of normal value. That was in pursuance of a program which has been operating several years. This particular appropriation was recommended and passed by the Senate as a part of the urgent deficiency bill of 1957. That bill is still in conference. It had to do with providing funds to carry on one of the programs that is embraced in a general public relief act, which I believe is known as Public Law 875.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is also my understanding that there is under way between the conference committees of the House and the Senate the working out of an arrangement whereby the deficiency bill will become law, and that one of the vital arguments in the consideration of that proposal deals with the \$25 million appropriated by the Senate for cattle growers several months ago.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is partly right in his statement. The matter is in conference. I understand it is in trouble. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is on the floor. He is one of the conferees. He could tell us of the situation. The bill deals with emergency feed. It is feared that the bill might have an effect upon dairymen, poultrymen, and other producers, in disturbing the normal prices at which they buy commodities necessary to them, and which are also furnished in the feed program. However, that bill has no relation whatever to the pending bill.

I may say that the pending bill contained a section, section 5, which would have amended Public Law 38, 81st Congress, or that part of it which dealt with the feed program, but it was dropped, for the reason that the House had dropped a similar provision out of H. R. 2367 and plans to hold hearings on the subject. We consulted with the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the author of the bill, and came to the conclusion with him that section 5 would better be considered as separate legislation so that action on a deferred grazing would not be delayed.

The pending bill has to do with providing needed range grass growth on many millions of acres of rangeland, lying in from 8 to 12 States. I have to put it that way because recent rains and snows may bring quicker relief to some of those States than was at first thought possible. But the bill affects a great area of our country, and has to do with the rehabilitation of a native asset, the growth on rangeland, which at present is not allowed for under any effective public program.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me say one thing more. The \$25 million which the Senator mentions, in other words, has no application at all to this program. The best measure we have as to the cost of this program, and the only measure on which we can rely, is the estimate of the Secretary of Agriculture that it will cost \$30 million, as he sees it now, to carry the program on for 2 years.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the chairman of the committee, who is also one of the conferees on the urgent deficiency bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have just returned from a conference between the House and the Senate on the urgent deficiency bill. We have been struggling in conference with this problem for the past 3½ weeks. The \$25 million figure mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Ohio was not agreed upon by the House, but, instead, we accepted a \$15 million appropriation. The reason for that was that the \$15 million appropriation would be sufficient to carry out the program until June 30, whereas the Senate had provided \$25 million to carry out the program until September 30, 1957.

Likewise, the Senate receded from the \$25 million figure and agreed to accept the \$15 million figure from the disaster loan revolving fund, to be used for emergency feed and seed assistance.

We have not reached agreement on the question of forcing the Secretary of Agriculture to assist farmers in procuring cottonseed meal or cottonseed cake or pellets for taking care of basic herds.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I ask the Senator from Louisiana a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield so that the Senator from Ohio may ask a question and receive an answer from the Senator from Louisiana.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the subject of the \$25 million which was granted to buy feed one of the items in controversy in the conference?

Mr. ELLENDER. No.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is not. Have the conferees agreed upon that?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the Senator will yield, I should like to ask the Senator from Florida a question.

I have had some word that the Secretary of Commerce has stated that if the \$25 million, which was included in the deficiency bill, is granted, this \$15 million a year is unnecessary. Has there been any such word delivered to the committee?

Mr. HOLLAND. No such word has been delivered to the committee, and if it were delivered, it would have to come from an uninformed source, because the two subject matters are completely different. One has to do with the matter of assistance in the furnishing of feed to basic herds to hold them together. The other is the matter of rebuilding the native grass on rangelands which have become almost desert, in many areas of the West, as a result of the drought.

Mr. LAUSCHE. When the deficiency bill was before the Senate, if I had known a request was going to be made for \$15 million or more, my vote would not have gone in support of that bill. I understand first there was provided aid for the grazers by way of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, which has been in existence. Am I correct in that?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then we passed a special bill to give \$25 million for them to buy feed. Now we are probably going to pass a \$15 million bill to help them reestablish their lands.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is partly right and partly wrong. The aid for feed covers a much wider area than does the pending bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Are they not both administered under the public-disaster law? They come under the same subject, do they not?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct; however, under different phases of that law. Insofar as concerns aid for feed, the right to purchase feed at 50 percent of normal cost applies to a much wider area than that to which the pending bill would apply, because in the pending bill it is not just required that it shall be a disaster area. There are many disaster areas where farms exist and where farming is in distress. The bill to which the Senator refers is the feed-and-seed bill. The present measure is confined to livestock, and it is also confined to areas in which—and I quote from the bill, and the Senator will find this language on lines 22 and following on page 4—"in which the Secretary of Agriculture determines grazing of native rangeland is a substantial factor in agricultural production, and finds that limited or deferred grazing is necessary and appropriate for the reestablishment or conservation of grass for grazing."

I wish to say to my distinguished friend that the aid-for-feed program has been going on for some years. The Senator from Florida, along with other members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, has been on inspection trips, to see how our aid for the acquisition-of-feed program was coming along. Some of that is in areas where, largely, cultivated farmland is involved, rather than rangeland. Some of it is in areas where the extreme drought lasted only 1 year, but where there is a lack of feed and a lack of assets and consequent inability to move ahead.

This bill relates to those vital cases where the native products of the soil—mostly grass, but other vegetation, also—have been so completely destroyed by the long-existing drought that the very existence of that area as a productive part of our agricultural economy is jeopardized and threatened.

The effort here is to provide for an emergency conservation and reestablishment practice which will enable the rebuilding of the native assets, the range grass and other things.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. The distinguished Senator from North Dakota is one of the

ranking members of the committee. Perhaps he has an observation to state on this point.

Mr. YOUNG. Yes, if I may be permitted to state it.

There is an item in conference now with the House, as to appropriations, relating to loans to farmers which are to be repaid. The item is for direct payments to the farmers for rehabilitation of rangelands. I think the two are entirely separate.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Delaware, with the consent of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Ohio was correct. We did appropriate a few weeks back \$25 million to provide for cheaper feed for this same area.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Twenty-five million dollars.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Ohio is correct. Situations will occur under the provisions of the proposed law whereby those who come within the grazing plan will lease grazing facilities to the Government and receive the normal grazing payments from the Government while at the same time the cattle they move off the area will be fed by the Government under another program at about one-half the normal price. Is that not correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, again I may say that is partly correct and partly incorrect. The maintenance of the basic herd, which is a great deal smaller than the full herd, is a matter of public concern, as well as a matter of private concern to the owner. That is protected and allowed for in part by the feed purchase program, to permit the grazer or the dairyman, after he has reduced his herd—and the areas I have helped inspect were more dairy areas than they were rangeland areas—the opportunity to keep life in the bodies of the basic herd, which has been culled out from his full herd. The rest of the cattle are gone.

That is the objective served by the feed program. The question of the preservation or restoration of the land is a different question. The law will be administered, however, by the same agency, and it will be administered with some commonsense.

Whether we like what Mr. Benson and his key men do or not, I think most of us would have to say they have shown a whole lot of good commonsense and demonstrated a great deal of good, common frugality in the handling of the main programs. I see no basic interference between these two programs, because they deal with different values.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not questioning the fact that the program contemplated may have some merit; I am merely pointing out that I think the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] is correct. It is possible if the bill is passed to have both programs operating with regard to the same farm simultaneously, where the farmer would be paid to take the herd off his land and would draw full com-

pension and payment for the acreage, while at the same time the Government would be helping to feed the herd, after the farmer put it off the land. There will be duplication.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Government would be helping him to feed his herd by selling him feed at half price.

After all, does the Senator suggest that we should attempt to replace these millions of acres of rangeland, but not attempt to provide cattle or sheep to go on them?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not suggesting that. There may be some merit to this proposal. I am suggesting that the time is long past due when we should have some form of State participation in these programs which provide for Federal aid in the various stages. I say that, regardless of which States may be involved, I will not support this bill as written.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I realize that there is room for a difference of opinion on these matters, but I wish to say that as between the measures, if I had to choose, I would say the national interest is much more concerned with the objectives of the pending bill than even with the wholesome objectives of the aid for feed program for the basic herd, whether it be dairy cattle or range cattle, or whatever it might be. After all, we are dealing with the preservation, protection, and revival of a very great national asset, which is jeopardized and nearing destruction.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The grave fear I have about the wisdom of passing the bill deals with a principle. It is my fear that the giving of such aid, as distinct from the general disaster aid which is applied to all, would positively lay the groundwork for cities to come to the Congress asking that their citizens who have suffered losses of houses and property be given special aid for special damages suffered under special conditions.

While I was mayor of Cleveland, the city of Cleveland suffered from tornadoes. While I was governor of Ohio, there were disasters on the Ohio River. The citizens came to me, as governor, and asked if the State could not help them directly in retrieving a part of the losses which they suffered. My answer was that the State could not.

If this bill is passed it will establish the principle that the Federal Government in periods of disaster will give direct aid, whatever the situation may be. I humbly submit to the Senate that if we give aid to the cattle grazer, how can we deny aid to the miner, or the quarryman, or the railroadman, whose property has been damaged or destroyed in a disaster?

I wish to further point out that this bill provides that at the end of 5 years it shall vanish; that there shall be no further force to the law. Five years from now I shall be here in the Senate, and I venture to say the amount requested will be larger, and there will be a request that the period be extended. The costs of the bill will accumulate, and the tax burden upon the citizenry will grow heavier. I fear passing the bill is not

wisdom, because of the dangerous precedent which it establishes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished Senator, the former Governor of Ohio. I have had somewhat similar experiences while serving as the Governor of our State of Florida. We have had hurricanes. We have had floods. We have had other disasters. After I came to the Senate we had a flood in 1947, which the United States engineers said resulted in a loss of \$59 million. I think the loss was a good deal greater than that, but \$59 million was the official figure. We did not come here asking for the restoration of those things which were lost. We did come asking for appropriate relief. We were generously treated by the Congress, which thought that measures which would prevent the recurrence of such a flood, or tend to do so in the future, were desirable from the standpoint not only of protecting individuals, properties, and the State, but particularly from the standpoint of the protection of the Nation, because we cannot take \$59 million out of the productive capacity of a small area in 1 State in 1 year without greatly reducing taxpayments to the Federal Government and other units of government. We came to Congress for the type of relief which was applicable to that type of case.

It seems to me that the Senator is disturbing himself with questions which are not applicable to this situation. If the Senator is prepared to hold that it is not a matter of grave national concern for many millions of acres of lands formerly rich and productive to become almost a desert comparable to the Sahara, displacing hundreds of thousands of people who have not only lived upon those lands, but have raised there commodities needed by the rest of the Nation, of course, his argument is sound. But it seems to the Senator from Florida, and it seemed to every other member of our committee, regardless of where we came from, or to which party we belonged, that this was a matter in which the public good of the United States was threatened by disaster, already grave, but which could possibly become more widespread in its permanent effect, and that instead of sitting still and doing nothing about it, we should at least offer a cooperative hand to the people of the areas so devastated. We should say to them, "Thank the Lord, you want to go back to the land and restore the area to productivity, instead of moving to States which have not been hurt." We are glad that that is a typical American attitude. The American people do not like to be driven from their homes. They do not like to leave their native heath. They want their children to be reared under the conditions under which they themselves were reared. They will stay where they are and fight, not only for themselves, but for the reestablishment of a great national asset.

The committee felt unanimously that a sufficiently important national question was involved to cause us to recommend strongly the enactment of this legislation, even though it would cost us, as is now estimated, \$30 million.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I deeply respect the great devotion which the Senator from Florida has to conservation. I cannot see how he could have a different attitude, knowing the great influence which the beauty of Florida naturally has upon him.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my distinguished friend. We will welcome him as a guest, frequently, I hope.

Mr. LAUSCHE. However, while I subscribe to the principle of conservation, and have fought for it diligently, I have in mind that we now have a general law making possible financial aid to the landowner who adopts a conservation program.

That law is uniform in its operation. It covers the entire breadth of the land. It covers every farmer and cattle raiser in the country. Ohio farmers have available to themselves the benefit of that law. But it is now sought to superimpose upon that general law a special law. That is why I disagree as to the wisdom and soundness of the bill before us.

Mr. HOLLAND. Replying rather briefly, let me say that the conservation acreage provisions of the soil-bank law, of course, cover most of the area of the State so ably represented by the Senator from Ohio, because it has a very great percentage of cultivated lands. The conservation acreage provisions are much more generous to the owners of cultivated lands than the provisions of this bill are to the owners of range land. It seems to our committee that we had before us for consideration a group which was left out of the soil bank and out of any other program applicable to cultivated lands, but a group of people who have had visited upon them this terrible disaster. They want to go back and restore the productivity of those lands. They want to rebuild a tremendous national asset. I say, more power to them. I believe that weaker souls would give up and move to the verdant fields of areas which have not been so adversely affected. But these people want to stay on their lands. I say, let us keep them there by treatment which is not only generous to them, but just to our national interest, because a great national interest is involved.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida for the wonderful exposition he has made of the situation facing some of the States in the drought area. I come from Oklahoma, which was one of the original dust bowl States. Many people decried the cost which was involved in the rehabilitation of the area where there was churned up dust which swept into Ohio, and even down to Florida and the Gulf of Mexico.

As the Senator from Florida says, the people want to stay with the land. The hardy pioneers who stayed with it restored the native grasses and, through help from the Government, recreated

grazing land very much like that which nature had created in the first instance.

During the war years I saw this land supply the meat and the wheat which helped to win the victory, and also to return in ever-increasing abundance the income taxes which paid back manyfold the cost of rescuing that barren land.

As the distinguished Senator from Florida has pointed out, farmers or ranchers are not allowed to put grazing lands in the soil bank. As the distinguished Senator knows, on three occasions I have sponsored amendments to make grazing lands eligible for the soil bank. Strangely enough, tame hay and crops planted each year to provide grazing are eligible for the soil bank. However, the grassland which nature gives us is not eligible. So it does not enter into the \$1,200,000,000 program, which allows the wheat farmer, the corn farmer, and other farmers to set aside a part of their acreage and be paid for not farming it.

But at the same time they are paid for not farming this acreage, what do they do with the land? They turn it into grassland, thus creating pasturelands which, in 2 or 3 years, will threaten with extinction the traditional and historic native grassland ranchers, those who have raised stock on what we call the short-grass areas. The grass does not grow back in a year. It will require 3 or 4 years. The land will have to be rested. It will require soil treatment—not merely that which is given to the ordinarily fertile areas which have plenty of rainfall, but reseeding. The people who depend upon the land for their very existence must be compensated in some way. That is what the bill is designed to do, as I understand. In order to share in this program, they must reduce the number of cattle in their herds. Only if they do so can they be paid 50 cents or a dollar an acre.

It seems to me that this is a very just and equitable bill. I appreciate the sturdy support which the distinguished Senator from Florida has given it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If I correctly understand, the bill provides \$30 million for the next 2 years. However, it is a 5-year bill. Would it be fair to say that it is a \$75 million bill, rather than a \$30 million bill?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not think that is fair, because that would mean that we must reach the conclusion that the drought will not be ameliorated. I do not know, and no one knows, whether or not it will be ameliorated. There is some indication that it may have been broken already in a very important part of the drought belt. We all hope that such is the case. No one knows.

There is no guaranty that the program will be completed in 5 years, because no one can foresee that. Instead of having an open-end bill, with no time of termination, and no assurance that subsequent Congresses would have an opportunity to study the reauthorizing legislation, we felt that a time limit should be imposed.

The original bill contained a minimum of 3 years, without any time limit. Upon very careful study and consideration, and after conferences with those in the Department who, we felt, knew most about the subject, the committee decided that it would be sounder to establish a limit of 5 years, rather than to have a minimum of 3 years, or to have a maximum of 3 years and a maximum of 5 years, because that would tend to indicate that we were committing everyone to a 3-year program, whereas the wording of the amended bill makes it clear that we recognize that there are differences between properties. Some of them have to be handled on a limited-use basis and others on a complete deferred-use basis. Still others, we hope, will be back to verdant green in much less than the 3 years' minimum prescribed in the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Oklahoma made reference to the fact that the bill would be applicable only to those farmers who were reducing their herd. Where in the bill is there a provision which requires a farmer to reduce his basic herd?

Mr. HOLLAND. There is no such provision. Of course, when the farmer defers grazing and takes his cattle off the range, he must either dispose of them or find some other source of feed for them.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This is just another subsidy. There is nothing in the bill which would in any way require a reduction of the herd in order to participate in the program. Am I not correct in that statement?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. The opposite side is that most people in this area have long ago reduced their herds anyway because of the feed situation. Instead of having an overpopulation of livestock in the area, I understand that the population is now very greatly reduced and, in many cases there is no basic herd left. Farmers who take their cattle off the range under the bill will, of course, have to dispose of them or find other feed.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida for calling attention to what is a problem of national significance, as the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, in relating history, emphasized with respect to his own State, which was a part of the Dust Bowl 25 years ago. I refer to a condition that existed not only in Oklahoma and Colorado, but extended through 10 States. A great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, in 1937, 20 years ago, recommended that Congress begin to take steps to treat this serious problem with a long-range plan and program. President Roosevelt recommended establishment of a territorial agency through which a Great Plains program could be developed.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] has asked about the provisions of an appropriation bill passed a few years ago. It is true that some of it dealt with feed, and it is also true that some millions of dollars dealt with listing of the soil, both of which are programs that were recommended 25 years ago. We are

dealing today with a measure of national importance. As the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma said, the soil of the West was blowing clear into the desks of Senators in Washington. That was said 20 years ago.

President Eisenhower made a tour of the critical area only a few weeks ago. Why? Because it was of national importance. Today we are dealing with stopgap, piecemeal legislation, just as we did a few weeks ago. I say to the distinguished Senator from Ohio—and I see also on the floor the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]—that I have a bill, which is now in process of preparation, which will attempt to put into effect some long-range recommendations made 20 years ago. But today we are doing our best with stopgap measures to deal with the economic problems of the 10 States involved. Later we will have before Congress measures which will deal with the problem in broader and more proper perspective. In the meantime the Senator from Florida certainly has given us a very intelligent and penetrating analysis of what we are faced with today.

In my own State, as I tried to explain a short time ago, there are 36 counties in eastern Colorado which come under the provisions of Public Law 875. We have now asked for the inclusion of 10 more counties because of the recent 3 blizzards. The people in those countries do not want to be foreclosed. They are saying, "You are spending money all over the world. We do not want gifts of money. Just do not foreclose us."

I have not studied the proposed legislation as carefully as the Senator from Florida has studied it. But I believe that it will give the people of my State to whom the elements have not been kind an opportunity to get their feet under them again.

I should like to make one further observation. Twenty-five years ago some of the area affected by this measure was a devastated area. Then the rains came. Do the Senators know what happened? The area became a great revenue producer for the United States Treasury. As the Senator from Oklahoma has said, people who live in this area are hardy and tough. They are of pioneering stock. They were born to the area. Sometimes I wonder why they stay there. But they do stay there. As the rains come, the land once again becomes a great revenue producer. In one county alone, which produced broom corn, the people paid thousands and thousands of dollars into the Treasury and today there is hardly anything left there. Today most of the cattle in that county have been destroyed.

A continuing and long-range program is needed for the hardy people of this vast and vital area. What we are doing today is providing temporary aid, and this is necessary legislation. But our next step must be a program to develop the economic health of the area in all periods, under all conditions, whether drought or rain.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Colorado has referred to the point about which I have great fear. He has described a new, special condition, which probably will need new and special help. My fear has been that a precedent will be established by the bill we are considering today. It will aid the grazer in Colorado. Colorado now has a special condition. If I voted for the bill under consideration, I would feel obliged to vote for a bill which the Senator from Colorado will ask to be passed to cope with his problem. I very deferentially say to the Senator from Florida that if I voted for the bill now pending before the Senate, when the next disaster comes—and God forbid that it should come—I would feel obliged to vote for special aid for special damages caused by new special conditions.

I predict the time will come when officials from Florida will be asking for special aid to reimburse the State for damages caused by a tornado or a hurricane.

Mr. HOLLAND. I would say, of course, that Florida is a part of the Union. Whenever we sustain damage or a disaster so great as to sweep us off our feet, we expect the generous people in the rest of the Union to recognize that fact. I am trying to recognize that fact now for areas in the western part of our country. That is not a new idea. We have had disaster relief legislation for some time. I recall some tremendous disasters which occurred on the Columbia River and in other sections of our country. In each case a generous Congress acted to provide some relief. A generous Congress acted very quickly, I may say, to give what relief could be provided. I may say, too, that any relief that can be given is always partial relief, because the area that is hit by disaster sustains most of the loss and damage and grief.

Later a great storm hit New England. I believe two great storms hit the New England area. Again, a generous Congress gave relief. That legislation was not passed under the leadership of New England legislators. It was passed because we realized that relief must be given to people who have been swept away from their moorings.

However, I do not believe that there has ever been any type of disaster which in its long duration and in its impact, becoming first bad, and then worse, and then finally running almost to the ultimate, can be compared with this drought. Three years ago, as a member of a subcommittee, I visited the States of Kansas and Missouri and Arkansas and Texas. At that time the drought conditions were already very severe.

Once before on the floor of the Senate I referred to the time when the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] and I tried to sleep in a certain north Arkansas community but were prevented from sleeping all through the night by the complaining of the cattle. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYEL] rose and supplied me with a better word. He said it was the bawling of the cattle. So I use that word now.

So there have been disasters. In a country so large as ours, we shall con-

tinue to have disasters from time to time, but not every little disaster will call for Congressional action or recognition; the people can handle the small disasters themselves.

When Florida lost \$59 million in 1947 from a flood, we did not come to Congress and ask for restoration. Neither would the people of the great State of Ohio, who have had similar situations which have unfortunately arisen occasionally from floods on the Ohio River. That is not a hardship which Congress is asked to take care of.

But this is a devastation which has resulted from years of drought which have just about destroyed the productive capacity of a great area of the Nation. If Congress should sit idly by and do nothing about it, I think Congress would be much more heartless than it has been in the past when it was confronted with disasters in other parts of the country.

Mr. President, I have but a few more paragraphs in my statement. I shall read them rapidly. I apologize to the Senate for speaking at such great length. I had not intended to be on my feet so long when I started, but Senators have been generous in their comments. A statement which originally comprised but four and one-half pages has grown tremendously.

The Department of Agriculture estimates that the program provided for by the committee amendment will cost about \$30 million for the next 2 years. The committee changes, which provide for limited use as well as nonuse, payment rates based on the value of the use withheld rather than on average rental values, and many of the safeguards which I have discussed have reduced the cost of the program considerably from that which would be required by the bill as introduced. The revised bill should assure that full value in conservation should be obtained in return for the money spent on the program.

The committee amendment omits section 5 of the bill as introduced.

I call this especially to the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], who may have been temporarily misled by not knowing that that had been done.

Section 5 would have provided for the inclusion of protein feeds in the feed relief program carried out under section 2 (d) of Public Law 38, 81st Congress. The House struck an identical provision out of H. R. 2367 and we are advised that the House Committee on Agriculture intends to hold hearings on the matter covered by this section. We do not feel that the deferred grazing program, which is urgently needed, should be held up until these hearings can be held. Therefore the committee recommended that this section be omitted from the bill. It has been omitted in the committee substitute.

H. R. 2367, which covers the same subject as the pending bill, was passed by the House on February 6 and is now before the Senate Committee on Agriculture. When the Senate has concluded its consideration of S. 511 it is my intention to move to discharge the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry from further consideration of H. R. 2367

and proceed to its consideration. I shall then move to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the Senate-approved language of S. 511. Thereafter, I shall move to postpone indefinitely S. 511.

I hope the Senate may take speedy action on the committee amendment to S. 511.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we are considering today a bill of extreme urgency. It is a measure intended to bring relief not only to drought-stricken farmers and ranchers but to precious soil assets which must be conserved for future generations.

The direct impact of this measure would be felt primarily in the great Southwest. That is the area which has born the brunt of the dry, parching years. But the beneficial effects of the bill will be felt by the whole Nation and by generations yet to come.

In simple terms, the bill would provide payments for deferred grazing at rates equal to the fair rental value of the land. The payments would apply only to non-federally owned land and to native range land.

There is a very practical basis for this measure. We are faced with the choice of either keeping the cattle, the sheep, and other stock off this land or losing for many decades to come soil resources which will be badly needed as our population continues to increase.

The farmers and ranchers cannot afford to take the stock off the land without some help. Drought is not only a physical disaster—it is an economic disaster which saps the financial lifeblood of every community.

If the stock remains on the land, the surface soil will be trampled and ground into a fine powder. It will blow away with the slightest breeze. Soon the land will become barren and sterile—fit for nothing except melancholy lectures on how we lacked wisdom.

It may be considered a paradox by those who live outside the drought area, but it is a fact, that the recent rains and snows have made the need for deferred grazing even more acute. The rains green up the ranges slightly and there is greater temptation to graze.

Such grazing is premature. It tends only to accelerate the rapid progress to complete disaster. The soil needs months—in some cases even years—of rest and gradual accumulation of water.

This situation is important not just to the people of the area, but to taxpayers and citizens throughout the Nation. The

drought has brought difficulties to people as far removed from the Southwest as New York City, or Duluth, Minn.

According to the Wall Street Journal, recent increases in shrimp prices can be blamed in part on the reduced flow of fresh water into the Gulf of Mexico. The shellfish prefer less salty water in which to mature.

Drought-caused shortages have helped increase the price of some lawn grass seeds by as much as 20 percent. The whole farm-implement industry has suffered setbacks because farmers and ranchers cannot buy needed equipment.

And unless the soil is restored, we will—in the foreseeable future—face serious shortages of food and fiber.

People who have rambled for generations cannot pull up their roots overnight and move to other parts of the country. They cannot readily be absorbed into other parts of our economy.

But they are heavily saddled with debt already. Even if the rains continue, many of them will be keeping their books in red ink for the next several years.

Mr. President, there are ample safeguards against abuse in this bill. Payments to any one person would be limited to \$5,000 for land in any one county or land operated as a single unit.

There would be no payment if the shift of the stock resulted in overgrazing in nondeferred areas. Permits under the Taylor Grazing Act would be protected.

In reporting the bill, the committee struck out the section relating to high-protein feed. I consider this section of major importance, but I can understand the reasons for this action.

It was done to conform to the House, which wishes to hold further hearings on the subject.

The costs of this measure are low considering the benefits that would be returned to our Nation. The Agriculture Department estimates \$30 million for the next 2 years.

This is admittedly a temporary measure. It is intended to meet an emergency situation—but it is an emergency which could lead to untold suffering for our people.

Mr. President, on last Friday, April 5, the Wall Street Journal carried an excellent summary of the drought situation. It was written by James C. Tanner. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Tanner's article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal of April 5, 1957]

DROUGHT DOUBT—DRENCHING RAINS AIM SOUTHWEST, BUT WORST MAY BE YET TO COME—SOME FARMERS SHOP FOR NEW PLOWS BUT OTHERS FIGURE THEY NEED YEARS OF RAIN—MR. DEEDS BANKS ON A BANK

(By James C. Tanner)

PRITCHETT, COLO.—Drenching rain and swirling snow have brought some relief and a little hope to the drought-stricken Southwest. But unless the rains continue, farmers, cattlemen, and bankers fear the worst may be yet to come.

Recent storms over broad sections of the Great Plains, including parts of Texas, Oklahoma, Colorado, and Kansas, have cheered

many farm folk. In areas outside of the new Dust Bowl green grass and sprouting crops hint of ample harvests in the months ahead.

But in the heart of the drought area—stretching from lower west Texas to northern Colorado—the picture still is grim. The blizzards and rains have not provided the deep, prolonged soaking which farm experts say the soil needs over a period of months or even years.

Most farmers, farm experts, economists, and scientists across the drought belt share this view: Although the drought has been eased in some sections, its full, long-term effects are yet to be felt. So they're pushing irrigation, pondering pipelines, and studying ways to cut evaporation of water.

START OF THE SUFFERING

Should the drought continue, says Dr. A. B. Wooten, an economist at Texas A. & M. College, "suffering is just beginning." He believes that in such a case some farm families will be needing "direct relief" including groceries, clothing, and medical care.

What's in store for this area is important not only to the people who live here but also to taxpayers across the country who must pay the costs of Federal aid. Obviously affected too, are farm implement and auto makers.

The impact spreads to the Nation's consumers. Some small samples: Drought-caused shortages have helped boost the price of some lawn grass seed by 20 percent. And higher shrimp prices, resulting from shortened supplies, are blamed in part on the reduced flow of fresh water into the Gulf of Mexico. The shellfish prefer less salty water in which to mature.

Even if the increase in rainfall continues, chances are farmers and ranchers will be saddled with debt for the next 5 to 10 years, economists say.

DEATH AND DAMAGE

In some parched sections, the storms have hurt more than they have helped. They have whipped off topsoil and thin covers of grass, causing further damage to the land. Floyd Reed, Department of Agriculture statistician at Denver, estimates about half of the 2 million acres of winter wheat planted in Colorado will be abandoned. And reports from New Mexico indicate the recent blizzards left 10,000 cattle dead in 2 counties alone. State police and highway crews are pitching in to help ranchers remove and bury the dead animals, which are posing a pollution threat.

"Eastern Colorado is in worse shape by far than last year," grieves Colorado rancher Paul W. Swisher, State commissioner of agriculture. He believes 3 or 4 years of above-average precipitation is necessary to restore this year's normal agricultural life.

Here in the heart of the section of which Mr. Swisher speaks, Earl Deeds, a Pritchett farmer-rancher, says that unless the Federal Government steps in with long-term loans, more and more of his neighbors will be heading for city jobs. Buffeted by years of scarce rainfall and more recently by cattle-killing blizzards, many farm folk can't hold on much longer, he says.

LOOKING TO WASHINGTON

Farmer Deeds, a spry 68, figures it would require at least 2 to 3 years of plentiful rainfall for his land and equipment to recover. Meanwhile, he's relying on the soil bank—"a man can live off the soil bank even without a crop but he can't pay off a loan every year"—and looking to Washington for help in the form of long-term credit.

When he gets the rainfall he needs, Mr. Deeds plans to raise oats, barley, and wheat again on acreage now idled by the soil bank. He also will rebuild his purebred Hereford herd, diminished by the dry spell to some 80 head, about one-third its former size. His

herd was reduced even further by the recent blizzards; he lost 8 animals, but some of his neighbors lost 100.

"But I'm not going to leave this land," vows Mr. Deeds, "I still think it's the best in the country."

Farm experts readily agree that the land is good—but they'll argue about what it's good for. Many soil scientists claim some 14 million acres of cultivated land in the drought sector should be turned to grass and used for grazing, with little attempt made to grow crops on it. Much is marginal land, they note, averaging less than 20 inches of rainfall annually even in normal years. Such is hardly sufficient for successful crop cultivation, they insist.

In the new Dust Bowl, an area larger than all of Connecticut, Delaware, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, and Rhode Island, winds this spring are kicking up dust from over 30 million acres of dried-out topsoil. The new Dust Bowl blankets that of two decades ago and spills over in all directions.

Soil conservationists warn that next year the damaged acreage will be even greater unless enough slow rainfall soaks the sun-baked earth.

"The ground in parts of Colorado is in such condition that it won't take water," notes a Denver soil conservationist glumly. "It will take 4 years of above average rainfall to bring this land back."

At Dallas, a bank economist declares: "We've mined out all the productive features of much of the soil. We'll have to allow a cooling-off period for a substantial portion, put it in grasses and leave it there for perhaps 5 years."

Agricultural officials report farmers are showing an increased awareness of the long-range problems presented by rainfall cycles, and a willingness to plan their operations accordingly. All through the southern half of the Great Plains more farmers are emphasizing diversification—in livestock as well as crops—and are pushing irrigation programs. They're building terraces, small ponds and dams so that rain, when and if it comes, can be trapped and held until it soaks into the thirsty soil.

FUTTING ON A CARPET

In south Texas, extensive root plowing is converting barren ground to grass-covered rangeland. Big tractors shave over brush and trees while knifing the earth. Seeder boxes on the back of each vehicle plant grass during the operation. The idea is threefold: To pit the ground so that it will hold the few drops of rain that fall, to rid the land of water-hungry trees, and to cover the earth with a carpet of grass.

In this section of the plains, farmers and ranchers are drawing their water from far under the ground through elaborate systems of pumps and piping. But some hydrologists warn that such underground reservoirs, stored up over the centuries, will be exhausted within a few years if current heavy use continues.

On a more grandiose scale, Government planners are mulling schemes to construct vast canals and reservoirs in drought-parched regions of the Southwest. Leading Texans, for example, are weighing a proposed \$1 billion, 450-mile long canal running from the gulf coast through southern portions of the State. It would irrigate nearly a million acres.

Already underway is a 23-mile, \$40 million tunnel under the Rocky Mountains. To be ready by 1962, the project will divert water from the western slope of the Rockies to the Denver area on the east side.

WATER PIPELINE NETWORKS

"We can foresee the day when there will be networks of water pipelines criss-crossing this country in much the fashion that petroleum lines do today," says Interior Secretary

Fred A. Seaton. Furthermore, he says, atomic power may provide the energy to pump water over long distances and to desalinate water already available in briny form.

Steps also are being taken to control evaporation, which costs Texans almost as much water as they use—eight million acre-feet a year.

At Southwest Research Institute, San Antonio, scientists are applying a chemical film to small ponds, cutting evaporation in half. A waxy substance—hexadecanol—spreads a thin film over the surface. Water which otherwise would be evaporated by the sun can be saved at an estimated cost of half a cent per thousand gallons, researchers claim.

Urban folk are as interested in these potential projects as their rural cousins. For the 8-year-old drought has been rubbing much of the bloom off what had been the Southwest's booming economy. "Texas was getting the big play on industrial expansion," says Dr. Harold Vagtborg, president of Southwest Research Institute. Now Louisiana is getting it.

Dr. Vagtborg frankly admits he'd like to see water diverted to industrial uses. "It takes as much water to support 1 farmer as 60 industrial workers." He claims, "If the industries are going to pull out because of lack of water let's look at the relationship of 60 to 1 and see what we come up with."

"Normal rainfall won't take care of our needs, particularly as we attract more industry," says Dr. Arthur Smith, vice president and economist at Dallas' First National Bank. The only thing for us to do is to go outside our borders for water.

The drought-spurred influx of farmers to metropolitan areas has only underscored the cities' own water shortages. Colorado agricultural commissioner Swisher, for instance, says his State is losing farm units at the rate of 1,000 or more a year.

"Over the short-run period the cities will be able to absorb this influx of farm people," asserts Dr. Philip Coldwell, Federal Reserve bank economist. "But whether this is true over a long period depends on whether the water problem is licked."

Most certainly, urban opportunities will continue in the drought belt despite water problems. Military payrolls, defense plants, and petroleum continue to pump dollars into city economies. In fact, many towns in areas of the Southwest where the drought's impact has not been too severe report steadily mounting economic activity.

In the fertile blackland belt of central Texas, for instance, many farmers figure they'll come up with normal crops this year because of early spring rains. And in the lower Rio Grande Valley, farmers have been withdrawing cotton acreage previously committed to the soil bank.

WINDOW SHOPPING FARMERS

In some areas now emerging from the drought, merchants report farmers are window shopping for replacements for 10-year-old tractors and rusted plows.

"The situation is getting to look pretty rosy," enthuses K. L. Blood, Oklahoma City department of agriculture statistician.

Another sign of hope in parts of the Southwest: Many cattlemen, encouraged by recent rainfall and favorable forecasts by some weather experts, are pressing reluctant bankers for loans to restock depleted herds.

But the bankers are holding off to see if more rain is in sight. For instance, at Kerrville, Texas, where five inches of rain last month turned pastures green, banker A. J. Lochte says he won't be granting loans for restocking until new grass is strong enough to be grazed. "We've had quite an increase in requests for loans from smaller stockmen," says Mr. Lochte. "But the larger ranchers still are waiting until they're more certain."

At San Angelo, C. R. Hallmark, president of the First National Bank, also is being cautious about granting agricultural loans de-

spite a recent light rain. "This drought isn't over yet," says Mr. Hallmark.

There are some, of course, who question whether the Great Plains cattle business—subject of much colorful prose and poetry—will ever again be a sizable factor in the Nation's livestock industry. The Nation's cattle population has shown a tendency in recent years to move eastward, and some Western cattlemen have moved with their herds.

"It's getting tougher all along to raise cattle in the old cowboy country," avers Dr. Smith, Dallas banker.

Western cattlemen will argue this point. "Good weather conditions will stabilize our herds," says a rancher at Truth or Consequences, N. Mex.

Despite a big increase in cattle production in Southeastern areas, the number of beef animals in the United States took a downturn this year. Continued drought likely will cause further reduction. If the drought country should have substantial rain this year or next, demand for replacement breeding animals probably will spur a new increase in total cattle population.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from the further consideration of H. R. 2367, and this I do with the consent of the chairman of the committee. If permission is granted, I shall then move that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is discharged from the further consideration of House bill 2367. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2367) to establish a deferred grazing program as part of the relief available to drought-stricken areas under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 2367?

Mr. HOLLAND. I so move.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to amend by striking out all after the enacting clause of H. R. 2367 and inserting in lieu thereof the text of Senate bill 511, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

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

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as a member of the committee and as a Senator representing in part one of the States which is interested in programs of this particular kind, I wish to say that I supported this measure in the committee, and I feel that the amendments which were made by the Senate committee have strengthened the bill and certainly tend to justify unanimous support of the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Morton in the chair). The Senator from Ohio will state it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has recognized the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I am ready to have the Senate vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H. R. 2367) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in connection with any major disaster due to drought determined by the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, as amended, the President is authorized and directed as part of the assistance provided pursuant to such Act to formulate and carry out, through the facilities of the Department of Agriculture, a deferred grazing program, which shall include nonuse or limited use, or any needed combination thereof, in any county affected by such disaster in which the Secretary of Agriculture determines grazing of native rangeland is a substantial factor in agricultural production, and finds that limited or deferred grazing is necessary and appropriate for the reestablishment or conservation of grass for grazing. Such program shall be applicable only to nonfederally owned land which is normally used for grazing. Within 30 days (1) after the date of enactment of this act, or (2) after any subsequent designation of any such area as a disaster area by the President, the Secretary shall designate the counties in any such area in which this program shall be available, and the program shall remain available in each such county for a period of not more than 5 years after the date of enactment of this act.

Sec. 2. The program shall provide for payment for deferred grazing to farmers and ranchers at rates equal to the fair rental value of the land for the grazing use withheld under the program, as determined by the Secretary on the basis of the normal grazing capacity of the land during periods of adequate precipitation. No payment shall be made under the program if it is determined that a shift of livestock from the deferred areas to other land results in overgrazing nondeferred areas. Payment to any person for deferred grazing on land in any one county or land in more than one county operated as a single unit shall not exceed \$5,000 for any 1 year.

Sec. 3. The program authorized herein may include such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically provided for herein, as are determined desirable to effectuate its purposes and to facilitate practical administration. The program authorized herein for any county shall be supplemental to the agricultural conservation program, and not in substitution of, other programs in such county authorized by any other law, except that no payment shall be made concurrently on the same land for deferred grazing under this and any other program.

Sec. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to other funds authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of Public Law 875, 81st Congress, such funds as are necessary to carry out the program authorized herein.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 511 is indefinitely postponed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which House bill 2367 was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table.

To motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SEVEN CORN BASE ACREAGE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 194, Senate bill 1771.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1771) to provide for a 1957 corn-base acreage of 51 million acres, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to announce that we do not contemplate any yea-and-nay votes this evening, or any further business this evening, other than statements to the Senate and statements for the RECORD.

PREMIER SHOWING OF THE MOTION PICTURE, WONDERS OF WASHINGTON

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that on Friday, April 19, at the Trans-Lux Theater, in Washington, D. C., there will be the premier public showing of a great documentary motion picture entitled "Wonders of Washington."

A number of weeks ago I had the privilege of seeing a preview of this motion picture; and I think that by all odds it is the greatest inspirational motion picture ever made of the National Capital, its environs, and its activities. I do not pose as an expert in the field of the cinema; but in support of that opinion of mine, I should like to read several paragraphs from a letter written by Mr. Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association of America. In his letter he states that:

A good many efforts have been made over the years to capture Washington * * * the Capital City * * * on film.

It has always proved a hard and elusive subject, for Washington is not just Government, or marble buildings, or the White House, or the Congress. It is all these things, to be sure, but there is another quality, an intangible quality, a thing of the heart and the spirit and the imagination. When this quality is missing the Washington story cannot be complete.

Now, at last, you of Columbia have hit the bull's-eye right in the middle * * * with Wonders of Washington.

Mr. President, I think all of us who are so much a part of Government at the National Capital will enjoy seeing this unusually fine piece of photography and this great rendition of the activities in Washington, D. C.

INDICTMENTS AND CONVICTIONS OF EMPLOYEES AND FORMER EMPLOYEES OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE, 1949 THROUGH 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, today I wish to incorporate in the body of the RECORD a report giving an itemized breakdown of the indictments and convictions of the employees and former employees of the Internal Revenue Service during the fiscal years 1949 through 1956.

This report is broken down both as to years and as to major offenses for which each was indicted, and shows that during this period 169 have been indicted for causes ranging from embezzlement, theft, bribery, extortion, et cetera, and of that number 125 have been convicted.

I ask unanimous consent to have the report incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

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

Employees or former employees of Internal Revenue Service indicted or convicted during fiscal years 1949 through 1956

Major offense for which indicted	1949		1950		1951		1952		1953		1954		1955		1956		Total	
	In-dict-ed	Con-vict-ed																
Embezzlement and theft	6	6	5	4	8	9	11	10	6	5	9	7	10	10	5	6	60	57
Bribery and graft	3	1	10	9	2	1	4	2	4	3	3	3	5	3	4	3	35	25
Conspiracy			1		1	1	6	1	8	5	4	5	1	4	2	25	12	
Extortion and threats	1		1	1	1	1	2		3	1	3	1	2		11	6		
Fraud and false statements					1	4	3	8	3	1	1	1	7	5	3	2	24	15
Tax evasion						1			1		1		1		2		2	2
Perjury									1	1			1	1		5		3
Claims and services in matters affecting Government							3	1		1						3		2
Postal violations													1	1		1	1	
Forgery														1	1	1	1	
Narcotics violations														1	1	1	1	
Total	10	7	17	14	13	13	31	17	31	20	14	19	30	21	22	14	168	125
Indictment dismissed									1			3	2		4		11	
Acquitted					2		1		3		2		3		5		19	
Pending trial:																	1	
July 1, 1948																		14
June 30, 1956																		
Total																	169	169

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until tomorrow, at 12 o'clock noon.

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

EFFECT OF GOVERNMENTAL SPENDING AND TAXATION ON PRESERVATION OF OUR BASIC INSTITUTIONS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, this intrusion upon the time and pa-

tience of the Senate is made with the greatest personal reluctance. Not only do I regret the nature of the subject which I propose to discuss, but also I hesitate to distract this body from its considerations of the pending business.

Yet, there is nothing of greater concern to all Americans than the preservation of their basic institutions in a sound and free economic climate; and without assurance of this protection, all our other labors are in vain. Indeed, it is my most sincere conviction that the whole future course of American liberty resides in our ultimate decision with respect to the matter of governmental spending and taxation; and it is our decision, and no one else's as we seek to fulfill the confidence of the 170 million

citizens of this country whom we have been elected to serve.

Let there be no misunderstanding, either, as to the political implications of my remarks. There are none. Just as I campaigned against waste, extravagance, high taxes, unbalanced budgets, and deficit spending in the recent Democratic administrations, so shall I also, if necessary, wage a battle of conscience and conviction against the same elements of fiscal irresponsibility in this Republican administration. In America we have no double standard of governmental soundness. What is bad under the leadership of one party cannot possibly be good under the leadership of the other.

It is, of course, with the deepest sorrow that I must pass such a judgment upon my own party. In most matters, the Republican record of the past 5 years has been exemplary. With little exception, we have remained true to the promises and pledges made in 1952. Until quite recently, I was personally satisfied that this administration was providing the responsible and realistic leadership so vital to the maintenance of a strong domestic economy which, in turn, is a vital factor in maintaining world peace.

Now, however, I am not so sure. A \$71.8 billion budget not only shocks me, but it weakens my faith in the constant assurances we have received from this administration that its aim was to cut spending, balance the budget, reduce the national debt, cut taxes—in short, to live within our means and allow our citizens the maximum personal benefits from their economic endeavors.

Mr. President, the Republican Party is pledged by principle to strengthen the basic economy of this Nation by the achievement of these aims. To do otherwise constitutes a betrayal of the people's trust. Yet, here we have this abominably high budget request which is the epitome of inconsistency, when compared with statements made by me, by many of my colleagues in both Houses of the Congress, and by the President in 1952.

No faithful public servant, whether by personal philosophy or through fear of voter retaliation, would dare to subscribe to such a breach of confidence. I for one, have always feared these political spending sprees because I have never believed that our people were fundamentally receptive to the idea of government by bribe. It is true that after 20 years of New Deal-Fair Deal experiments in socialism, Americans have been considerably softened to the doctrine of Federal paternalism but whatever degree of slavish economic indigence has resulted should be treated with lessons in free enterprise and States rights, not, as the President recently suggested in a speech here in Washington, by educating the people "in the simplest functions of Government that are misunderstood" and inspiring them to accept Federal moneys for projects which they ought to be paying for themselves, directly through their State and local governments.

Indeed, Mr. President, the functions of Government are misunderstood. They are thought by many to constitute Federal benevolence from the cradle to the grave; they are projected by the pseudo-liberalists in this country in such quantity and to such a degree as to make a mockery of the immutable precepts of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence.

Surely, our people do need to be inspired—inspired in the way of helping themselves, unimpeded by Government encroachments upon their liberties, and inspired in the conviction that the Federal Government gives to the people nothing which it does not first take from them. It is not the business of government to encourage people to become

either lazy or extravagant. It is the business of government to respect their rights and to spend their tax dollars wisely, and only on those projects which have public support because they cannot be accomplished otherwise at the State or local level.

What is needed, at the present moment, Mr. President, is a continuation of the type of leadership that our President and his administration displayed when, on taking office in 1953, they went to work on a similarly high budget, and reduced it to workable limits. What is needed, Mr. President, is a continuation of the type of leadership displayed by the President and the administration through the ensuing years that have given us one tax reduction and a balanced budget. What is needed, Mr. President, at the present time, is a continuation of the type of leadership displayed up until the present budget by the President and the administration in their efforts to return this country to fiscal soundness.

Mr. President, I have been receiving voluminous amount of mail on this subject in recent weeks. In this, I feel certain I am not alone. Several of my colleagues and I have discussed this issue, and the public reaction to the proposed budget. Our people are outraged, as well they should be. Actually, it has taken them too long to wake up to the evils in this tide of "spend and spend, tax and tax." But a \$71.8 billion budget ought to wake the dead, and I am only hopeful that this deluge of public indignation has not come too late.

Of one thing I am certain: If this budget is not cut as intelligently and drastically as any budget has ever been cut, there will be a lot of people on both sides of the aisle in this Congress who will not be here 2 years from now. Maybe I will be among the missing. If so, it will decidedly not be because I sat here in this body and cast my vote against the taxpayer of this Nation by appropriating billions of dollars for projects designed to ingratiate the Republican Party to this country and to the world. I am not so partisan that I cannot see beyond the end of my nose to that inevitable point in imminent history when the United States can spend itself out of existence as a free and sovereign nation. Nor will I ever stand accused, by the people of Arizona or anyone else, of failing to exert every energy at my command toward the reduction of unneeded Federal expenditures so that this budget can be cut and brought into balance—so that, ultimately, the people of this country can again have the opportunity to build their own lives with the products of their own labors, unhampered by excessive taxes in the name of projects with which they are not now and never have been in accord.

No, Mr. President, if the junior Senator from Arizona is not a Member of the 86th Congress, it will not be because he has broken faith with either the American people or the principles of the Republican Party in this almost frenzied rush to give away the resources and freedoms of America, whether in Federal spending programs at home or economic aid efforts abroad.

Since I have had the privilege of serving in the Senate, I have warned on repeated occasions that we must call a halt to the incessant demands upon the Federal Government for financial assistance merely because, during the era of the New Deal, the American people and the people of the world learned the awful truth that Uncle Sam is a sucker.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator recall the highest peacetime budget during the New Deal, about which he is speaking?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I cannot recall the exact amount.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In fiscal 1940, the highest spending budget in a peacetime year under President Roosevelt—and I emphasize "peacetime"—was \$9 billion.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thought the Senator may have been alluding to domestic spending.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. And the Federal employees numbered 900,000. The highest spending budget in a peacetime year, under the so-called Fair Deal of President Truman, was \$39.6 billion in fiscal 1950. We had gone from \$9 billion to \$39.6 billion.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is the Senator sure he is correct in those figures? I think he is a little high.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will say they were accurate as of Saturday.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Does he refer to the domestic budget?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The entire expenditures for this Government for the highest peacetime year under President Roosevelt, amounted to \$9 billion, with 900,000 persons employed in the Federal Government. Under President Truman, the comparable figure was \$39.6 billion, with approximately 2 million Federal employees. The estimated figure for the coming fiscal year under President Eisenhower, is \$71.8 billion with 2,400,000 Federal employees. Those are the three high peacetime budgets.

They take in the highest peacetime years of the New Deal Roosevelt administration, of the Truman administration, and of the so-called great crusade.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thought the Senator from Texas was alluding to the domestic budget alone when I questioned what he said, because, if my memory serves me correctly, the highest domestic budget was in 1951 or 1952, and I believe it was around seventeen or nineteen billion dollars.

I might say, for the edification of my friend from Texas, I believe it is in the neighborhood of thirty or thirty-one billion dollars this year.

I continue with my statement. As recently as February 27 of this year, I cautioned as follows:

As recently as February 27 of this year, I cautioned as follows:

How long can we in Washington bask in the shade of the money tree, thinking that somewhere in its branches there grow dollar bills which we are going to use to finance the rest of the world in this international welfare state in which we find ourselves? We cannot support the rest of the world.

We admit we cannot take care of our own domestic problems and necessities.

Now, many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, all well-intentioned men I know, have occasionally referred to my consistent opposition to appropriations for foreign economic aid in the hope that I might be persuaded to share their respect for this approach to peace and security. Well, my answer is two-fold: In the first place, as I have already indicated, the American economy cannot stand this drain upon its resources; and if we lose our economic strength, we lose the basic defense against all forms of aggression, military and philosophical.

Secondly—and of more direct concern to my obligations as a Member of this body—I waged my campaign for the Senate in 1952, and was elected, by no little virtue of my opposition to these foreign giveaways during the previous Democrat administration. During that campaign, I said:

In addition to the billions being spent to prepare our own Military Establishment, we have undertaken to underwrite the rearming of Western Europe. Despite the staggering amounts of money committed to this project, it is almost impossible to get any definite information regarding the total objective or the total cost.

I ask, Mr. President, are we really any better informed today? Yet, our policies with respect to financial commitments abroad remain substantially unchanged.

Continuing with my remarks of 1952, I added:

You can't buy friends or loyalty * * * men don't fight for money * * * they fight for ideals. And we have done such a poor job in exploiting the ideal of freedom that we find men all over the world choosing slavery instead.

Now, I should like my colleagues to consider just how attractive we do make this ideal of freedom today with a \$71.8 billion budget, increased centralization of Government activity through excessive Federal spending, and the promise of even greater tax burdens if this trend continues unabated. Oh, yes, of course, here in the United States we are free. But how long is that freedom going to last? Where is the finely drawn line between freedom and slavery when, under the present deficit, every baby born in this country has a \$1,675 first-mortgage tag hanging around its neck?

In making these observations, I do not intend to convey the impression of a wholesale condemnation of our Government's efforts in foreign affairs. For instance, I have repeatedly urged that those of us here who are opposed to foreign economic aid as such should be allowed to differentiate in our vote between that and other portions of measures presented to us which we feel might have merit. I have suggested to the White House on numerous occasions that when appropriations for mutual security come before us we should have an opportunity to vote separately on economic aid, on military aid, and on technical assistance. If that were the case, I would be voting for some military aid and technical assistance, but never for economic aid. To date, this suggestion has gone unheeded. I reiterate it today as just

one solution to the problem of providing a sound system of defense through foreign affairs, while, at the same time, opening up an area for drastic budget reductions.

I realize, of course, that the administration is committed to the doctrine of foreign aid. I respect its right to this viewpoint, but I do not condone its persistent indulgence of such a proven extravagance in the face of the present compelling necessity to curb Government spending all along the line.

Now, I shall not presume so greatly upon the time of the Senate as to enumerate the multitude of other items which could be removed from this budget without impairing in any respect our national security or our domestic needs. The Senators know well where these cuts can and should come. If only we can muster the courage necessary to say to the country—as, I might add, many in the country have said themselves—

We are calling a halt. Some things that we want will have to wait. Other things that can be done locally, by the States and the citizens themselves, will have to be done there, or not at all.

Actually, it is a tragic commentary upon the sensibilities of this body and of the administration that anyone should be compelled to speak harsh words in connection with the fiscal responsibilities of this Government, or that the quality of courage should be apparently so difficult to achieve in these days which demand the fullness of our national strength and character.

It is equally disillusioning to see the Republican Party plunging headlong into the same dismal state experienced by the traditional Democrat principles of Jefferson and Jackson during the days of the New Deal and the Fair Deal. As a result of those economic and political misadventures, that once great party has now lost its soul of freedom; its spokesmen today are peddlers of the philosophy that the Constitution is outmoded, that States rights are void, and that the only hope for the future of these United States is for our people to be federally born, federally housed, federally clothed, federally educated, federally supported in their occupations, and to die a Federal death, thereafter to be buried in a Federal box in a Federal cemetery.

In the Republican Party, there are also vociferous exponents of this incredible philosophy. It may be, in fact, that they are the "Modern Republicans" about whom there has been so much discussion in recent months. Certainly, the faulty premises of "Modern Republicanism" do not refute this big budget concept. Indeed, it is curious that the administration's departure from its pledges to the American people should occur during what I believe will be the rather brief tenure of this splintered concept of Republican philosophy.

What strange magic, Mr. President, has developed in the halls of the administration since 1932 that has caused administration after administration to abandon the concepts of conservatism, balanced budgets, and lower taxes, after having recognized their desirability, and after having pledged themselves to at-

taining them? Remember the campaign of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, during which he promised reduced Federal spending, economy in Government, and a reduction in taxes. He was elected and, yet, within 1 year, these worthy purposes had been forgotten and we had embarked on the greatest spending spree in the Nation's history. His recurring elections only resulted in greater spending, and the history of President Truman's budgets was only a continuation of the "tax and tax, spend and spend" philosophy.

In 1953, a Republican administration entered these Halls and for 4 years it made valiant efforts toward reducing the budget and attacking the deficit, and actually reduced taxes in 1954. Now, though, this strange and mysterious force seems to have descended upon the Republicans, for something has happened to change the mind of the administration since 1952 when it campaigned across the length and breadth of this land for economy, balanced budgets, curtailment of wastes and extravagance in Government, and an end to deficit spending. What has happened in the past 5 years to require that this Republican administration, instead of following its original campaign pledges, simply parrot the antics of its predecessor against which it labored so loud and lustily in 1952?

My mind has not been changed in these 5 short years. If anything, I am more than ever convinced, as I said during my campaign for the Senate, that—

Big Government, no matter how benevolent, operating from a center of authority, separated by time and distances from the people, always has and always will be reckless with public funds.

And, at that time, the administration agreed with me.

In a speech at Jefferson City, Mo., on September 20, 1952, President Eisenhower said:

We can try, we can institute and pursue programs that will lead much more likely to peace and the absence of Koreas than we have had over the last 7 years. We can reduce our budget. * * * That is what the brains of America can do if we just give them a chance.

Well, Korea is over, thanks to the genius of President Eisenhower. But what do the brains of America have to show for the resultant opportunity? A \$71.8 billion budget.

At Lansing, Mich., on October 1, 1952, the President said:

We believe. * * * that the deficits must be eliminated from our national budget.

And he said on October 4, 1952, at Fargo, N. Dak.:

If you have the kind of government that this crusade is determined to offer you, you will have a government that will examine, with a critical eye, all of these crazy spending programs of the National Government. It will eliminate deficits, as its first step toward bringing down taxes and making your dollar sound.

Still later, on October 20, 1952, at Worcester, Mass., the President said:

Our first task must be to go after waste and extravagance.

And in a statement of campaign pledges from his New York headquarters on November 1, 1952, Mr. Eisenhower said:

I pledge an elimination of waste, inefficiency, and duplication in government. Expenditures and, consequently, taxes are too high. We must take steps that will make a reduction possible. One such step we must take immediately. We can eliminate waste and extravagance in government and give our people a dollar's service for each tax dollar received.

Now, Mr. President, those are the words with which I thoroughly agree. Indeed, during the same campaign I was preaching the same philosophy, when I said, for instance:

Budgets, waste, deficit financing, expanding Government bureaus and Government services, these are the secret weapons, the sugar-coated poisons which will rob us of our freedom and doom our Nation to destruction.

What magic prevailing in the halls of the administration has changed its mind? In a radio talk in 1952, I stated:

The major cause of our difficulty today is the reckless spending of the New Deal bureaucrats and the reckless taxation by those men who have supported the New Deal and its program of continually increasing expenditures.

That statement is as true today as it was 5 years ago. I say this reluctantly because, now, I must say it with respect to a Republican administration. But it still applies because, I repeat, nobody has changed the Goldwater mind.

A news story appearing in the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 4 of this year carried the headline, "Ike Says Budget Pays High Price of Peace." How different a concept from that expressed by the same President Eisenhower who also said at Worcester, Mass., on October 20, 1952:

I do propose, through prudent handling of Government expenditure, through the elimination of the national deficit, through halting inflation, and through eventual lowering of taxes, to preserve for the people of the United States these security gains. I do not believe that these gains should be secretly whittled away by creeping inflation.

Five years ago, frugality was a virtue, earnestly sought. Today, apparently, thrift and a sound domestic economy constitute the principal sacrifice which we must make for peace. I ask my colleagues: Was peace any less desirable in 1952 than it is in 1957? It was not. Indeed, we were, as a nation, more keenly searching after it then in the wake of the Korean holocaust. Why, then, this drastic change in philosophy? Who has changed the administration's mind?

Campaigning for the United States Senate in Arizona in 1952, I stated:

The New Deal politicians tell us that increased taxes are a necessary part of the national-defense program.

Speaking to the 13th Washington Conference of the Advertising Council earlier this month, President Eisenhower, a Republican, said:

Much as we hate taxes, it (world peace) is an objective that overrides our aversion to high taxes.

Who, indeed, and what has changed the administration's mind?

I suggest that we have been so thoroughly saturated with the New Deal doctrine of big, squanderbust government, that, as a party, we Republicans have on more than one occasion shown tendencies to bow to the siren song of socialism and, instead of hurling a challenge against the ravages of the pseudoliberals among us, have accepted their doctrines lock, stock, and barrel, saying only "we can do it better."

Such an attitude, Mr. President, denies the fundamental thesis of our whole scheme of government. It abandons the proven worth of two-party government, wherein the system of checks and balances is further applied to protect the citizens of this country against exaggerated philosophies and actions.

Surely, because there is something better than giveaway government, the Republican Party can flex its muscles without fear or favor in seeking to restore this Nation to the path of its true greatness, the path of private initiative and enterprise, of States rights, and of limited Federal jurisdiction.

To hear a President tell us, as Mr. Eisenhower told the Washington Conference of the Advertising Council recently, that we must educate Americans to the need for Federal aid to domestic school, welfare, and health programs astounds me. Mr. President, what we need, at the moment, is a continuation of the leadership developed during the last 4 years that has been willing to rely upon the inherent spirit of independence which lives within all Americans.

When are we Republicans, and some Democrats, going to start remembering the lessons of history, including the admonitions of Karl Marx and other Communist leaders that the United States could be conquered without firing a shot, simply by undermining and destroying our basic economic institutions? That is what this budget does, Mr. President. It subverts the American economy because it is based on high taxes, the largest deficit in history, and the consequent dissipation of the freedom and initiative and genius of our productive people, upon whom the whole structure of our economic system depends for survival.

This is not a new situation. Every great nation in the world which has fallen has been guilty of the same disposition to economic inebriation and bloated government. I have a magnificently prepared document, of unknown authorship, which clearly and concisely sets forth the chronological pattern of these events which have so corrupted the history of man; and I shall ask that this be inserted in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks in order that my colleagues and others interested may see that there is abundant precedent for the arguments which I am propounding here today. As I said, I do not know the author of this statement. I wish I did. If he reads it and recognizes it, I hope he will come forward and make himself known, for I would like to shake the hand of at least one individual who

has had that rare combination of both foresight and hindsight to consider objectively the recurring nature of governments which, through the devious process of taxation and spending, and in the name of welfare, become the masters, rather than the servants, of the governed.

This article, which is entitled "How Freedom Vanished in the Ancient World by Popular Vote," carries a statement delivered to the Congress by President Martin Van Buren on September 7, 1837, which clearly merits recitation again today.

It is not the Government's legitimate object to make men rich or to repair, by direct grants of money or legislation, losses not incurred in the public service. This would be substantially the use of the property of some for the benefit of others.

In presenting that theory of Martin Van Buren's I do not so much intend to express concurrence in the actual substance of his philosophy as I do to point up how far we have traveled in a relatively brief 120 years. It is astounding, Mr. President, and it is tragic.

When are we Republicans, and some Democrats, going to learn that we cannot longer win elections in this country by playing the role of a political Santa Claus?

Neither can we, at any time, properly serve the function of Government in such a disguise. The attempt to be all things to all men is a frail admission that, each in our own philosophies of government, has not sufficient substance or competence to serve the Nation well, and in accordance with constitutional standards. I reject this approach to the responsibilities of political office. A man may be so much of everything that he is nothing of anything, and that is what can be said of the Members of this Congress if they ignore their basic responsibility to the people in the field of fiscal soundness in this year of 1957.

Mr. President, "every item in the Federal budget can and must be reduced. And this reduction will not take place until you and I and every citizens raises his voice against the Federal waste. To go through the budget item by item and eliminate the waste and nonessentials requires the insistent demands of the voter and the willing cooperation of Congress. But it can be done and it must be done."

These words were first spoken by me in the fall of 1952. They are as true now as they were then. My mind has not been changed, and I suggest that when we find out who and what changed the administration's mind we shall have the answer to this too-high budget and a further incentive to reduce it in every respect.

Some have requested that the meat-ax be applied to this budget and, with their intentions, I fully agree. However, I think if we apply the surgeon's scalpel, cutting intelligently and watching for items that have long-range effects in spending, we can do a better job for the American people.

It may even be, in some areas, that we shall find that money spent is money saved, such as in the area suggested by

the Cordiner report, which would require more money being spent now, but would result in a saving far in excess of the original sum.

If we do not do this, if we do not pitch our efforts toward a sound and stable economy, with adequate return to our people of the fruits of their labors, I am convinced that every Member of the Congress will, and of right ought to be, subjected to the most devastating retaliation on the part of the American people in all our history.

The citizens of this country are tired of the New Deal, now more so than in 1952, when they made the first effort to throw it over. They are fast learning that the way to real security is through limited Government and the highest form of fiscal responsibility. They are expressing an increasing willingness to abandon the luxury of paternalism in favor of the sanctuary of freedom.

Indeed, if the Congress, in its wisdom, will demonstrate the courage that is being displayed by the American people on this issue, there can be no question as to either the strength of our defenses or the permanence of our liberty.

In summation, Mr. President, I should like to recall a brief statement which I offered earlier this year before this body, in discussing this same general subject.

I have heard discussed on the floor something about the rights of American citizens. The question is asked, "What rights have we lost?" Let me name one right we have lost. We have lost the right to decide for ourselves how to spend about 30 percent of our income, because that is about what is going into taxes today. Thirty percent of the income of the people is regulated by the Federal Government. We have lost the right to decide for ourselves where we are going to spend it.

I suggest, therefore, that by reducing this incredibly high budget, we can begin the long march to the restoration of that right and every other privilege of American citizenship which has been submerged beneath these outrageous Federal spending programs.

It is my earnest hope that the President and my colleagues in the Congress will give serious and penetrating thought to this question. We may not, any of us, be here to witness the ultimate consequences of a continuation of this trend, but history would not forget that ours was the challenge forfeited.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I referred during the course of my remarks be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

HOW FREEDOM VANISHED IN THE ANCIENT WORLD BY POPULAR VOTE

(A study of how majority rule can be used to impose ruthless dictatorship from the earliest times to the Middle Ages, with an observation that the modern-day forms of dictatorship (communism) (socialism) are likewise imposed by popular vote)

Interludes of freedom are short and far between.

About 500 years before the birth of Christ, Athens—then the center of the world's civilization—was rapidly falling into a severe depression.

To combat it, Pericles started what would today be called a PWA program. His public

works program staggered the imagination. He began with the building of a great temple, called the Temple of Athena Nike. In 9 years he constructed the Parthenon, then art galleries and still more public buildings. Dams were built with PWA money, some wholly unnecessary. Along with all this was his own variety of give-away programs: Public housing, licenses, privileges, loans and contracts—plunder to the faithful voters and members of his political party. He himself dipped into the public treasury too.

All this made Pericles more and more popular. The people elected him chief strategos, a title roughly comparable to that of President of the United States. They elected him to this office 15 times. In so doing they violated what one historian called "the most sacred tradition in the Constitution—the rotation tradition that had rigidly been observed * * * and which was considered a bulwark against dictatorship. In fact, democracy under Pericles degenerated into liberty of the sovereign people "to decide as Pericles thought best." And a majority approved.

The big PWA program brought jobs to a lot of people. Here are some of them, listed by the historian, Plutarch (Pericles, 12): Carpenters, sculptors, cobblersmiths, stone masons, dyers, moulderers of gold, painters, embroiderers, engravers, merchants, sailors, wheelwrights, wagoners, drivers, rope makers, flax workers, leather cutters, road makers, and miners.

According to the pattern that has come down to this date, Pericles asked for and got from the people all power concentrated into his hands. He could even decide the issue of war or peace. In the end he chose war, as nearly all governments do in the pinch of trouble, threatened resistance by the people, unemployment, and especially fading popularity of the leader. Pericles went to war with Sparta. Most of the experts now agree the disastrous Peloponnesian War was wholly unnecessary. Pericles thought it was. Sparta did not attack Greece. Greece—at the direction of Pericles—attacked Sparta. The Spartan king, Archidamus, did all in his power to prevent war. Neither he nor his countrymen wanted war.

In fact, Archidamus put up with all sorts of insults from Pericles rather than go to war. He received ambassadors from Pericles who taunted Sparta about her shortcomings in the Persian wars. When that didn't work, Pericles cut inland Greek states off from an outlet to the sea by closing the port of Piraeus which they (the Spartans) had used for many years. He violated a 30-year peace pact by a belligerent act. Plutarch, the historian, said flatly that but for Pericles, the Spartan war could have been avoided.

The real reason for Pericles' decision to go to war was revealed in the plays of the great dramatist, Aristophanes, who said that since Pericles' power and popularity were fading, he saw war as the only way to bolster both.

But the gigantic PWA program of Pericles, and the war expenditures, "left the door open for one type of effective opposition." That was to promise more to the people in the way of government money.

Now take a look at the man who did that.

CLEON

Cleon was a shoe salesman. Like Huey Long, who sold mineral oil, Cleon managed to get around among a lot of people. When Cleon wasn't peddling shoes, he was a cobbler. He had a loud voice, was given to uncouth language. He decided maybe he could outpromise Pericles. So he went around promising the people better pay and shorter hours. The people began to listen to him. He offered more government spending than Pericles ever thought of. That they liked, too.

By this time Athens was in the second year of the war with Sparta, and since the

war was unpopular, the prestige of Pericles was slipping. Cleon had support both from the rabble and those who honestly thought the war was a mistake. Although Pericles had taken over most of the democratic forms, he hadn't yet conquered the courts. And Cleon successfully accused Pericles of misappropriating public funds. That was the end of Pericles and Cleon took over.

Cleon now had to make good. If he was going to keep up government spending, he had to get the money from somewhere. "Under his leadership," says one historian, "Athens extorted every penny she could from the vassal states remaining to her. This fund, augmented by wholesale confiscations of the property of wealthy people, was distributed as a dole to the people. For a short time the people realized higher doles and more leisure, but they were to discover that higher wages would not buy wealth that was not produced."

Cleon had no ethics. He looted the Athenian treasury without compunction. When it came time to submit the annual budget for a vote in the Ecclesia, he didn't submit it item by item, as Athens had once known in the days of democracy. He asked it be approved as a lump sum. Had debate been allowed, Cleon's thievery would have been exposed.

Meanwhile, he put more and more people on the public payroll. A vast bureaucracy was developed. Long after the war with Sparta, thousands were still on the public payroll. Only a feeble democracy survived. Demosthenes describes it "as overrun with salaried paupers."

When at last, in the third century before Christ, Philip of Macedon destroyed what was left of Greek "democracy," he found—as he stood at the gates of the once proud capital—"a hollow democracy in which the people were ground down by poverty and resigned to a spiritless dependence on the state for their daily crusts of bread. The Athenians had long since ceased to take pride in the glory of Athens or any courageous interest in defending free government."

It was the rise of Big Government, with its one and only policy—Government spending—that ruined Athens. Today, as we look on the ruins of the Parthenon, we should remember that those who choose to ignore the mistakes of history are condemned to repeat them.

The next outstanding world figure to use the giveaway programs to get the vote through the forms of freedom was the successor of Julius Caesar. He was the Caesar Augustus (Octavius) referred to in the New Testament as emperor of Rome when Jesus of Nazareth was born. Like Pericles and the rapacious Cleon, he believed in government spending on a big scale. That means big government management and control, which means in turn destruction of individual invention and freedom of choice.

Julius Caesar himself, faced with economic crisis, had contrived to keep his popularity by a combination of (a) extraordinary political showmanship and (b) a modest amount of government spending. Soon after he came into power in 49 B. C. he made free distributions of corn and oil and even money to the populace and staged vast shows—wild beast hunts and gladiatorial contests—in every quarter of the city of Rome.

Likewise he stirred the imagination of the people by grandiose schemes, such as diverting the course of the Tiber, cutting up the Campus Martius into building sites, building a huge theater, establishing large libraries, piercing the Isthmus of Corinth, building a gigantic road over the Apennines and the codification of all existing law.

But Caesar and his friends also conducted "a wholesale pillage of public money under his eyes * * * in his climb to power he had not hesitated to bribe liberally." But before long he was running out of money. How

was he to get more? He cast envious eyes on Parthia (Persia). Here were vast stores of all sorts of material wealth. If only he could conquer it. Plainly, it was the only way out.

So he set out to conquer Persia. Some of his rich friends, however, knew that if he came back with the plunder of Persia, he would be powerful enough also to plunder them. And Caesar was ambitious. So one of these friends (Brutus) assassinated him just as he was to leave on the Persian campaign.

No sooner was Caesar buried than the nation plunged into civil war, out of which emerged Octavius as the supreme leader. He had at his command a tremendous amount of war booty. War was the quickest way in ancient times of getting wealthy. Monopoly—by and with the consent of the dictator—was the second fastest way.

Octavius was not only the richest man in the Roman state but he made himself richer after the murder of Caesar by confiscating the estates of his political enemies. Besides, in Egypt he had captured all the treasure of Cleopatra, then believed to be the biggest single fortune in the world. The redistribution of wealth to his supporters and party members bought their votes in his time. These techniques that had been employed for 2,000 or 3,000 years before Karl Marx were simply modernized by him out of factors of history that were very old by his time.

As chief consul, Octavius observed all the outward forms of a constitutional dictatorship created with the consent of the people. He even continued the tradition of having two annually elected consuls, the other being his stooge. From 30 years before Christ to 27 years after His birth, Octavius ruled Rome; but 3 years before Jesus of Nazareth began His ministry, he took over a new office conferred on him by the senate, called the principate. The senate also gave him the complimentary title of Augustus, by which he is known chiefly in history. In his new office he ceased to go through the forms of running for office each year.

He was also elected by the Senate Pontifex Maximus for life. That meant he was the chief priest of the Roman religion. Finally, he was voted the power to issue edicts, and so—for the first time in Roman history—we have government by edict.

By vote of the majority, he was also voted the power to convene the senate at his pleasure, to command candidates for election to any post, to set aside the act of any magistrate.

Now how did the citizens of Rome come to yield all these powers, in spite of the lessons of disaster following dictatorship? Did the people have any choice but to follow one dictator after another who could bump off the dictator before him, often by out promising him.

First of all, as Ferrero notes in his "Greatness and Decline of Rome" (vol. IV, p. 163):

"To secure his hold of Rome and of the republic without any display of force or undue influence, he patiently worked to attach every social class to the new government, and these bonds were forged of golden chains, delicate and almost invisible, but nonetheless strong. Augustus laid down one of the essential principles for the future policy of the empire—that expenditure should be wide and free at Rome and directed to the profit of every class."

Says Willis J. Ballinger in *By Vote of the People* (p. 117):

"Only a thoroughgoing reform of Roman capitalism, which would have been directed to releasing the productive powers of private business in the domestic market, could have made it possible for the Roman citizen to earn his living without being dependent on the state. * * * With a prodigal hand he annulled all the state claims for back taxes * * * he paid the Roman municipalities for

land seized from them in the civil war, distributing among them probably 300 million sesterces in hard cash. To the plebeians of Rome, that dangerous and disorderly rabble of more than 250,000 men, he distributed 400 sesterces apiece. To his soldiers who totaled some 250,000 men, he gave 1,000 sesterces apiece and in addition a plot of land."

While Octavius was playing Santa Claus in a big way, he further endeared himself to the voters by affirming his faith in "Roman democracy." He even announced he had "handed over the republic to the control of the senate and the people of Rome."

Now he started a more ambitious public works program than Julius Caesar ever dreamed of. He built roads and temples and public buildings on a vast scale. His personal fortune was so vast, derived from war booty and inheritance, that he could for a while delay the day when he had to increase taxes at Rome and on the barbarian tribes. But that day was to come. So great was his government spending program that he created in process one of the most powerful political machines ever known in the history of the world. But he did this, using all the forms and trappings of democracy.

All this government spending made him enormously popular. "The evidence," says Ballinger, "is convincing that Octavius was deeply venerated by the people, and that the people on more than one occasion petitioned him to become dictator. Indeed, in one instance, the masses threatened to burn down the Roman senate if it did not make Octavius a dictator at once. * * * The gradual absorption of power was done by vote of the people. All during the emerging dictatorship, the Roman assembly continued to exercise its two basic functions—the election of magistrates which, of course, included the princeps, and the ratification of all laws. The transference of power was ratified step by step by the Roman assembly. The conclusion is inescapable that, in the last analysis it was the Roman people who destroyed Roman democracy."

Thus under Octavius, Rome passes from the outward form of a republic to an empire and a long line of emperors.

The last and final step was to make Octavius' dictatorial powers hereditary. Thus Tiberius, Octavius' stepson, became his successor. "The Roman Senate and Assembly voted to make Tiberius Princeps for life." That was the end of representative government in Rome.

In fact, the truth is that "under a literal rain of jobs, the people surrendered their sovereignty. But when dictatorship became fully established, the picture changed. The necessity no longer existed to court the people. They no longer had any power to surrender. Dictatorial government then changed its tune. It became thoroughly exploitative. The Roman people one day awoke to find that they no longer possessed civil rights and that their lives were at the mercy of the Emperor."

After Octavius came the deluge—government interference with business, with the individual, with the expression of public opinion. Paul Louis in *Ancient Rome at Work* (p. 21) describes how the state interfered with the marketing of oil, the conditions of carpentering, earthenware manufacture, and of house painting. So much so, adds this historian, that "the masses of people, broken under tyrannical legislation and plunged into incurable misery, did not even dream of emancipation."

DIOCLETIAN

Three hundred years after Octavius (284-305) came the Roman Emperor, Diocletian, who outdid in state control anything his predecessors, both in the republic and empire, ever tried.

He not only fixed prices and regulated wages, but persecuted Christians in the bar-

gain. The reason he did the latter was that they were the only ones he couldn't control. He wanted to revive the old Roman religion, and the church as an independent organization he looked upon as a menace to his authority.

"Diocletian," says Ballinger, "for all his purple toga and imperial dignity, sounds a good deal like the La Follettes and Bryans of our day. He excommunicated the rich men of his era for stifling production and impoverishing the people as thoroughly as many liberal leaders of our own democracy have done."

But what did Diocletian do?

He decided that everything could be remedied, everything straightened out, if only he could fix wages and control prices. That would give a fair break to everybody. But how to do it? First, he must wipe out the last vestiges of local government. There was some local autonomy even under the empire. Clearly, that was bad. So he set to work to centralize all authority in Rome.

He set up a huge bureaucracy, entirely dependent on—guess whom?—the Emperor. He filled the ancient capital with thousands upon thousands of civil servants. Everything had to be decided from Rome.

Like Octavius, he was enamored of a public-works program. He "adorned the city with numerous buildings, such as the Thermae, of which extensive remains are still standing."

But Diocletian made himself famous—one of the few Roman emperors to be remembered—by his effort to control prices and fix wages.

Never had the ancient world seen anything like it.

It has gone down in history as the Imperial Edict of 301 A. D.

The punishment fixed for violating the price-fixing edict was death.

Price fixing included cereals, wine, oil, meat, vegetables, fruits, skins, leathers, furs, footgear, timber, carpets, and all clothing. There were maximum prices set in great detail for all these articles.

Wages were also controlled, ranging all the way from the wages of laborers to the fees for lawyers and doctors.

The effect of the price-fixing-wage-control edict was disastrous. Business was bound down in a maze of red tape. Trade came virtually to a standstill. The value of money was also rigidly controlled, adding to the confusion.

So many violations were alleged that Diocletian himself pardoned or exonerated many; the Tribunes (courts) were clogged; nobody could make any sense out of what was going on. The price-fixing, wage-control attempt was limited to the eastern part of the empire. The law was on the books long after Diocletian died, but enforcement fell by the wayside, and finally fell into abeyance. Technically, it was on the books of the empire at least down to 403 A. D., but long before that it was recognized as impossible to enforce. It was the last and most ambitious attempt in the ancient world to control wages and fix prices. Yet the effort was bound to fail, just as the empire itself centuries later was bound to fall, not only from external assault but internal decay.

COSMO, DICTATOR OF FLORENCE (1434-65 A. D.)

Now we come to the most interesting story of all. No people in the history of the world loved freedom more than the people of Florence, an independent state on the Italian peninsula. They did not have a democracy, as we know it, nor even representative government. But they did love freedom, and they went to extraordinary lengths to safeguard it—but even Florence was taken in by a dictator who beguiled them with government spending—and the end, as usual, was ruin.

In fact, Cosmo founded a dictatorship which lasted 300 years. Yet the citizens of Florence thought they had done everything possible to prevent a dictator from rising.

Florence in the 13th century had a population of about 90,000, but only 4,000 or 4,500 could hold office. They included the merchants, learned lawyers, and great artists. "Within this small circle was an intense love of political liberty and an ever-present dread of despotism." Now this small group appeared to have one purpose in common: that was to prevent the rise of a dictator.

To achieve this purpose, they wrote extra-cautious provisions into the constitution. Let us see how the constitution came about.

In the 11th century Florence was little more than a town in northern Italy. A feudal nobility owned most of the land. Gradually, however, the city of Florence expanded rapidly in 3 centuries, and the merchants—getting together in 7 guilds—wrested political power in the realm from the nobles, so that by the 13th century, the Florentine Constitution was an extraordinary instrument of freedom.

By the 14th century, the people—that is, every male resident—had the right to approve or reject any change in the constitution. This did not mean that everybody could hold office in the state. They couldn't, as these honors were limited to the merchants and the professions.

Whenever a change in the constitution was proposed, the government had to summon "a gathering of the whole male resident population of Florence." Whatever change was proposed was to be carried out by a specially appointed commission. And the question would be put to the people whether such a commission should be appointed.

Thomas A. Trollope in his *History of the Commonwealth of Florence* (vol. 2) describes the Florentine Constitution and how jealously the merchants and professional class guarded the freedom of the people—for a while.

Instead of having a chief executive or president, they feared the centralization of power in one man, so the executive office or signory was composed of 36 members, with a presiding chairman called the gonfalonier.

Instead of having 1 attorney general, they had 12 attorneys, schooled in constitutional law.

To avoid having a legislature that might be pliant to the will of the executive office, even though the latter was composed of 36 members, the legislative power was split up into 3 houses. Further to prevent the rise of a dictator, the constitution provided that all of the above named officials were to rotate in office every 2 months.

But the Florentines carried their caution further:

Because they thought the commander in chief of the Florentine army might become a military hero and thus become a dictator, they provided by law that he must be a foreigner, chosen annually, and thus not eligible for any civil office. Likewise, they provided that the chief of police and the minister of justice must be foreigners, appointed in a similar manner.

Finally, to prevent the rise of a political machine, the Florentine Constitution provided that officeholders (drawn from the special group hitherto mentioned) must be selected by lot. Thus, "the names of all citizens eligible for office were put into borse or purses. Citizens so eligible were business proprietors who were not in arrears in their taxes."

The historian Trollope (vol. 2, p. 179) goes on to say:

"No people under heaven ever had so much faith in the virtue of haphazard * * * the names of all citizens should be put and drawn by chance for all offices of trust and power * * * for how else can we prevent our rulers

from getting to be greater than we? If we appoint the most able, his very ability will help him to put the yoke on our necks. * * * We will trust no man. * * * Then, at all events, I am as likely to be king as you. And in order that every dog may have his day, and we may be all kings in our turn, we will reduce the term of office to 2 months. There surely can be no danger of a man making himself great in that time."

Now one would think, on the face of this, that it would have been impossible for a dictator to have arisen in Florence. The people had written extraordinary precautions into law against the possibility. But they reckoned without the cleverness and the government spending ideas of one Cosmo di Medici.

Cosmo—the people called him that—Inherited, like Octavius in Rome, a great fortune. His father, Giovanni di Medici, had been one of Florence's richest bankers at a time when Florence was the banking center, or financial capital, of the world. The Florentine bankers in the 13th century loaned money even to the Kings of England and of France. At this time Florence had 120 banking firms, each with branch offices all over Europe.

Cosmo's father had made the family name revered among most Florentines by leading a reform in the tax system, whereby the rich paid their fair share of taxes. On the death of his father, Cosmo fell heir to the leadership of the liberal party. There was the counterpart of the liberal and conservative party running all through this history.

There was a great difference between Cosmo and his father, however. Cosmo was ambitious. He saw dreams of personal power. To get it he remained in the background. Like Boss E. H. Crump of Memphis, he held no political office—for a while. Instead, he went around quietly paying up the tax arrears of citizens qualified to hold office. Next there were rumors that the borse of purse, from which officeholders were selected by lot, had been tampered with. The right names seemed to be coming up all the time. In fact, a blind beggar by the name of Benedetto "made himself rich by predicting what names would come out of the borse when a new signory was drawn."

In addition, Cosmo—still keeping in the background—lent money to influential men. It was not long before every important citizen in the commonwealth was indebted to him. His behind-the-scenes power got so great that the signory, not yet under his control, ordered him into exile.

Yet this didn't faze Cosmo. Even from exile he continued to dictate things. Within a year, however, a new signory, favorable to him, came into power and he was brought back into the city as a hero. The deft way he had manipulated "the selection by lot" of the signory now paid off. The members bent to his will. They summoned a parliament of the people, and it granted him dictatorial power for 5 years.

Never had Florence seen anything like it. He had seduced the processes of free government by his moneybags, and now he started on a spree of government spending.

He started what today would be called a WPA and PWA. He ventured on a gigantic public housing project, providing housing for the poor at a loss to the government. He founded and expanded a great bureaucracy. He built—with government money—endless public hearings and even churches.

He established his dictatorship in Florence in 1434. For 30 years he ruled with a despotic hand—so cruel that many murders were committed by his henchmen and no man was brought to justice for them.

The technical name of the signory had been the Priors of Signory. He changed the name to Priors of Liberty. Why? Machiavelli amused all of Europe by explaining: "He did

this so that the people might at least preserve the name of the thing they had lost."

Gradually, government spending increased, instead of lessened, and Florence sank from the foremost republic in the world to a tax-ridden tyranny. "The people were abandoned to their poverty, the slums of Florence became models of filth and disease." For 300 years the dictatorship, initiated by Cosmo, continued until it fell before the invading armies of a united Italy.

Significantly, however, Cosmo acquired his dictatorship by majority vote, and until he had firmly entrenched himself he appeased the masses by government spending until the people were finally reduced to incredible poverty. Yet never before had so many safeguards been thrown around republican government, all to no avail in the face of an ambitious man, greedy for power with his supporters and beneficiaries corrupting the voters by taking from those having the fewer votes and giving the proceeds to those with the greater number of votes.

We now move toward communism by majority vote, while observing all the forms of democracy.

A STUDY OF KARL MARX'S COMMUNIST MANIFESTO AND THE EXTENT OF ITS TRANSLATION INTO FACT IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Communist Manifesto was published in 1848. It is the official creed of the Communist Party. In 1948 the 100th anniversary edition of this book was published. The following are the major goals in the modern giveaway programs already tested in history as sure to work and get the vote of a majority of the people, as set out in the official Communist Manifesto (pp. 32, 33, 34). We are all quite familiar with them. Most of the countries of the world have adopted the concepts, including the United States. It has adopted the principle of Marx, but in some cases stopped short of Marx's total consummation of his goals. Having adopted the principles, how can we stop or reverse the course?

1. Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.

How far has this happened in the United States of America?

To get an understanding of the answer, we must look at the traditional land policy of the Government. As Adm. Ben Moreell has pointed out, "The early American policy was to get this land into the hands of private owners as quickly as possible. Sometimes it was given away, but always the idea was to get it into the hands of private owners, whether it be a railroad, a college, an individual homesteader, or others."

Now, however, the reverse is true. More and more land is being taken for public purposes. So what has happened? One-fourth of all the land now in the confines of the continental United States is owned by the Federal Government.

Thus the Federal Government owns 85 percent of Nevada, 71 percent of Utah, and 69 percent of Arizona. "There isn't much land left to acquire west of the Mississippi, and the trend is steadily upward."

2. A heavy, progressive, or graduated income tax.

In this, our beloved country has out-Marx'd Marx.

In 1894 a revenue bill was passed by Congress which provided for a graduated income tax (act of August 27, 1894).

The law was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court on April 8, 1895 (*Pollock v. Farmers Loan and Trust Co.*). It was held invalid on the ground that the law imposed direct taxes, not apportioned among the States as required by the Constitution.

On February 25, 1913, the 16th amendment to the Constitution was adopted authorizing the imposition of income taxes without apportionment among the several States.

The tax, says Moreell, "was described by its proponents as a modest levy, with a normal

rate of 1 percent on personal income up to \$20,000, a surtax to a maximum of 6 percent of \$500,000, and a flat corporate tax rate of 1 percent. The sole purpose, they said, was to produce revenue. When a Senator protested that the normal rate might some day rise to the confiscatory level of 10 percent, he was shouted down in derision."

Instead of 10 percent, the personal tax has risen to more than 90 percent in the highest brackets. The tax acts as a powerful brake on private capital, thus making it easier for the Government to step in with public capital.

Take a specific illustration in line with the Marxian ideal of "wresting, by degree, all capital from the owners of private property." In 1951, says Moreell, "the total of the income-tax payments to the Federal Government by the largest company in each of the 20 largest industries was three times the total amount that was paid of the owners of the businesses. That is, for every dollar set aside for Federal taxes and dividends by these companies, 75 cents went to the Federal Government and 25 cents to the stockholders."

3. Abolition of all rights of inheritance.

Not only has the inheritance tax taken as high as 75 cents of the grants in the highest brackets, but to this has been added the gift tax, something Marx never thought of.

When one of the du Ponts died recently, leaving an estate of \$75 million, a total of 75 percent of this was paid out to the Federal Government in inheritance taxes. This, too, is moving in the direction of the Marxian goal "to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie."

To quote Moreell: "You may condone this action, saying, 'Oh, well, there is plenty left,' but I speak here of a basic moral principle, the right to retain property."

4. Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.

American citizens of Japanese parents, who were suspected of possibly becoming rebels, were deprived of their property during World War II. When the war was over the Government compensated them for it at a fraction of what it was worth.

5. Centralization of credit in the hands of the state, by means of a national bank with state capital and an exclusive monopoly.

Already proposals are before the Congress, with the support of the New Dealers and Fair Dealers, to buy the stock of the Federal Reserve Bank and place title in the Government. Then all new Government money requirements, including those for retiring outstanding bond issues, would be met by delivering non-interest-bearing bonds to the banks, which would establish corresponding credits on their books. Better than that: the United States variety of socialism issues interest-bearing Government bonds at 3 percent tax-exempt. For example, 3 percent public housing bonds in the hands of those in the 80 to 90 percent tax bracket is better for them than investments in 13 percent dividend stock. Thus public ownership thrives—private investment dies. Lenin said the surest way to destroy the capitalistic system is to destroy its currency. Government control of credit and interest rates is a movement in exactly the direction Marx had in mind.

6. Centralization of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the state.

Both the FCC and ICC have made a start in this direction. The railroads, for example, are not only sometimes taken over by the Government, but they are so strictly controlled they cannot, with propriety, be pointed to as examples of private ownership and operation. Add to this situation the heavy Federal subsidies to steamship lines, airlines, airports, bridges, etc., and we have the beginning of overall controls.

7. Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the state, the bringing into cultivation of wastelands, and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.

Here we have a record of many manufacturing plants owned outright by the Federal Government. Then there is the entry of the Federal Government into the ownership and operation of electric powerplants. Federal ownership in this field (of plants already in operation) has reached 10.7 percent of the total, and by the end of 1955 it will be 15.4 percent. If State and local plants are added, the total is 23.8 percent.

In another field—synthetic rubber—in the first 6 months of 1952, Government-owned plants produced 62.3 percent of the Nation's consumption of new rubber.

8. Equal liability of all to labor. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.

This one plank has not gained wide acceptance here, despite memories of the Works Progress Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps. Yet the American Communist Party in 1921 advocated the closed shop as essential to the creation of a Red America.

Nor should the Temporary Industrial Disputes Settlement Act of May 26, 1946, recommended by President Truman, be forgotten. This empowered the President to draft workers and management into the Army. The House of Representatives, by overwhelming majority vote and under suspension of the rules, voted it, 306 to 13. In the Senate, Senator Taft led the fight to eliminate the draft provisions, and was successful; the bill then was passed and died in conference. Said Taft at the time: "I wish to say that it seems to me that section 7 goes further toward Hitlerism, Stalinism and totalitarian government than any provision I have ever seen proposed in any measure."

9. Government planning in agriculture and industry.

We appear to have accepted the fundamentals of this plank. Proposals are now under consideration to force the decentralization of industry under the emergency powers of the Defense Production Act. Likewise we have the example of the Truman-sponsored Brannan plan, a scheme to lock a large segment of agricultural production in the vice of bureaucratic controls. Rent, wage and price control are commonly accepted policy.

10. Government-controlled schools.

The president of Harvard University recently advocated the abolition of all privately operated grade and secondary schools. In a recent Columbia University study, James Earle Russell reported: "The Federal Government in a typical year (1947) spent \$500 million of the \$1 billion it cost the colleges to operate—or 50 cents of every dollar." The report shows higher education has become a major concern of the Federal Government. The Supreme Court has already laid down the principle: "It is hardly lack of due process for the Government to regulate that which it subsidizes." How far off is regulation?

Observes Ben Moreell of these 10 planks:

"We cannot imprison or shoot an idea. We can only study it and try to understand it. If the ideas we sponsor—knowingly or unknowingly—are Communist ideas, democracy will be of little help. It is just as much a Communist idea if the majority impose it upon a minority *** as if it is done in the name of dictatorship."

MARTIN VAN BUREN (1837-41)

Like a breath of fresh air in a smoke-filled room was the philosophy expressed in the message of Martin Van Buren to Congress on September 7, 1837.

It came at the height of the first great depression to hit the United States. In it

President Van Buren turned down suggestions, emanating from both parties, that he take the lead in a program of Government spending. Said the President to Congress:

"All communities are apt to look to the Government too much. Even in our country, where its power and duties are strictly limited, we are prone to do so—especially at periods of sudden distress and embarrassment. But this ought not to be."

"The framers of our Constitution, and the people who approved it with calm and sagacious deliberation, acted at the time on a sound principle. They wisely suggested that the less Government interferes with private pursuits the better for general prosperity ***."

"It is not the Government's legitimate object to make men rich or to repair, by direct grants of money or legislation, losses not incurred in the public service. This would be substantially the use of the property of some for the benefit of others."

This philosophy, expressed by the President of the United States, raised a storm of objection in Congress, in both Houses, but the President stood his ground.

Daniel Webster professed to be shocked. Said Webster, addressing the Senate: "I confess this declaration (of the President) is to me quite astounding. And I cannot think but that—when it comes to be considered—it will be a shock to the country. This avowed disregard for the public distress on the ground of alleged want of power; this exclusive concern for the interest of Government and revenue—now for the first time drawn—between the interests of the Government and the people, must surely be regarded as commencing a new era in our politics."

The press echoed with Webster's denunciation, but suddenly support came to the President from a strange quarter. John C. Calhoun and his followers had all but withdrawn from the Democratic Party. Now, almost overnight, they returned. And Calhoun himself, although ill and hardly able to stand, took the floor of the Senate and alined himself squarely on the side of the President of the United States. Said Calhoun:

"I dread the doctor more than the disease itself *** I rely more on the growing crops, on the cotton, rice and tobacco of the South, than all the projects and devices of the politicians *** We have arrived at a remarkable era in our history. The days of legislative and executive encroachment *** and extravagant expenditures are past for the present. We are about to make a fresh start. I move off under the States-Rights banner, and go in the direction in which I have been so long moving."

A revolt against Van Buren's policy broke out in his own party, however, led by Nathaniel Talmadge of New York and William C. Rives of Virginia. Nevertheless, the President was able to muster enough support, including Calhoun and his followers, to avert upset of his leadership.

And so we conclude, that where the Constitution has been torn down, the first step is to repair and reassert it. The way to do it is clear. Who will do it?

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 9, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 8, 1957:

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Thomas James Donegan, of New York, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for the term expiring April 9, 1962. (Reappointment.)

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Howard C. Botts, of Ohio, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Ohio for a term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires April 30, 1957.

Richard A. Simpson, of Virginia, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Virginia for a term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires July 17, 1957.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION

To be medical directors

Leland A. Hatchett	Michael B. Shimkin
Fred Morse	Joseph C. Sturgell
Edgar W. Moreland	Benno K. Milmore
Paul T. Erickson	William J. Brown
Ralph B. Hogan	Benjamin Highman
Glenn S. Usher	Daniel J. Daley
Robert R. Smith	George F. Ellinger
Robert L. Zobel	John F. Oesterle
Travis P. Burroughs	Gabriel P. Ferrazzano
Harry Heilmann	Joseph H. Gerber
Robert L. Cherry	Horace De Lien
Henry W. Kassell	Clarence L. P. Hebert
R. Frank Reider	Leslie W. Knott
John B. Vander	Robert J. Anderson
Isidor Abrahamer	William H. Stimson
Welby W. Bigelow	William S. Baum
Lewis H. Hoyle	Kenneth W. Chapman

To be senior surgeons

Wayland J. Hayes, Jr.	Robert H. Dysinger
Leonard T. Kurland	Vincent E. Price
Thomas A. Burch	Robert B. Neu
Alan D. Miller	Robert M. Farrier
Louis B. Thomas	Stewart M. Sessions
Robert B. Dorsen	Sheldon Dray
Robert P. Grant	Donald Harting
Wilton M. Fisher	Henry D. Smith
Richard S. Yocom	Henry C. Savage
Murray C. Brown	Charles E. Smith
Roy P. Lindgren	

To be surgeons

Leslie T. McClinton	Maurice L. Sievers
G. Gilbert Ashwell	Clermont S. Powell
Wintrop E. Hoyle	Robert N. Phillip
Tracy Levy	John K. Irion
Sarah E. Stewart	Agamemnon Despopoulos
Kamehameha K. Wong	John M. Lynch
Ernest C. Siegfried	Calvin R. MacKay
John M. Buchness	Joseph E. Jack
Lester R. Nagel	Daniel Steinberg
John J. Walsh	George W. Metcalf
Joseph A. Gallagher	William H. Stewart
Alexis I. Shelokov	Harry Y. Spence
Mirriam D. Manning	

To be senior assistant surgeons

Elbert E. Hines	John G. Mahaney
John F. Ice	Ted L. Flickenger
C. Lowell Edwards	James T. Worlton, Jr.
Roy E. Tolls	Donald A. Neher
Michael W. Justice	Ralph J. Zecca
David H. Looff	Duane L. Hanson
John R. Trautman	George C. Hottinger
Irwin B. Kaplan	Herman L. Smith
Thomas E. Kiester	Leon N. Branton
Neely E. Pardee	Arnold R. Haugen
Gordon S. Siegel	

To be dental directors

William W. Calhoun, Jr.	Harry G. Trautman
	Donald J. Galagan

Joseph E. Unsworth	James O. Blythe, Jr.
Clovis E. Martin	

To be senior dental surgeons

Peter J. Coccaro.	
Richard P. French.	
Peter B. Drez.	

To be dental surgeons

Oswald Spence	Biagio J. Cosentino
William B. Savchuck	John E. Frank
Carl J. Witkop, Jr.	James E. Kelly

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

Robert R. Kelley	William D. Bowker
Calvin M. Reed	Howard B. Hancock
Winston H. Bowman	Ivan T. Shaurette
W. Frederick Schmidt	Robert A. Hesse
Stanley D. Sherriff	E. Duane Oakes
Bernard A. Yenne	Harry H. Hatasaka
James R. Dow	

To be sanitary engineer directors

Hayes H. Black	Russell W. Hart
Joseph E. Flanagan, Jr.	Charles D. Yaffe
	Robert R. Harris
James G. Terrill, Jr.	Malcolm C. Hope
August T. Rossano	Harry G. Hanson
M. Allen Pond	Wesley E. Gilbertson
Ralph J. Vanderwerker	Callis H. Atkins

To be senior sanitary engineer

Alfred E. Williamson, Jr.	
---------------------------	--

To be sanitary engineers

Ronald E. Bales	Lester E. Blaschke
Gerald N. McDermott	Donald E. Pecok
James A. Westbrook	Robert P. Morfitt
Ronald G. Macomber	William H. Davis, Jr.
Charles E. Sponeagle	

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers

Archie E. Becher	Harry C. Vollrath III
James G. Gardner	Jules B. Cohen
Guy H. Trimble.	

To be pharmacist director

To be senior pharmacists

Joseph P. Crisalli.	
Victor F. Serino.	
Arthur W. Dodds.	

To be pharmacists

Joseph J. Hackett	Henry W. Beard
John A. Scigiano	Alfred A. Rosenberg
Richard F. Bolte	Richard R. Sherwood
Allums F. Smith	

To be scientist directors

Jerry W. Carter, Jr.	Howard M. Kline
Charles G. Dobrovolsky	Carl L. Anderson
Malcolm J. Williams	Louis Block
Clarence M. Tarzwell	Lewis J. Cralley
Harold M. Skeels	Pope A. Lawrence
Emlen J. Bell	

To be senior scientists

Lewis J. Sargent.	
Archie D. Hess.	
William H. Ewing.	

To be scientists

Harold J. Fournelle	Leo Kartman
William R. Carroll	Jack J. Monroe
Roy W. Chamberlain	Bill H. Hoyer
Robert K. Ness	Robert Holdenried
Clarence A. Sooter	Charles R. Maxwell
William F. Durham	

To be senior assistant scientists

Seymour Rubenfeld	Donald S. Boomer
Donald S. Blough	Kenneth W. Walls

To be senior sanitarians

Nell McKeever.	
Mary Jo Kraft.	
Milton Wittman.	

To be sanitarian

Wallace W. Jonz.	
------------------	--

To be senior assistant sanitarians

Richard A. Steinmetz.	
Grace M. Littlejohn.	

To be senior veterinarian

Raymond J. Helvig.	

To be veterinarians

Robert E. Kissling.	
Ladd N. Loomis.	
Karl R. Reinhard.	

To be senior assistant veterinarians

Anton M. Allen.	
Kenneth O. Quist.	

To be nurse directors

Marion Ferguson	Donna Pearce
Hazel Shortal	Lorena J. Murray
Margaret K. Schafer	Elsie T. Berdan

To be senior nurse officers

Emily M. Smith	Helen M. Danley
Margaret Denham	Mildred Struve

To be nurse officers

Elizabeth W. Maher	Katherine Bastress
Philomene Lenz	Albina A. Bozym
Loretta C. Parsons	Mildred F. Barnett
Mabel N. Hay	Frances S. Wolford
Madge M. Neill	Catherine N. McDuffie
Myra I. Johnson	Grace E. Mattis
Jennie H. Rakich	Mary G. Damian
Margaret M. Cahalan	Mary R. Lester
Florence E. McKerrow	Dorothy L. Connors
Lillian S. Dick	Merliss R. Porter
Florence E. Gareau	Hilda A. Nivala
Mary E. Allen	

	To be senior assistant nurse officer
	Dorothy C. Calafiore.

To be therapist

Nellie L. Evans.	
------------------	--

To be senior assistant therapists

Royce P. Noland.	
------------------	--

Dean P. Currier.	
------------------	--

To be assistant therapist

Arthur J. Nelson.	
-------------------	--

CONFIRMATIONS

	Executive nominations confirmed by
	the Senate April 8, 1957:

UNITED NATIONS

	Stanley C. Allyn, of Ohio, to be the representative of the United States of America to the 12th session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.
--	---

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

	Francis H. Russell, of Maine, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to New Zealand.
--	--

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

	Alan T. Waterman, of Connecticut, to be Director of the National Science Foundation, term of 6 years.
--	---

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

	Katherine Brownell Oettinger, of Massachusetts, to be Chief of the Children's Bureau, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
--	---

POSTMASTERS

ALASKA

Paul G. Swanson, Chugiak.	
---------------------------	--

ARKANSAS

Fred C. Seaton, Forrest City.	
-------------------------------	--

CALIFORNIA

Lucille Peyton, Aromas.	
-------------------------	--

Wilda B. Keller, Boulevard.	
-----------------------------	--

Helen M. Robertson, Cobb.	
---------------------------	--

Raymond A. Hunter, Colton.	
----------------------------	--

Barbara P. O'Neill, Crannell.	
-------------------------------	--

Gladys L. Ralph, Eagle Mountain.	
----------------------------------	--

Edward F. Fuselli, Fairfax.	
-----------------------------	--

Noma Joyce Marshall, Five Points.
 Thomas G. Moore, Folsom.
 Frank B. Branson, Fort Jones.
 Marion S. Karrh, La Jolla.
 Lewis B. Miller, Moorpark.
 Edith R. Wirtanen, Mount Hamilton.
 Dorothy P. Faust, Newberry.
 Albert W. Oxen, Pleasanton.
 John Redstreake, Quincy.
 Beryl E. Carroll, Rancho Cordova.
 Flora R. Sproul, Redway.
 Lawrence Kenneth Fee, Sr., San Miguel.
 Mervin H. Sheppard, Sutter Creek.
 Mary G. Hutchinson, Tecate.
 Orion K. Beeson, Venice.
 Raymond J. Schulze, Yountville.

COLORADO

Sidney E. Koon, Arvada.
 Glenn A. Daniels, Castle Rock.
 Max T. Robb, Central City.
 Wilbur A. Snyder, Fountain.
 Louise J. Caddell, Grand Lake.
 Eva G. Woolley, Louviers.
 Alex J. Campbell, Norwood.
 Joseph P. Davis, Peyton.

DELAWARE

Richard A. Yost, Houston.
 Elizabeth M. Clandelin, Lincoln.

FLORIDA

Lillian S. Rodgers, Bascom.
 Harry E. Kesler, Fellsmere.
 Marshall I. Richards, Grant.
 Emmet W. Doak, Neptune Beach.
 Essie M. Cogdill, St. Marks.
 Everett A. Phillips, Wildwood.

GEORGIA

Alex B. Greenway, Alma.
 Guy D. McKinney, Ball Ground.
 Luther A. Adams, Elberton.
 Joseph E. Turner, Jr., Hephzibah.
 Walter T. Brown, Mountain View.
 Thomas E. Wynne, Warm Springs.

INDIANA

Richard W. Garvin, Battle Ground.
 Mary Ann Massa, Blanford.
 Anne Lee Cooper, Clarksburg.
 Guy E. Edds, Dugger.
 Walter A. Smith, Indianapolis.
 James H. Nelson, Ladoga.
 George M. Smith, Medora.
 William F. Reineke, Mount Vernon.
 Frances L. Autrey, Newberry.
 William S. Hutchison, Paoli.
 Arthur R. Bietry, Richmond.
 Eura Annita Dillon, Williamsburg.
 Donald Eugene Greenburg, Wolcott.

KANSAS

Ralyn M. Hill, Abilene.
 Frank W. Daharsh, Americus.
 Ivan R. Calahan, Kincaid.
 Leonard L. Livengood, Morrill.
 Paul Vern Grittman, Simpson.

KENTUCKY

Wilmer L. Boggs, London.

LOUISIANA

Alva L. Coon, Arcadia.
 Roy E. Boyd, Converse.
 Dalton J. Richard, Creole.
 Marlin M. Ryder, Deville.
 Robert D. Comeaux, Duson.
 America Hahn Falgout, Meraux.
 Hannah J. Cunningham, Metairie.
 Pauline B. Cambre, Paulina.

MAINE

Eleanor H. Foss, Boothbay Harbor.
 Richard Paul Dyer, Turner.

MARYLAND

Beatrice P. Brittingham, Fishing Creek.
 Olie K. Teeter, Flintstone.
 Bertha N. Rohde, Glyndon.
 Dudley I. Windsor, Hurlock.
 Elwood J. Greenhalgh, Royal Oak.

MASSACHUSETTS

Kenneth E. Keith, Bridgewater.
 Alfred K. Wilde, Edgartown.
 Berton E. Hobart, Holbrook.
 Adelbert M. Eldredge, Northboro.
 Richard H. Crittenden, Otis.
 Clifford A. E. Norrman, Plympton.
 Marian F. Church, Rochester.
 Essie H. Reynolds, South Acton.
 Hazel B. Hiltz, South Ashburnham.
 Albert R. Lacroix, Spencer.
 Roger D. Scudder, Sunderland.

MINNESOTA

Joseph G. Williams, Buffalo Lake.
 Robert P. Clark, Cromwell.
 Garrett W. Magee, Detroit Lakes.
 Delmer E. Drysdale, Dover.
 Walter R. Johnson, Hendricks.
 Ruth M. Bishop, Longville.
 Milton J. Moyness, Montevideo.
 Russell L. Spielman, Odin.
 Lawler H. Olson, Perham.
 Lyle D. Nelson, Randall.
 Earl W. Axeen, Sartell.
 Harry Stickney Lamb, Schroeder.
 Manfred C. Folstad, Shelly.
 Agnes M. Quam, Watson.

MISSISSIPPI

Rufina F. W. Gully, Preston.

MISSOURI

James E. Lysinger, Lowry City.
 George R. Arnold, Smithville.
 Eugene W. Waite, Wheeling.

MONTANA

Ronald F. Yandell, Cascade.
 Dell H. Riggs, Conrad.
 Arthur L. Hamilton, Fishtail.
 Alma M. Slevin, Froid.
 Mark M. Fuller, Great Falls.
 Lloyd M. Hughes, Lolo.
 Robert Julian, Sheridan.
 John C. Emerson, Stevensville.
 Lyle C. Marsh, Valier.
 Ben H. Williams, Virginia City.
 William B. McCracken, Wolf Point.

NEBRASKA

James H. Ross, Elm Creek.
 Verl A. Brunkow, Murdock.
 LeRoy J. Henry, Wellfleet.
 Mabel L. Kendrick, Whitney.

NEVADA

Claude L. Taylor, Battle Mountain.
 Antoine Primeaux, Elko.
 Lucy B. Belin, Pittman.

NEW JERSEY

John A. Beetle, Blackwood.
 Fern W. Buskirk, Deepwater.
 William H. Rule, Dover.
 Francis E. Bruce, Eatontown.
 Edith L. Brown, Mantua.
 Clinton W. Wood, Jr., Oceanport.

NEW MEXICO

Marion S. Dunnam, Artesia.
 Emma R. White, White City.

NEW YORK

John W. Ginther, Adams Basin.
 Gaetano Pavone, Bear Mountain.
 Eldred R. Wood, Canton.
 John Wesley Sinnickson, Center Moriches.
 John Hobert Stear, Churchville.
 Marta E. Hoffman, Commack.
 John C. Newkerk, DeLancey.
 Gardner A. Cross, Feels Mills.
 Amelia L. Donovan, Forestport.
 August J. Oliver, Frankfort.
 Anthony B. Nicastri, Franklin Square.
 Rudolph M. Jabbonsky, Holbrook.
 Catherine V. Whalen, Hopewell Junction.
 Walter J. Beattie, Lake Luzerne.
 Loren Grace, Jr., Lodi.
 Fotius Stellianou, Lyndonville.
 Harold B. Lauster, Lyons.
 Robert P. Siersma, Marcellus.
 Margaret M. Fitzgerald, Maryknoll.
 Lawrence Leo Shade, Merrick.

NEW YORK

William Adolph Roese, Mineola.
 Louis I. Katz, Mountain Dale.
 Archie C. Davidson, New City.
 Clifford S. Van Valkenburgh, Jr., New Paltz.
 Vincent E. Trunk, Niagara University.
 Russell A. Southard, Otego.
 Laura E. Ebmeyer, Palisades.
 Donald W. Floyd, Port Jefferson.
 Phyllis N. Cooley, Richburg.
 Kenneth D. Woods, Setauket.
 Robert J. Johnson, Staten Island.
 Harry F. Erickson, Stottsville.
 John J. Blake, Taberg.
 Edmon L. Sowers, Thiells.
 Sylvia C. Semel, Thompsonville.
 Frederick J. Weigel, Tribes Hill.
 Stanley L. Evans, Utica.
 William A. Todd, Valley Stream.
 Robert K. La Londe, Wantagh.
 William J. Brown, Jr., Waterford.

NORTH CAROLINA

Judson G. Burrell, Barnardsville.
 David C. Keller, Jr., Chimney Rock.
 Vera N. Scarborough, Grifton.
 Cleveland C. Hines, Jr., Holly Ridge.
 Annie P. Wolfe, Jamesville.
 Vernon W. Taylor, Oxford.
 John C. Hammond, Rockingham.
 James H. Parks, Swannanoa.
 Jasper M. Brown, Troy.

OHIO

Ralph E. Kienzle, Bolivar.
 Winifred F. Brown, Casstown.
 Ralph C. Steer, Damascus.
 John Jay Gold, Dennison.
 John M. Frazier, Frazeysburg.
 Karl H. Haberecht, Gates Mills.
 Vincent J. Marcarello, Girard.
 Elizabeth C. Watts, Highland.
 Donald L. Meyer, Houston.
 Ralph M. Hardy, Mansfield.
 Craig F. Barnett, Mineral City.
 Paul E. Neal, Mogadore.
 Otto E. Lankenau, Napoleon.
 Eric Lester Finney, New Philadelphia.
 Clarence C. Sanders, Port William.
 Harry D. Anderson, Republic.
 Arthur C. Larimer, Sandusky.
 Fern Pittenger, Shiloh.
 Salvatore D. Zavarella, Solon.
 Elsie E. Johnson, Williston.

OKLAHOMA

Fred W. Loula, Lookeba.
 Randolph H. Grinstead, Pawhuska.

OREGON

Theresa E. Bryson, Adams.
 Richard L. Willey, Elkton.
 Oleta R. Farrens, Monument.
 Virginia L. Lydick, Swisshome.
 Orel T. Bateman, Vernonia.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Davis O. Johnson, Hayti.
 Daryl C. Lunn, Kimball.
 Michael P. Bowar, Seneca.
 Merle S. Frickey, Vermillion.

TENNESSEE

William C. Ashworth, Franklin.
 Louis W. Oliver, Jr., Hendersonville.
 Charles R. Sanford, New Tazwell.
 Carl A. Thompson, Pleasant Hill.

UTAH

Shirley J. Bartholomew, Mayfield.
 David L. Warner, Midvale.

VIRGINIA

Zeb Jerome Barbee, Jr., Altavista.
 Thomas M. Strickland, Chester.
 Toney S. Reynolds, Jr., Collinsville.
 Allen F. Maxwell, Dillwyn.
 Drunette N. Holland, Eastville.
 John W. Leslie, Glasgow.
 Wilton E. Dunton, Hudgings.
 George F. Walls, Isle of Wight.
 Paul S. Richmond, Lanexa.
 Walter G. Carter, Nottoway.
 Roy L. Reeve, Sperryville.
 Stephen K. Burns, Jr., Swoope.

WISCONSIN

Roland R. Kucksdorf, Bowler.
Rita A. Fornero, Camp Lake.
Albert D. Rusch, Crandon.
Paul R. Dyer, Crivitz.
Merlin H. Jacobson, Galesville.

WYOMING

Ruth Newbrough, Pavilion.
Harold C. Jones, Saratoga.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 8, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O Thou great God of our spirits, at this noon hour, we are approaching Thy throne of majesty and mercy, of grace and goodness, compelled by many needs but, above all, constrained by Thy love which will never fail or let us go.

We rejoice that Thy divine love has neither geographical boundaries nor numerical limitation for it reaches everywhere and includes all mankind.

Help us to appreciate the wonderful opportunities which each day affords us for building a social order that has in it a larger measure of love and goodwill.

May we love Thee with all our mind and heart and soul and strength, which is the first and great commandment, and also be obedient to the second commandment to love our neighbor as ourselves, for on these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.

Through the name of our blessed Lord we ascribe unto Thee all the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 5, 1957, was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 6659.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 51]

Adair	Bass, N. H.	Brown, Mo.
Alexander	Baumhart	Buckley
Alger	Belcher	Byrne, Pa.
Anderson,	Bentley	Carrigg
Mont.	Beets	Celler
Aspinall	Bosch	Chenoweth
Barden	Bowler	Chudoff
Barrett	Breeding	Clark

Coffin	Gregory	Powell
Corbett	Gubser	Prouty
Coudert	Gwynn	Radwan
Cramer	Harris	Reece, Tenn.
Cretella	Healey	Rogers, Colo.
Delaney	Holtzman	Rogers, Tex.
Dies	Jackson	Roosevelt
Diggs	Keating	Sadiak
Dollinger	Kelly, N. Y.	Santangelo
Donohue	Keogh	Scrivner
Dooley	Kluczynski	Sikes
Dorn, N. Y.	Lane	Spence
Eberhardt	Latham	Springer
Edmondson	Lennon	Teller
Elliott	McConnell	Van Pelt
Engle	McCormack	Walter
Farbstein	McCulloch	Westland
Fino	Magnuson	Wharton
Flynt	Martin	Williams, Miss.
Fogarty	May	Willis
Friedel	Morano	Wilson, Calif.
Fulton	Osmers	Withrow
Grant	Patterson	Young
Green, Pa.	Philbin	Zelenko

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AUDITORIUM COMMISSION

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4813) to extend the life of the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

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

The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MORRISON, MULTER, GRANAHAN, KEARNS, and BROYHILL.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia Day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN], chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

METROPOLITAN POLICE RELIEF ASSOCIATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 4840) to incorporate the Metropolitan Police Relief Association of the District of Columbia, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That Clarence H. Lutz, Francis Conley, Garland B. Waters, William G. Schenck, Lawrence D. Johnson, Anthony A. Cuozzo, John R. Wallace, and Edwin S. Grayson are hereby created and declared to be a body corporate by the name of "Metropolitan Police Relief Association of the District of Columbia" (hereinafter in this act referred to as the "corporation"), and by such name shall be known and have perpetual succession and the powers and limitations contained in this act.

COMPLETION OF ORGANIZATION

SEC. 2. The persons named in the first section of this act are authorized to complete the organization of the corporation by the selection of officers and employees, the adoption of a constitution and bylaws not in-

consistent with this act, and the doing of such other acts as may be necessary for such purpose.

OBJECT AND PURPOSE OF CORPORATION

SEC. 3. The corporation shall not be conducted for profit but shall have as its object and purpose, upon the payment of specified amounts, the payment of death benefits with respect to (1) persons who are or have been officers or members of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia, (2) wives of persons who are or have been officers or members of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia, and (3) persons who are or have been employees of the District of Columbia assigned to the Metropolitan Police Department.

CORPORATE POWERS

SEC. 4. The corporation shall have power—

(1) to enter into contracts with those persons described in section 3 of this act to pay death benefits with respect to such persons;

(2) to issue certificates of membership as evidence of the contracts referred to in paragraph (1);

(3) to collect specified amounts with respect to contracts for the payment of death benefits;

(4) to sue and be sued in any court of competent jurisdiction;

(5) to choose such officers, directors, managers, agents, and employees as the business of the corporation may require;

(6) to adopt, amend, and alter a constitution and bylaws, not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, the laws of the United States, and the laws in force in the District of Columbia for the management of its property and regulation of its affairs;

(7) to contract and be contracted with;

(8) to take and hold by lease, gift, purchase, grant, devise, or bequest any property, real or personal, necessary for attaining the object and carrying into effect the purpose of the corporation subject to applicable provisions of law in force in the District of Columbia;

(9) to transfer, encumber, and convey real or personal property;

(10) to adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal;

(11) to borrow money for the purposes of the corporation, issue bonds therefor, and secure such bonds, subject to the laws of the United States, and the laws in force in the District of Columbia;

(12) to invest the funds of the corporation only in such securities as the United States District Court for the District of Columbia may approve, from time to time, for the investment of funds by fiduciaries operating under its jurisdiction; and

(13) to do any and all acts and things necessary and proper to carry out the object and purpose of the corporation.

MEMBERSHIP; VOTING RIGHTS

SEC. 5. (a) Eligibility for membership in the corporation and the rights and privileges of members of the corporation shall, except as provided in this act, be determined by the constitution and bylaws of the corporation.

(b) Only members of the corporation shall have the right to vote on matters submitted to a vote at meetings of members of the corporation. Each member of the corporation shall have only one vote with respect to matters submitted to a vote at meetings of members of the corporation.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS; COMPOSITION, RESPONSIBILITIES

SEC. 6. (a) Upon enactment of this act, the membership of the board of directors of the corporation shall consist of those persons named in the first section of this act. Such persons shall remain on the board of directors of the corporation for a period of 1 year from the date of enactment of this act.

(b) After 1 year from the date of enactment of this act, the board of directors of the corporation shall be composed of (1) one officer or member from each precinct, bureau, and division of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia (who is a certificate holder of the corporation) elected by a majority vote of the certificate holders of the corporation who are assigned to the precinct, bureau, or division from which such officer or member is elected; (2) one member of the White House Police force (who is a certificate holder of the corporation) elected by a majority vote of the certificate holders of the corporation who are members of the White House Police force; and (3) one member of the Retired Men's Association of the Metropolitan Police Department (who is a certificate holder of the corporation) elected by a majority vote of the certificate holders of the corporation who are members of such association.

(c) The board of directors shall be the governing board of the corporation and shall be responsible for the general policies and program of the corporation. The board of directors may appoint from among its membership such committees as it may deem advisable to carry out the affairs of the corporation, including an executive committee and an investment committee.

(d) The board of directors shall make and adopt such bylaws for the conduct of the corporation as it may deem necessary and proper which are consistent with the terms of this act.

OFFICERS OF THE CORPORATION

SEC. 7. (a) The officers of the corporation shall be a chairman of the board of directors who shall also be the president of the corporation, a vice president, a secretary-treasurer, and an assistant secretary-treasurer. The duties of the officers of the corporation shall be as prescribed in the constitution and bylaws of the corporation.

(b) The board of directors shall elect the officers of the corporation in such manner as may be prescribed by the constitution and bylaws of the corporation.

USE OF INCOME; LOANS TO OFFICERS, DIRECTORS, OR EMPLOYEES

SEC. 8. (a) No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to any member, officer, or director, except as payment of death benefits or as remuneration for services which remuneration for services must be approved by the board of directors of the corporation.

(b) The corporation shall not make loans to its officers, directors, or employees. Any director who votes for or assents to the making of a loan to an officer, director, or employee of the corporation, and any officer who participates in the making of such loan, shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of such loan until the repayment thereof.

NONPOLITICAL NATURE OF CORPORATION

SEC. 9. The corporation, and its officers, directors, and duly appointed agents, as such, shall not contribute to or otherwise support or assist any political party or candidate for elective public office.

LIABILITY FOR ACTS OF OFFICERS AND AGENTS

SEC. 10. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

CHARITABLE CORPORATION, NOT SUBJECT TO INSURANCE LAWS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

SEC. 11. The corporation created by this act is declared to be a benevolent and charitable corporation, and all of the funds and property of such corporation shall be exempt from taxation, other than taxation on the real property of the corporation. Such corporation shall not be subject to the laws regulating the business of insurance in the District of Columbia.

BOOKS AND RECORDS; INSPECTION

SEC. 12. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall keep minutes of the proceedings of its members, board of directors, and committees having any of the authority of the board of directors; and it shall also keep a record of the names of its members. All books and records of the corporation may be inspected by any member, or his agent or attorney, for any proper purpose, at any reasonable time.

FILING WITH THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

SEC. 13. (a) The corporation shall file, with the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia or an agent designated by the Board, a copy of its bylaws and copies of the forms of contracts to be offered to eligible persons.

(b) The financial transactions of the corporation shall be audited annually, at the end of the fiscal year established by the corporation, by an independent certified public accountant in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the corporation are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the corporation and necessary to facilitate the audit shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audit; and the full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositors, fiscal agents, and custodians shall be afforded to such person or persons.

(c) A report of such audits shall be made by the corporation to the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia or an agent designated by the Board not later than 6 months following the close of such fiscal year for which the audit is made. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and shall include verification by the person or persons conducting the audit of statements of (1) assets and liabilities, (2) capital and surplus or deficit, (3) surplus or deficit analysis, (4) income and expenses, and (5) sources and application of funds. Such report shall also include a statement of the operations of the corporation for such fiscal year.

(d) If the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia or an agent designated by the Board for such purpose shall have reason to believe that the corporation is not complying with the provisions of this act, or is being operated for profit, or is being fraudulently conducted, they shall cause to be instituted the necessary proceedings to require compliance with this act, or to enjoin such improper conduct.

TRANSFER OF CONTRACTS, OBLIGATIONS, AND ASSETS

SEC. 14. The corporation is authorized and empowered to take over, assume, and carry out all contracts, obligations, and assets of the corporation heretofore organized and now doing business in the District of Columbia under the name of the Metropolitan Police Relief Association of the District of Columbia, upon discharging or satisfactorily providing for the payment and discharge of all liability of such corporation and upon complying with all laws in force in the District of Columbia applicable thereto.

AGENT IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

SEC. 15. The corporation shall maintain at all times in the District of Columbia a designated agent authorized to accept service of process for the corporation, and notice to or service upon such agent, or mailed to the business address of such agent, shall be deemed notice to or service upon the corporation.

RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO ALTER, AMEND, OR REPEAL CHARTER

SEC. 16. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 5, strike the name "Edwin S. Grayson" and insert in lieu thereof "Royce L. Givens."

On page 6, after line 15, insert the following:

"(b) Before entering upon his duties as secretary-treasurer or as assistant secretary-treasurer, each such officer shall be required to give a good and sufficient surety bond to the corporation in the amount of \$10,000, conditioned upon the faithful performance of his duties. For the purposes of this section the term "faithful performance of his duties" shall include the proper accounting for all funds and property received by reason of the position or employment of the individual so bonded and all duties and responsibilities imposed upon such individual by this act and by the constitution and bylaws of the corporation."

Page 7, line 8, strike out "(b)" and insert "(c)."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

MR. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to incorporate the Metropolitan Police Relief Association of the District of Columbia.

The bill provides that the corporation shall have power—

First. To enter into contracts with those persons described in section 3 of this act to pay death benefits with respect to such persons;

Second. To issue certificates of membership as evidence of the contracts.

Third. To collect specified amounts with respect to contracts for the payment of death benefits;

Fourth. To sue and be sued in any court of competent jurisdiction;

Fifth. To choose such officers, directors, managers, agents and employees as the business of the corporation may require;

Sixth. To adopt, amend, and alter a constitution and bylaws, not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, the laws of the United States and the laws in force in the District of Columbia for the management of its property and regulation of its affairs;

Seventh. To contract and be contracted with;

Eighth. To take and hold by lease, gift, purchase, grant, devise, or bequest any property, real or personal, necessary for attaining the object and carrying into effect the purpose of the corporation subject to applicable provisions of law in force in the District of Columbia;

Ninth. To transfer, encumber, and convey real or personal property;

Tenth. To borrow money for the purposes of the corporation, issue bonds therefor, and secure such bonds, subject to the laws of the United States, and the laws in force in the District of Columbia;

Eleventh. To invest the funds of the corporation only in such securities as the United States District Court for the District of Columbia may approve, from time to time, for the investment of funds by fiduciaries operating under its jurisdiction; and

Twelfth. To do any and all acts and things necessary and proper to carry out the object and purpose of the corporation.

In order to protect the members of the corporation the following provisions are set forth in the bill:

First. The secretary-treasurer and the assistant secretary-treasurer shall both be bonded.

Second. No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to any member, officer, or director except a payment of death benefits or as remuneration for services which remuneration for service must be approved by the board of directors of the corporation.

Third. The corporation shall not make loans to its officers, directors, or employees of the corporation, and any officer who participates in the making of such loan shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of such loan until the repayment thereof.

Fourth. The corporation and its officers, directors and duly appointed agents shall not contribute to or otherwise support or assist any political party.

Fifth. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

The corporation is declared to be a benevolent and charitable corporation and all of the funds and property are exempt from taxation, other than taxation on the real property of the corporation. The bill also provides that the corporation shall not be subject to the laws regulating the business of insurance in the District of Columbia.

The bill further provides that correct and complete books and records shall be kept and that they shall be inspected by any member or his agent or attorney for any proper purpose at any reasonable time.

The bill require the corporation to file with the Board of Commissioners, or their agent, a copy of its bylaws and copies of the forms of contracts to be offered to eligible persons.

Also provided for in the bill are the following:

First. Provides for an audit of accounts.

Second. Report of audit to be made to Board of Commissioners or an agent designated by the Board not later than 6 months following close of such fiscal year for which audit is made. The report shall include a statement of assets and liabilities, capital and surplus or deficit, surplus or deficit analysis, income and expenses, sources and application of funds and this report shall be verified by person conducting audit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 4840 is a bill to incorporate the Metropolitan Police Relief Association of the District of Columbia. In 1869 the metropolitan police formed this relief association. In 1911 the Congress passed the District of Columbia insurance bill which exempted this relief association from the laws concerning insurance. In 1934 another bill was passed in which the exemption was not mentioned. In

order that this organization may continue to operate it is necessary that they be incorporated.

The purpose of this bill is to incorporate the Metropolitan Police Relief Association of the District of Columbia.

The bill provides that the corporation shall have the power to:

First. To enter into contracts with those persons described in section 3 of this act to pay death benefits with respect to such persons;

Second. To issue certificates of membership as evidence of the contracts;

Third. To collect specified amounts with respect to contracts for the payment of death benefits;

Fourth. To sue and be sued in any court of competent jurisdiction;

Fifth. To choose such officers, directors, managers, agents and employees as the business of the corporation may require;

Sixth. To adopt, amend, and alter a constitution and bylaws, not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, the laws of the United States and the laws in force in the District of Columbia for the management of its property and regulation of its affairs;

Seventh. To contract and be contracted with;

Eighth. To take and hold by lease, gift, purchase, grant, devise, or bequest any property, real or personal, necessary for attaining the object and carrying into effect the purpose of the corporation subject to applicable provisions of law in force in the District of Columbia;

Ninth. To transfer, encumber, and convey real or personal property;

Tenth. To borrow money for the purposes of the corporation, issue bonds therefor, and secure such bonds, subject to the laws of the United States, and the laws in force in the District of Columbia;

Twelfth. To invest the funds of the corporation only in such securities as the United States District Court for the District of Columbia may approve, from time to time, for the investment of funds by fiduciaries operating under its jurisdiction; and

Thirteenth. To do any and all acts and things necessary and proper to carry out the object and purpose of the corporation.

In order to protect the members of the corporation the following provisions are set forth in the bill:

First. The secretary-treasurer and the assistant secretary-treasurer shall both be bonded.

Second. No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to any member, officer, or director except a payment of death benefits or as remuneration for services which remuneration for service must be approved by the board of directors of the corporation.

Third. The corporation shall not make loans to its officers, directors, or employees of the corporation, and any officer who participates in the making of such loan shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of such loan until the repayment thereof.

Fourth. The corporation and its officers, directors and duly appointed

agents shall not contribute to or otherwise support or assist any political party.

Fifth. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

The corporation is declared to be a benevolent and charitable corporation and all of the funds and property are exempt from taxation, other than taxation on the real property of the corporation. The bill also provides that the corporation shall not be subject to the laws regulating the business of insurance in the District of Columbia.

The bill further provides that correct and complete books and records shall be kept and that they shall be inspected by any member of his agent or attorney for any proper purpose at any reasonable time.

The bill requires the corporation to file with the Board of Commissioners, or their agent, a copy of its bylaws and copies of the forms of contracts to be offered to eligible persons.

Also provided for in the bill are the following:

First. Provides for an audit of accounts.

Second. Report of audit to be made to Board of Commissioners or an agent designated by the Board not later than 6 months following close of such fiscal year for which audit is made. The report shall include a statement of assets and liabilities, capital and surplus or deficit, surplus or deficit analysis, income and expenses, sources and application of funds and this report shall be verified by person conducting audit.

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

AUTHORIZING COMMISSIONERS TO CONSTRUCT BRIDGES

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Committee on District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 6306) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two 4-lane bridges to replace the existing 14th Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes," and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gentleman is going to take some time to explain this bill to the House.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I will be glad to explain it as fully as the gentleman wishes me to.

Mr. GROSS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the first section of the act entitled "An act authorizing and

directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two 4-lane bridges to replace the existing 14th Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes," approved July 16, 1946 (60 Stat. 566), is amended (a) by inserting "bascule-span" immediately after "four-lane"; and (b) by striking "\$7,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$17,500,000."

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to amend the act authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two 4-lane bridges to replace the existing 14th Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes.

The act approved July 16, 1946, authorized the construction of two 4-lane bridges across the Potomac River to replace the older structure known as the 14th Street or Highway Bridge, at a cost not to exceed \$7 million. Because of the extremely rapid inflationary cost of heavy construction from the time that estimates were made in 1946 until construction of one of the two bridges began, the final cost of the first of the two bridges amounted to approximately \$6,800,000, or substantially the amount authorized by Congress for both bridges.

Present plans call for the replacement of the older south-bound structure. The cost of this work, together with the cost of constructing the approaches to the new bridge is estimated at \$9,200,000. In order to complete the work required by the act of July 16, 1946, the Commissioners request the amendment of that act so as to authorize appropriations totaling \$16 million—of which \$6,800,000 has already been expended for the northbound bridge at 14th Street. Appropriations not exceeding \$9,200,000 would be authorized to be made for the replacement of the existing southbound 14th Street Bridge.

The District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1957, approved June 29, 1956, included an appropriation of \$1,750,000 for the construction of the second of the two bridges authorized by the act of July 16, 1946.

The House Committee on Appropriations in reporting the bill which became the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1957—House Report No. 1896—made the following statement:

The committee has approved the funds requested for the Highway Bridge replacement but has stricken the language raising the ceiling on the cost of construction of the 2 spans from \$7 million to \$16 million, and suggests that this increased limitation be requested of the proper legislative committee.

The Comptroller General has ruled that the District of Columbia may not enter into a contract for construction of the second bridge authorized by the act of July 16, 1946, for any amount in excess of the amount appropriated.

In view of the urgent need for a new southbound bridge at this location the Commissioners recommended early action on the bill.

To carry out the recommendations set forth in this letter, Hon JAMES C. DAVIS, a member of the House District Committee, on March 11, 1957, introduced a bill, H. R. 5816, for the purpose of

increasing the authorized appropriation from \$7 million to \$16 million.

At a hearing before a subcommittee of the House District Committee on Thursday, March 21, 1957, the Director of the Highway Department for the District of Columbia testified on this legislation and explained the need for a bridge at that location authorized in this bill. The Director of Highways testified that in an inspection made by engineers of his Department in 1950 "that the bridge had a life that would expire in 1960." Upon being questioned by the members of the subcommittee the Director of the Highway Department testified that the bridge presently in use would become unsafe by 1960. The Director of the Highway Department and an engineer from his department exhibited to members of the subcommittee a clip angle from the bridge which had broken and further testified that there were as many as 17 clip angles which had been cracked. The Director of Highways further testified that if the use of the bridge continued beyond 1960 it might be necessary to spend millions of dollars to make the necessary repairs in order to maintain the bridge in a safe condition. It was further testified that if such repairs could not be made it might be necessary to condemn further use of this bridge after the year 1960.

Testimony before the members of the subcommittee brought out the fact that the Highway Department had planned to construct a bridge across the Potomac at the point authorized in the bill, without a draw. Upon further consideration the subcommittee voted unanimously to write language into the bill which would require a bascule span bridge and increased the appropriation from \$16 million to \$17,500,000. The additional \$1,500,000 being the amount estimated it would cost to provide a bascule span in the proposed bridge.

At a meeting of the full House District Committee on Monday, March 25, 1957, the members of the committee by a unanimous vote authorized the approval of \$17,500,000 upon the condition that a bascule span-type bridge be built and authorized me, as the chairman of the subcommittee, to introduce a clean bill containing these provisions.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in 1946 an authorization was passed to construct two 14th Street bridges, one incoming and one outgoing. The incoming bridge has been constructed, and due to increased costs the \$7 million which was authorized for the construction of both these bridges was almost entirely used up. The actual sum used in the construction of the first bridge was \$6.8 million. That left only \$200,000 available for the construction of the outgoing 14th Street Bridge. This bill would authorize an additional sum to construct the outgoing 14th Street Bridge. The additional sum authorized is \$10½ million. That is for the purpose of constructing according to the estimates of Mr. Robertson, the head of the Highway Department of the District, a bridge which corresponds exactly as to construction and design and distance from the high and low level of the water

to the present newly constructed incoming 14th Street Bridge.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This means, then, that all of the taxpayers of the country are going to spend \$10 million to build another bridge across the Potomac River; is that correct?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. That is correct; I believe it is \$10½ million. The reason for that is, as the gentleman knows, that this bridge is on the main United States Route No. 1. It carries traffic to and from the Shirley Highway and other highways coming into Washington.

Mr. GROSS. But the gentleman will agree, will he not, that this bridge will serve mainly the traffic between the District of Columbia and the States of Virginia and Maryland?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. It serves all of that traffic, but it serves any traffic coming from that direction into Washington, and moving from Washington in that direction.

Mr. GROSS. Is any contribution being made to the construction of this bridge by the States of Virginia and Maryland, and the District of Columbia?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. The staff counsel informs me that the State of Virginia contributes toward the construction of the approaches on the Virginia side and that the District of Columbia contributes toward the cost of the approaches on the District of Columbia side.

Mr. GROSS. How much do they contribute?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I do not have the figures.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Last year there was \$15 million appropriated for a bridge down at Alexandria, Va., known as the Jones Point Bridge. I understand that there is another bridge being proposed as an extension to Constitution Avenue which will probably cost—it will be either a bridge or a tunnel—\$25 million. It seems to me that the taxpayers of the States of Virginia and Maryland ought to contribute something to the building of these bridges.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. They are contributing to the building of the approaches.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think it has not been called to the attention of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] that the Pentagon Building is at the south approach to that bridge. Virginia did not have anything to do with putting the Pentagon Building over there. The Navy Department Building is just up on the hill from there. There are large Federal Government installations situated on the other side of the river. Virginia did not tell them to put them over there. They just put them over there

for the convenience of the Government. Those people have got to move back and forth across the river.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] and anybody who cares to listen that when they get all the proposed bridges built, if they ever do, there will not be enough of them.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. With reference to that, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa first that I appreciate his vigilance in looking out for the taxpayers of the country, but we had the head of the District Highway Department before the committee discussing this bridge. He testified that there is approximately the same number of vehicles leaving the District of Columbia with their occupants going to work in the Pentagon Building and the Navy Building and the other buildings and installations over there as there are vehicles coming into the District of Columbia with Virginia residents who work here in the District.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is this bill open to pro forma amendments?

The SPEAKER. It is open to amendments, being considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. The testimony was very definite about this bridge that by 1960 the present outgoing 14th Street Bridge will have to be condemned. It will not be safe for travel longer than that time. The testimony was that these angle clips which hold the floor to the foundation of the bridge have become worn and fatigued. Mr. Robertson had some of them there to demonstrate their condition at the time we were holding hearings on this bill. He said they had had to take 17 of them out and replace them within the last 3 or 4 weeks and that this bridge would not be safe longer than 1960 and would have to be condemned unless replaced by that time. He also said that it would take 9 to 12 months to plan the bridge and 2½ to 3 years to construct it, and that it is imperative to get it started immediately.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. It seems to me that this is a very, very important bill insofar as it reaches into the pockets of the taxpayers all over the land to the extent of about \$10 million. I think you had better take this bill back and get a rule on it and give us a couple or 3 hours of debate on it. This is too important a bill to consider this way. I do not think it ought to be passed this way.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. What objection does the gentleman have to passing it today?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. If you pass it today, with no more Members on the floor than there are, you are going to come back here in a few days and ask \$10 million from the Committee on Appropriations with which to build the bridge. I think we ought to have more consideration of this matter. I am surprised you bring the bill up in the way you have today, a bill that involves so much money.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. We brought it up in the regular way. Of course, I appreciate the gentleman's comments, but we did bring it up in the regular way, after full hearings and after it was reported out unanimously by the subcommittee and the full committee.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Where are those hearings?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Here they are.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. It looks thin to me.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. We did not seek to make them large just for the fun of it. We heard everyone who wanted to be heard, after due notice, and we went into great detail about it.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HYDE. Is it not true that this bill is in effect merely an amendment of a former bridge bill? We have already approved the bridge as such by previous legislation. All this does is approve it for the purpose of putting in a draw.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. That is correct.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did I understand the gentleman correctly to say that this bridge has already been authorized?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Yes. This is simply to increase the authorization, because the money that was authorized for the two bridges was all spent, except \$200,000, to build the first bridge, the incoming 14th Street Bridge.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is to say, Congress authorized two bridges and you spent all the money on one, the first one?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Congress authorized two bridges, to cost \$7 million. That was in 1946. They constructed the first bridge at a cost of \$6,800,000. There was only \$200,000 left.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. This bridge is authorized only to the extent of about one-half million dollars. If it goes through it will be authorized to the extent of about \$10 million. Let us put the gentleman from Michigan straight. He was thinking right in the first place.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I have endeavored to give all the figures that were asked for.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. You would not call this a million-dollar authorization bill for a bridge across the Potomac River; would you?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Two bridges were authorized by the act of 1946 at a cost of \$7 million. They went to work and built the first bridge at a cost of \$6,800,000. The present bill is to increase the authorized amounts so as to

be able to build the outgoing 14th Street Bridge.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Why does not the District of Columbia since this is a Federal highway, why does the money for this bridge not come out of the Public Roads Administration fund like all other bridges throughout the country? Why must the District of Columbia come here and always ask for special favors and special money and burden the taxpayers all over the country to build bridges here when they can get it out of available Federal road and bridge aids? Why must they be given special consideration?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. This is the setup under which these bridges are built. All of the bridges that are now in existence have been paid for in the same way that this one is going to be paid for, and all of them went through the same legislative procedure.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, I have an amendment to offer, to correct a typographical error.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: On page 2, line 2, strike out the first sum and insert "\$7,000,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, we are confronted here again today with the same old story of building another bridge across the Potomac River for the particular benefit of the District of Columbia and the States of Maryland and Virginia at a cost of \$10½ million. Last year, as I said a while ago, \$15 million was appropriated to build a bridge at Jones Point. In other words, at Alexandria, Va., a 6-lane highway bridge costing about \$15 million with the States of Virginia and Maryland contributing nothing to that bridge except the approaches, and I am not sure that the State of Maryland has even agreed to build the approach on that side of the river. Still another bridge is proposed here at the end of Constitution Avenue or somewhere in that area—either a bridge or a tunnel to Virginia costing \$24 million or \$25 million, with the taxpayers of the entire country paying for that bridge, too. There was a time, I understand, when the District of Columbia did spend some money building bridges across the Potomac River, but that was a long, long time ago when the District of Columbia recognized its responsibility and probably the States of Maryland and Virginia did, too. Today, it has become the fashion to hand this over to the taxpayers of the entire country. I simply take the floor to warn you of what you are about to do if you vote for the construction of this four-lane highway bridge across the Potomac River at 14th Street. You are going to supply the money—that is, the taxpayers you represent—the tax-

payers of the entire country. Bridges are not built on that basis across the rivers in your districts throughout the Nation.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I would call to the attention of the gentleman from Iowa that the procedure provided in this bill is the same as that under which the present incoming 14th Street Bridge was constructed. We are not asking for any different procedure to be followed at all with reference to this bridge.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman refers, as I take it, to the incoming 14th Street; is that correct?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is referring to the incoming 14th Street and not the old bridge that this would supplant.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Well, they both are called 14th Street bridges, you see. One handles the traffic only going in and the other handles only traffic going out.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman what money built the bridge which is now used for outgoing traffic across the Potomac?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I was not here then. That was built, I believe, in 1904. I am unable to tell the gentleman. But, I suppose it was built in the same way.

Mr. GROSS. No. I think the gentleman would find there was a time when the District of Columbia spent some money to build bridges as well as the States nearby. If Members of the House are interested in economy they will vote down this bridge proposition.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. O'KONSKI. We appropriated \$7 million originally to build two bridges and we got one.

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. O'KONSKI. They are now asking for \$10 million. Is it not likely that they will be asking for another \$10 million before long?

Mr. GROSS. I do not know. I would not be surprised if they asked for another \$10 million or some part of it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it, this bill is an authorization for another bridge across the Potomac. Without this bill they cannot build another bridge.

We allowed \$7 million to build two bridges. They spent \$6.5 million or more on one and they have little money left. Now they want to increase the amount of the original authorization as you will see from page 2, line 2, by striking out \$7 million and inserting in lieu thereof \$17,500,000. They are more than doubling the original appropriation for the one additional bridge. The original appropriation of \$7 million, less than half of this amount, was to build two bridges. Now they want \$10,500,000 to build one bridge.

I want to say to my own friends on this side, and especially my good friend from the Eighth Congressional District of Indiana, the gentleman from Evansville [Mr. DENTON], I believe we have four bridges between Evansville, Ind., and Cincinnati, Ohio, crossing the Ohio River. Our people have to drive between 40 and 50 miles to get to one bridge across the Ohio River, yet right here within 4 miles of the spot I am standing we have five bridges crossing the Potomac.

I am not going to ask my people to appropriate \$10,500,000 to put an extra bridge here when they already have five bridges within 4 miles of where I am standing and my people are having to drive 40 miles to find one bridge. The people in most of our districts have to do as in mine, wait for a bridge until they can get the money to pay for it.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to examine this thing very closely, especially in the light of the authorizations that have already been made by the Congress of the United States. You will find that there are more than \$500 million of authorizations for construction in the vicinity of the District of Columbia. Five hundred million dollars is half a billion. That is what the Congress has authorized in the last year and in the past 2 years. \$500 million of construction to be paid for by the taxpayers all over the Nation.

This bill, if it passes, will be in excess of \$10 million more.

I think we ought to call a halt to these handouts that are always being asked by the District of Columbia and vicinity, handouts for school aid, handouts of all kinds. Just the other day I saw a trade publication, and that trade publication published an advertisement by industry here in Washington, D. C., stating that the District of Columbia has the highest average national income of any place in the world—not in the Nation, in the world. The average per capita income in the District of Columbia and vicinity is the highest of any place in the world, yet every day they are coming here for another handout at the expense of the taxpayers all over the Nation. I think we ought to stop, look, and listen on this thing. Certainly, as far as I am concerned, this thing is not going to pass without a rollcall. The President of the United States has stopped construction and has asked that construction be stopped on various projects all over the Nation because it might lead to inflation. Here we have already authorized \$500 million for construction in the District of Columbia and they are asking for more.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this bill will be defeated.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise once again to call the attention of the gentleman from Iowa to the fact that the Founding Fathers of this country in their wisdom set up a Federal city which was to be the property of all the people of the United States of America. That

city is Washington in the District of Columbia.

I might remind the gentleman from Iowa also that the land on which we are standing and on which this building is standing was given to the Federal Government by the State of Maryland.

I remind him, too, that if he were to drive down the streets of the city of Washington he will see many cars from Iowa as well as cars from all over the country coming here to the Capital of the United States. They must use these bridges as an approach to the Capital of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this is a peculiar situation. It is peculiar to the District of Columbia and to the city of Washington which, as I said, is the Federal city. We have, therefore, a duty to provide the approaches to this city for the people of the country. It is not for the specific or special benefit of the people of the States of Maryland and Virginia. As the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] pointed out, the Government placed some of these agencies in our States. True, sometimes we asked for them—I will beat you to the punch—we did ask for them, but it is all part of the Government.

I might add for the benefit of the gentleman from Michigan, too, that if he will get himself a fishing license and come down to see me, I will be very happy to provide him with fishing grounds. I dare say in Maryland we do not bait ducks or use live tollers any more than they do in Michigan, or anywhere else in the country.

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

Mr. LANKFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman will also agree that those Iowans who drive cars to the District of Columbia have to pay a toll to cross the Mississippi River in order to get to Washington, D. C.

Mr. LANKFORD. Did the State of Iowa provide land for the Capital of the United States?

Mr. GROSS. Iowans paid their share of the taxes.

Mr. LANKFORD. You paid taxes, certainly, as has everyone else, as have the people of Maryland and Virginia paid taxes. We pay for these bridges, too.

Mr. BROYHILL. 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to increase an original authorization by an amount sufficient to replace the old 14th Street Bridge.

This work was considered not only desirable but vitally necessary by the Congress a number of years ago and due to delay in getting the work done costs have gone up like they have on everything else.

The testimony received by the Committee on the District of Columbia merely bears out the original contention of the Congress that this bridge is worn

out and unless replaced in the near future is in serious danger of collapsing. To delay this project any further can only cause a possible further increase as well as place lives in jeopardy.

In addition, I think we can all agree that as a matter of preserving the beauty of this approach to our Nation's Capital that this antiquated structure should be replaced.

Then, of course, we are all aware of the need of additional traffic lanes over the Potomac. The replacement of this structure will provide one additional lane.

Now, as far as the age-old argument is concerned regarding who is going to pay for this. Let me point out that the Congress has authorized 90-percent Federal participation in the cost of interstate highways all over the country. We should certainly not argue about agreeing to this work which is not only part of an interstate system but vitally affects the Nation's Capital. The capital of all our people.

I urge favorable action on this legislation.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the only reason I am taking the time to make some observations on this bill is to point up, if I can, the importance of following correct procedures in considering matters of authorizations and appropriations. If following correct procedures is important, then a vote against measures that have not been considered under proper procedures is indicated.

To put it briefly, a person can be in complete accord with the idea that a new bridge should be built to replace the existing 14th Street bridge and yet vote against H. R. 6306.

The hearings on H. R. 6306, although quoted to some extent in the 2½-page report accompanying the bill, were not printed and were unavailable to the House membership during this debate.

The members of the committee which voted out this bill and were handling it on the floor were unable to answer the very pertinent question of how much Maryland and Virginia were contributing to this project, although it was stated that they were contributing something.

The question of why this Federal highway bridge could not be constructed under the Federal highway program remained unanswered, although the pertinency of the question was obvious. What was not so obvious is the provision under the Federal Highway Act calling for a 10-percent State matching of funds. Is this why the normal course was not followed?

The most important question of all remained undiscussed. Has inflation and heavy construction costs been such that a project estimated at \$7 million in July 1946 now is estimated at \$17,500,000? On the face of it some pretty factual and detailed explanation is in order.

Finally the question of why the drawbridge features were included in the project was not fully answered, although there was indication that the answers were available in the hearings had the hearings been made available.

The basic issue involved in this authorization bill is the basic issue that exists in almost every authorization and appropriation bill that comes before the House. The question is not so much of whether the objectives of the project are good and noble, but whether the planning will attain these objectives. Until the House is willing to go behind labels in order to see whether the product lives up to the label, we will never get on the top of Federal spending.

The press and the public relations media are even more prone than the Congressmen to take the label at face value and so create pressures among the people. From a practical standpoint, it is these pressures which largely prevent the Congressmen who are willing to go behind labels from doing so.

Now, I am not against the building of a new bridge at 14th Street. I am against authorizing what on the face seems to be a half-baked project, or a half-baked presentation of a project, that says it is for building such a bridge at 14th Street.

Nor am I against veterans, old people, sick people, retarded children, friends abroad, the farmers, the laboring man, and all the other groups that the label followers would have the people believe I am against. I am against phony products sold under false labels. To protect the people against phony products I ask the Congress to stand up and look behind labels. I ask the Congress to follow correct procedure in debating authorization and appropriation bills.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the pending legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my colleagues that the present bridge was built 53 years ago. There are 25 supporting angle arms to this bridge, of which 22 already have either weakened because of the terrific load on the bridge or have cracked. Others are going fast. This bridge needs almost weekly inspection in order to keep the bridge safe. We have reduced the truckload to 10 tons on each truck in order to have a not too heavy weight for the bridge to support.

I would like to remind the Members of Congress, too, that it is our obligation to run the Federal City that the gentleman spoke so eloquently about. Sometimes Members do not want to serve on the District of Columbia Committee. Others who do serve on the committee are very conscientious in performing their duties.

Coming from the great State of Pennsylvania I am only too happy when the need for an additional bridge presents itself to rise to my obligation to support such legislation. I hope all of you will deem it wise to do the same thing, because we need the bridge. It is not helping any particular State; it is helping the entire Nation and I hope we will have the wisdom to do the right thing here today.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal of talk about this bridge which, it seems to me, does not in any way touch on that which is most important in the consideration of appropriating Federal money for its construction. It is very necessary for national defense. That is one good reason for its construction with Federal funds.

Another good reason for it is this: In your States, where you build bridges across various rivers, they are paid for not by the particular city that the bridge happens to touch, but they are paid for by the whole State, all the States which they connect.

Now, the District of Columbia is not part of a State. The whole burden of this cost would have to fall on one city if you were to ask the District of Columbia to pay for it. The District of Columbia is part of the United States, and that is another reason why the United States should have to pay for these bridges. I think this whole discussion here overlooks some of these very, very important points. Certainly the Federal Government should provide for bridges so that this Nation's business and this Nation's Capital can be properly run and operate.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to call the attention of the Members to this fact. Some of the opponents who have spoken have said we ought not to bring this bill up in this way. Now, today is District Day. This bill is being brought up today as all other District bills are. It has had the usual routine of legislative procedure and it is coming up in the regular way.

Now, there are some 112,000 vehicles using these two 14th Street bridges every day. The testimony was that the entire crossings of all the bridges over the Potomac are now 244,000 per day. I imagine that some of you people were down yesterday and saw the terrific bottleneck which existed there at the Jefferson Memorial where the cherry-blossom festival was going on. I understand it took an hour and a half to get a car by that.

Now, the testimony is very definite that this bridge is going to be condemned in 1960, whether there is any new bridge built or not. That is just 3 years away. If you think you can get along without it, that is all right, but you certainly will see some awful traffic bottlenecks there unless this new bridge is built to take over when the old bridge is condemned.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. It is simply my contention that the States of Virginia and Maryland and the District of Columbia ought to participate in the building of this bridge and all of these other bridges that are being built to serve particularly the needs of this area.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I appreciate the gentleman's concern, but I think that has already been answered by those who have spoken to the point.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. Why is this not a part of the interstate highway, and why should it not be taken out of the special tax fund for the interstate highway?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Well, I did not draw the legislation for either one. As I said, we are proceeding under the existing legislation here that these other bridges have been built under.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is there any prospect of making this a toll bridge?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I do not think so.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, this is a question of some seriousness and some emergency because of the condemnation that is intended for this bridge.

What I would like to remind my friends is, in answer to this discussion that Virginia ought to pay part of the cost of this bridge, that the State of Virginia, like your own States, is not authorized to build bridges in other States. Now, the District of Columbia boundary is the high-water mark on the Virginia side. Virginia has no authority to build a bridge if we wanted to, and we could not. But the testimony of the Engineers was very clear and very positive that this bridge had to be condemned in 1960. If you authorize it today it will take all of the time between now and the date of the condemnation of the bridge in order to have it ready when this other bridge is put out of commission. The Engineers brought before the committee some things that shocked me, some exhibits of the steel in this bridge. We have these pieces of steel, as they were shown to us, that were broken entirely. Other were cracked with the constant vibration all day long.

This is a serious situation. It does not involve so much the State of Virginia or the State of Maryland or the State of Ohio, but it does very seriously involve the operation of the Government of the United States. Let us look at some of the things over there that the Government put there; Virginia did not ask them to put them there. But in the first place there is the Pentagon Building. That is right at the approach to this bridge. The people working there have to get across the river in the morning to do their work and they have to get back at night. Then on the hill, half a mile away, you have the Navy Department Building. These are large buildings, where thousands of employees of this Government work; not of the State of Virginia, nor of the State of Maryland, nor of the State of Ohio, but of the Federal Government. The Federal Government put them there.

Then you have Fort Myer. You have the signal station just a little distance away. Then you have Fort Belvoir, a large Army engineer establishment with thousands of Government employees and

members of the Armed Forces who have to get back and forth between there and Washington. Then you have further down the Quantico station, which is a large installation.

Incidentally, we have another little installation over there that affects many Members of Congress, the National Airport. Thousands of vehicles go over there every day.

So what are we going to do about it? I complain as much as anybody about the high cost of everything. I complain about these inaccurate estimates of what these projects are going to cost. I think the estimates ought to be more accurate. But we are confronted here with an emergency situation. The question is whether or not you are going to be able to build this bridge in time to take care of the Government installations. There are other bridges on the river. Virginia people who do not have business with the Government can change their hours a little bit and get across on some of the other bridges. But there are thousands and thousands of Government employees who have to punch a time clock and come in on time.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WIER. There is one point in this bill that disturbs me a little bit, and I was going to ask a question about it of the chairman. I believe there is about \$1 1/2 million in this bill for a drawspan. I am told that there are only one or two boats that ever go beyond that bridge. They are only a couple of oil boats that go up the river; and that outside of that there is no use for a drawspan in this bridge.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is a navigable river. We have a port at Georgetown, one of the oldest ports in the history of this country. It does a considerable business. I do not think the House of Representatives is ready as yet to do away with navigation on that river. As a matter of fact, that question came up in the Committee on the District of Columbia and the committee unanimously voted against closing the Potomac River to transportation. We do not know what the future developments of Georgetown Harbor may be. But if you do not have a draw on that bridge, you will put a period to the future development of that harbor.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WILSON of Indiana moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant-at-Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 190, nays 131, not voting 111, as follows:

[Roll No. 52] YEAS—190		
Abbitt	Gordon	Multer
Abernethy	Granahan	Murray
Albert	Gray	Natcher
Allen, Calif.	Green, Oreg.	Neal
Arends	Gubser	Nicholson
Ashley	Hale	Norblad
Ashmore	Hardy	Norrell
Auchincloss	Harrison, Va.	O'Brien, Ill.
Avery	Haskell	O'Brien, N. Y.
Ayres	Hays, Ohio	O'Hara, Ill.
Bailey	Hebert	O'Hara, Minn.
Baldwin	Hemphill	O'Neill
Bass, Tenn.	Heseltine	Passman
Beckworth	Hess	Patman
Blatnik	Hollifield	Perkins
Blitch	Holland	Pilcher
Boggs	Holmes	Poff
Bolling	Holt	Porter
Bolton	Horan	Preston
Bonner	Hosmer	Price
Boykin	Huddleston	Rains
Brooks, La.	Hull	Reuss
Brown, Calif.	Hyde	Rhodes, Pa.
Brown, Ohio	Ikard	Riley
Broyhill	James	Rivers
Burdick	Jenkins	Roberts
Bush	Jennings	Robeson, Va.
Byrd	Johnson	Robston, Ky.
Byrnes, Wis.	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Fla.
Canfield	Karsten	Rogers, Mass.
Cannon	Kean	Saund
Carnahan	Kearns	Scherer
Christopher	Kee	Scott, N. C.
Clevenger	Keeney	Scott, Pa.
Coad	Kelley, Pa.	Selden
Cole	Kilday	Shuford
Cooley	King	Sieminski
Cooper	Kirwan	Sikes
Curtis, Mass.	Knutson	Simpson, Ill.
Davis, Ga.	Landrum	Sisk
Dawson, Ill.	Lanham	Smith, Miss.
Dellay	Lankford	Smith, Va.
Dempsey	Long	Staggers
Denton	Loser	Stauffer
Devereux	McCarthy	Steed
Dorn, S. C.	McFall	Talle
Doyle	McGovern	Teague, Tex.
Dwyer	McGregor	Thompson, N. J.
Fallion	McMillan	Thompson, Tex.
Fascell	Mack, Ill.	Trimble
Feighan	Mahon	Tuck
Fenton	Mailliard	Udall
Flood	Mason	Ullman
Forand	Matthews	Vanik
Ford	Merrow	Vinson
Forrester	Metcalfe	Vorys
Fountain	Miller, Calif.	Wainwright
Frazier	Miller, Md.	Watts
Frelinghuysen	Mills	Whitener
Garmatz	Morgan	Widnall
Gary	Morris	Wolverton
Gathings	Morrison	Yates
Gavin	Moss	
George		
NAYS—131		
Addonizio	Berry	Chiperfield
Allen, Ill.	Bow	Church
Andersen,	Boyle	Collier
H. Carl	Bray	Colmer
Andrews	Brooks, Tex.	Cunningham,
Antuso	Broomfield	Iowa
Baker	Brownson	Cunningham,
Baring	Budge	Nebr.
Bates	Burleson	Curtin
Beamer	Byrne, Ill.	Curtis, Mo.
Belcher	Cederberg	Dague
Bennett, Fla.	Chamberlain	Dawson, Utah
Bennett, Mich.	Cheif	Dennison

Derouian	McIntosh	Schenck	Mr. Walter with Mr. Baumhart.
Dingell	McVey	Schwengel	Mr. Lennon with Mr. Coudert.
Dixon	Macdonald	Scudder	Mr. Keogh with Mr. Cretella.
Dowdy	Mack, Wash.	Seely-Brown	Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Sadlak.
Evins	Madden	Sheehan	Mr. Santangelo with Mr. Scrivner.
Fisher	Marshall	Siler	Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Wilson of California.
Griffiths	Meader	Smith, Calif.	Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Keating.
Gross	Michel	Smith, Kans.	Mr. Teller with Mr. Latham.
Hagen	Miller, Nebr.	Smith, Wis.	Mr. Healey with Mr. Bentley.
Haley	Miller, N. Y.	Sullivan	Mr. Buckley with Mr. Fino.
Harden	Moore	Taber	Mr. Celler with Mr. Cramer.
Harrison, Nebr.	Moulder	Taylor	Mr. Delaney with Mr. Bosch.
Harvey	Mumma	Teague, Calif.	Mr. Powell with Mr. Betts.
Henderson	Nimtz	Tewes	Mr. Barrett with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.
Herlong	O'Konski	Thomas	Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Van Peit.
Hiestand	Ostertag	Thomson, Wyo.	Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Dooley.
Hill	Tollefson	Utt	Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. McConnell.
Hoeven	Felly	Van Zandt	Mr. Boland with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Hoffman	Frost	Weaver	Mr. Donohue with Mr. Vursell.
Jensen	Pillion	Wharton	Mr. Zelenko with Mr. McCulloch.
Johansen	Polk	Whitten	Mr. Breeding with Mr. May.
Jones, Mo.	Rabaut	Wier	Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Westland.
Kilburn	Ray	Wigglesworth	Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Krueger.
Kilgore	Reed	Williams, N. Y.	Mr. Jarman with Mr. Patterson.
Knox	Rees, Kans.	Wilson, Ind.	Mr. Kitchin with Mr. Osmers.
Laird	Rhodes, Ariz.	Winstead	Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Prouty.
LeCompte	Riehman	Withrow	Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Chenoweth.
Lesinski	Rodino	Wright	Mr. Lane with Mr. Kearney.
Lipscomb	Roney	Younger	
McDonough	Rutherford	Zablocki	
McIntire	St. George		
	Saylor		

NOT VOTING—111

Adair	Dooley	McCulloch	Messrs. ROONEY, JONES of Missouri,
Alexander	Dorn, N. Y.	Machrowicz	SCHENCK, and RHODES of Arizona
Alger	Durham	Magnuson	changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."
Anderson, Mont.	Eberhardt	Martin	Messrs. KELLEY of Pennsylvania,
Andresen, August H.	Edmondson	May	RHODES of Pennsylvania, and DELLAY
Aspinall	Elliott	Morano	changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."
Barden	Engle	Osmers	The result of the vote was announced
Barrett	Farbstein	Patterson	as above recorded.
Bass, N. H.	Fino	Philbin	The doors were opened.
Baumhart	Fogarty	Poage	A motion to reconsider was laid on
Becker	Friedel	Powell	the table.
Bentley	Fulton	Prouty	
Beets	Grant	Radwan	
Boland	Green, Pa.	Reece, Tenn.	
Bosch	Gregory	Rogers, Colo.	
Bowler	Gwin	Rogers, Tex.	
Breeding	Halleck	Roosevelt	
Brown, Mo.	Harris	Sadiak	
Buckley	Hays, Ark.	Santangelo	
Byrne, Pa.	Healey	Scrivner	
Carrigg	Hillings	Shelley	
Celler	Holtzman	Sheppard	
Chenoweth	Jackson	Simpson, Pa.	
Chudoff	Jarman	Spence	
Clark	Judd	Springer	
Coffin	Kearney	Teller	
Corbett	Keating	Thompson, La.	
Coudert	Kelly, N. Y.	Thornberry	
Cramer	Keogh	Van Felt	
Cretella	Kitchin	Vursell	
Davis, Tenn.	Kluczynski	Walter	
Delaney	Krueger	Westland	
Dies	Lane	Williams, Miss.	
Diggs	Latham	Willis	
Dollinger	Lennon	Wilson, Calif.	
Donohue	McConnell	Young	
	McCormack	Zelenko	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Young of Texas for, with Mr. Radwan against.

Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Holtzman against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Corbett.

Mr. Engel with Mr. Gwin.

Mr. McCormack with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Anderson of Montana with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Dies with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Friedel with Mr. Hillings.

Mr. Alexander with Mr. Adair.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Becker.

Mr. Will with Mr. Dorn of New York.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Jackson.

Mr. Coffin with Mr. Springer.

Mr. Brown of Missouri with Mr. Fulton.

Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Morano.

Mr. Machrowicz with Mr. Carrigg.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. August H. Anderson.

Schenck	Schwengel	Mr. Walter with Mr. Baumhart.
Macdonald	Scudder	Mr. Lennon with Mr. Coudert.
Mack, Wash.	Seely-Brown	Mr. Keogh with Mr. Cretella.
Madden	Sheehan	Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Sadlak.
Marshall	Siler	Mr. Santangelo with Mr. Scrivner.
Meader	Smith, Calif.	Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Wilson of California.
Michel	Smith, Kans.	Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Keating.
Miller, Nebr.	Smith, Wis.	Mr. Teller with Mr. Latham.
Miller, N. Y.	Sullivan	Mr. Healey with Mr. Bentley.
Minshall	Taber	Mr. Buckley with Mr. Fino.
O'Konski	Taylor	Mr. Celler with Mr. Cramer.
Ostertag	Teague, Calif.	Mr. Delaney with Mr. Bosch.
Tollefson	Tewes	Mr. Powell with Mr. Betts.
Felly	Thomas	Mr. Barrett with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.
Pfost	Thomson, Wyo.	Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Van Peit.
Pillion	Tollefson	Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Dooley.
Polk	Utt	Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. McConnell.
Rabaut	Van Zandt	Mr. Boland with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Ray	Weaver	Mr. Donohue with Mr. Vursell.
Reed	Wharton	Mr. Zelenko with Mr. McCulloch.
Rees, Kans.	Whitten	Mr. Breeding with Mr. May.
Rhodes, Ariz.	Wier	Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Westland.
Riehman	Wigglesworth	Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Krueger.
Rodino	Williams, N. Y.	Mr. Jarman with Mr. Patterson.
Roney	Wilson, Ind.	Mr. Kitchin with Mr. Osmers.
Rutherford	Winstead	Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Prouty.
St. George	Withrow	Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Chenoweth.
Saylor	Wright	Mr. Lane with Mr. Kearney.

Schenck	Schwengel	Mr. Walter with Mr. Baumhart.
Macdonald	Scudder	Mr. Lennon with Mr. Coudert.
Mack, Wash.	Seely-Brown	Mr. Keogh with Mr. Cretella.
Madden	Sheehan	Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Sadlak.
Marshall	Siler	Mr. Santangelo with Mr. Scrivner.
Meader	Smith, Calif.	Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Wilson of California.
Michel	Smith, Kans.	Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Keating.
Miller, Nebr.	Smith, Wis.	Mr. Teller with Mr. Latham.
Miller, N. Y.	Sullivan	Mr. Healey with Mr. Bentley.
Minshall	Taber	Mr. Buckley with Mr. Fino.
O'Konski	Taylor	Mr. Celler with Mr. Cramer.
Ostertag	Teague, Calif.	Mr. Delaney with Mr. Bosch.
Tollefson	Tewes	Mr. Powell with Mr. Betts.
Felly	Thomas	Mr. Barrett with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.
Pfost	Thomson, Wyo.	Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Van Peit.
Pillion	Tollefson	Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Dooley.
Polk	Utt	Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. McConnell.
Rabaut	Van Zandt	Mr. Boland with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Ray	Weaver	Mr. Donohue with Mr. Vursell.
Reed	Wharton	Mr. Zelenko with Mr. McCulloch.
Rees, Kans.	Whitten	Mr. Breeding with Mr. May.
Rhodes, Ariz.	Wier	Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Westland.
Riehman	Wigglesworth	Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Krueger.
Rodino	Williams, N. Y.	Mr. Jarman with Mr. Patterson.
Roney	Wilson, Ind.	Mr. Kitchin with Mr. Osmers.
Rutherford	Winstead	Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Prouty.
St. George	Withrow	Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Chenoweth.
Saylor	Wright	Mr. Lane with Mr. Kearney.

Schenck	Schwengel	Mr. Walter with Mr. Baumhart.
Macdonald	Scudder	Mr. Lennon with Mr. Coudert.
Mack, Wash.	Seely-Brown	Mr. Keogh with Mr. Cretella.
Madden	Sheehan	Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Sadlak.
Marshall	Siler	Mr. Santangelo with Mr. Scrivner.
Meader	Smith, Calif.	Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Wilson of California.
Michel	Smith, Kans.	Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Keating.
Miller, Nebr.	Smith, Wis.	Mr. Teller with Mr. Latham.
Miller, N. Y.	Sullivan	Mr. Healey with Mr. Bentley.
Minshall	Taber	Mr. Buckley with Mr. Fino.
O'Konski	Taylor	Mr. Celler with Mr. Cramer.
Ostertag	Teague, Calif.	Mr. Delaney with Mr. Bosch.
Tollefson	Tewes	Mr. Powell with Mr. Betts.
Felly	Thomas	Mr. Barrett with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.
Pfost	Thomson, Wyo.	Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Van Peit.
Pillion	Tollefson	Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Dooley.
Polk	Utt	Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. McConnell.
Rabaut	Van Zandt	Mr. Boland with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Ray	Weaver	Mr. Donohue with Mr. Vursell.
Reed	Wharton	Mr. Zelenko with Mr. McCulloch.
Rees, Kans.	Whitten	Mr. Breeding with Mr. May.
Rhodes, Ariz.	Wier	Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Westland.
Riehman	Wigglesworth	Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Krueger.
Rodino	Williams, N. Y.	Mr. Jarman with Mr. Patterson.
Roney	Wilson, Ind.	Mr. Kitchin with Mr. Osmers.
Rutherford	Winstead	Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Prouty.
St. George	Withrow	Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Chenoweth.
Saylor	Wright	Mr. Lane with Mr. Kearney.

Schenck	Schwengel	Mr. Walter with Mr. Baumhart.
Macdonald	Scudder	Mr. Lennon with Mr. Coudert.
Mack, Wash.	Seely-Brown	Mr. Keogh with Mr. Cretella.
Madden	Sheehan	Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Sadlak.
Marshall	Siler	Mr. Santangelo with Mr. Scrivner.
Meader	Smith, Calif.	Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Wilson of California.
Michel	Smith, Kans.	Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Keating.
Miller, Nebr.	Smith, Wis.	Mr. Teller with Mr. Latham.
Miller, N. Y.	Sullivan	Mr. Healey with Mr. Bentley.
Minshall	Taber	Mr. Buckley with Mr. Fino.
O'Konski	Taylor	Mr. Celler with Mr. Cramer.
Ostertag	Teague, Calif.	Mr. Delaney with Mr. Bosch.
Tollefson	Tewes	Mr. Powell with Mr. Betts.
Felly	Thomas	Mr. Barrett with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.
Pfost	Thomson, Wyo.	Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Van Peit.
Pillion	Tollefson	Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Dooley.
Polk	Utt	Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. McConnell.
Rabaut	Van Zandt	Mr. Boland with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Ray	Weaver	Mr. Donohue with Mr. Vursell.
Reed	Wharton	Mr. Zelenko with Mr. McCulloch.
Rees, Kans.	Whitten	Mr. Breeding with Mr. May.
Rhodes, Ariz.	Wier	Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Westland.
Riehman	Wigglesworth	Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Krueger.
Rodino	Williams, N. Y.	Mr. Jarman with Mr. Patterson.
Roney	Wilson, Ind.	Mr. Kitchin with Mr. Osmers.
Rutherford	Winstead	Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Prouty.
St. George	Withrow	Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Chenoweth.
Saylor	Wright	Mr. Lane with Mr. Kearney.

Schenck	Schwengel	Mr. Walter with Mr. Baumhart.
Macdonald	Scudder	Mr. Lennon with Mr. Coudert.
Mack, Wash.	Seely-Brown	Mr. Keogh with Mr. Cretella.
Madden	Sheehan	Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Sadlak.
Marshall	Siler	Mr. Santangelo with Mr. Scrivner.
Meader	Smith, Calif.	Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Wilson of California.
Michel	Smith, Kans.	Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Keating.
Miller, Nebr.	Smith, Wis.	Mr. Teller with Mr. Latham.
Miller, N. Y.	Sullivan	Mr. Healey with Mr. Bentley.
Minshall	Taber	Mr. Buckley with Mr. Fino.
O'Konski	Taylor	Mr. Celler with Mr. Cramer.
Ostertag	Teague, Calif.	Mr. Delaney with Mr. Bosch.
Tollefson	Tewes	Mr. Powell with Mr. Betts.
Felly	Thomas	Mr. Barrett with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.
Pfost	Thomson, Wyo.	Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Van Peit.
Pillion	Tollefson	Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Dooley.
Polk	Utt	Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. McConnell.
Rabaut	Van Zandt	Mr. Boland with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Ray	Weaver	Mr. Donohue with Mr. Vursell.
Reed	Wharton	Mr. Zelenko with Mr. McCulloch.
Rees, Kans.	Whitten	Mr. Breeding with Mr. May.
Rhodes, Ariz.	Wier	Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Westland.
Riehman	Wigglesworth	Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Krueger.
Rodino	Williams, N. Y.	Mr. Jarman with Mr. Patterson.
Roney	Wilson, Ind.	Mr. Kitchin with Mr. Osmers.
Rutherford	Winstead	Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Prouty.
St. George	Withrow	Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Chenoweth.
Saylor	Wright	Mr. Lane with Mr. Kearney.

Schenck	Schwengel	Mr. Walter with Mr. Baumhart.
Macdonald	Scudder	Mr. Lennon with Mr. Coudert.
Mack, Wash.	Seely-Brown	Mr. Keogh with Mr. Cretella.
Madden	Sheehan	Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Sadlak.
Marshall	Siler	Mr. Santangelo with Mr. Scrivner.
Meader	Smith, Calif.	Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Wilson of California.
Michel	Smith, Kans.	Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Keating.
Miller, Nebr.	Smith, Wis.	Mr. Teller with Mr. Latham.
Miller, N. Y.	Sullivan	Mr. Healey with Mr. Bentley.
Minshall	Taber	Mr. Buckley with Mr. Fino.
O'Konski	Taylor	Mr. Celler with Mr. Cramer.
Ostertag	Teague, Calif.	Mr. Delaney with Mr. Bosch.
Tollefson	Tewes	Mr. Powell with Mr. Betts.
Felly	Thomas	Mr. Barrett with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.
Pfost	Thomson, Wyo.	Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Van Peit.
Pillion	Tollefson	Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Dooley.
Polk	Utt	Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. McConnell.
Rabaut	Van Zandt	Mr. Boland with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Ray	Weaver	Mr. Donohue with Mr. Vursell.
Reed	Wharton	Mr. Zelenko with Mr. McCulloch.
Rees, Kans.	Whitten	Mr. Breeding with Mr. May.
Rhodes, Ariz.	Wier	Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Westland.
Riehman	Wigglesworth	Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Krueger.
Rodino	Williams, N. Y.	Mr. Jarman with Mr. Patterson.
Roney	Wilson, Ind.	Mr. Kitchin with Mr. Osmers.
Rutherford	Winstead	Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Prouty.
St. George	Withrow	Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Chenoweth.
Saylor	Wright	Mr. Lane with Mr. Kearney.

Schenck	Schwengel	Mr. Walter with Mr. Baumhart.
Macdonald	Scudder	Mr. Lennon with Mr. Coudert.
Mack, Wash.	Seely-Brown	Mr. Keogh with Mr. Cretella.
Madden	Sheehan	Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Sadlak.
Marshall	Siler	Mr. Santangelo with Mr. Scrivner.
Meader	Smith, Calif.	Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Wilson of California.
Michel	Smith, Kans.	Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Keating.
Miller, Nebr.	Smith, Wis.	Mr. Teller with Mr. Latham.
Miller, N. Y.	Sullivan	Mr. Healey with Mr. Bentley.
Minshall	Taber	Mr. Buckley with Mr. Fino.
O'Konski	Taylor	Mr. Celler with Mr. Cramer.
Ostertag	Teague, Calif.	Mr. Delaney with Mr. Bosch.
Tollefson	Tewes	Mr. Powell with Mr. Betts.
Felly	Thomas	Mr. Barrett with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.
Pfost	Thomson, Wyo.	Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Van Peit.
Pillion	Tollefson	Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Dooley.
Polk	Utt	Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. McConnell.
Rabaut	Van Zandt	Mr. Boland with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Ray	Weaver	Mr. Donohue with Mr. Vursell.
Reed	Wharton	Mr. Zelenko with Mr. McCulloch.
Rees, Kans.	Whitten	Mr. Breeding with Mr. May.
Rhodes, Ariz.	Wier	Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Westland.
Riehman	Wigglesworth	Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Krueger.
Rodino	Williams, N. Y.	Mr. Jarman with Mr. Patterson.
Roney	Wilson, Ind.	Mr. Kitchin with Mr. Osmers.
Rutherford	Winstead	Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Prouty.
St. George	Withrow	Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Chenoweth.
Saylor	Wright	Mr. Lane with Mr. Kearney.

Schenck	Schwengel	Mr. Walter with Mr. Baumhart.
Macdonald	Scudder	Mr. Lennon with Mr. Coudert.
Mack, Wash.	Seely-Brown	Mr. Keogh with Mr. Cretella.
Madden	Sheehan	Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Sadlak.
Marshall	Siler	Mr. Santangelo with Mr. Scrivner.
Meader	Smith, Calif.	Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Wilson of California.
Michel	Smith, Kans.	Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Keating.
Miller, Nebr.	Smith, Wis.	Mr. Teller with Mr. Latham.
Miller, N. Y.	Sullivan	Mr. Healey with Mr. Bentley.
Minshall	Taber	Mr. Buckley with Mr. Fino.
O'Konski	Taylor	Mr. Celler with Mr. Cramer.
Ostertag	Teague, Calif.	Mr. Delaney with Mr. Bosch.
Tollefson	Tewes	Mr. Powell with Mr. Betts.
Felly	Thomas	Mr. Barrett with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.
Pfost	Thomson, Wyo.	Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Van Peit.
Pillion	Tollefson	Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Dooley.
Polk	Utt	Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. McConnell.
Rabaut	Van Zandt	Mr. Boland with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Ray	Weaver	Mr. Donohue with Mr. Vursell.
Reed	Wharton	Mr. Zelenko with Mr. McCulloch.
Rees, Kans.	Whitten	Mr. Breeding with Mr. May.
Rhodes, Ariz.	Wier	Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Westland.
Riehman	Wigglesworth	Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Krueger.
Rodino	Williams, N. Y.	Mr. Jarman with Mr. Patterson.
Roney	Wilson, Ind.	Mr. Kitchin with Mr. Osmers.
Rutherford	Winstead	Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Prouty.
St. George	Withrow	Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Chenoweth.
Saylor	Wright	Mr. Lane with Mr. Kearney.

Schenck	Schwengel	Mr. Walter with Mr. Baumhart.
Macdonald	Scudder	Mr. Lennon with Mr. Coudert.
Mack, Wash.	Seely-Brown	Mr. Keogh with Mr. Cretella.
Madden	Sheehan	Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Sadlak.
Marshall	Siler	Mr. Santangelo with Mr. Scrivner.
Meader	Smith, Calif.	Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Wilson of California.
Michel	Smith, Kans.	Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Keating.
Miller, Nebr.	Smith, Wis.	Mr. Teller with Mr. Latham.
Miller, N. Y.	Sullivan	

shall likewise be exempt from any such assessment or tax.

“Sec. 3. Every Federal or District of Columbia tax of any kind not paid at the time of the approval of this act, heretofore levied or assessed against said Columbia Historical Society, or against any property, real or personal, owned by it, or in respect of any property, real or personal, conveyed, devised, or bequeathed to said society, together with any interest or penalty thereon, is hereby abated.

“Sec. 4. The value of all testamentary or inter vivos gifts to said society shall be deductible as charitable contributions for income, estate, gift, inheritance, and other similar tax purposes, both Federal and District of Columbia, under such regulations as may be duly promulgated from time to time in respect of transfers to charitable, educational, and other similar organizations.”

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to amend the act of July 2, 1956, which exempted certain property of the Columbia Historical Society from taxation.

After this law was enacted, a ruling was handed down by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia that this law did not provide the following exemptions:

First. That the Columbia Historical Society is not entitled to exemption from inheritance taxation under the District of Columbia inheritance-tax law.

Second. That gifts to the society by persons subject to District of Columbia franchise or individual income taxes are not allowable deductions in determining their tax liability.

Third. That the society does not meet the requirements for exemptions of its tangible personal property from taxation.

Fourth. That books, papers, and so forth, in storage and not open to the public do not constitute a library within the meaning of the law.

As a result of this ruling by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the bill, H. R. 4874, was introduced which would exempt all personal property owned by the Columbia Historical Society, which is not used for a commercial purpose, from all assessment and taxation of any kind by either the Federal or the District of Columbia Government, and all income from any property which is so exempt shall likewise be exempt from any such assessment or tax.

The bill also provides that every Federal or District of Columbia tax of any kind not paid at the time of the approval of this act, heretofore levied or assessed against the Columbia Historical Society, or against any property, real or personal, owned by it, or in respect of any property, real or personal, conveyed, devised, or bequeathed to said society, together with any interest or penalty thereof, is to be abated.

The bill further provides that the value of all testamentary or inter vivos gifts to said society shall be deductible as charitable contributions for income, estate, gift, inheritance, and other similar tax purposes, both Federal and District of Columbia.

The loss in revenue to the District of Columbia would be approximately \$16,007.02.

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.

AUTHORIZATION TO BORROW MOTOR VEHICLES IN VEHICLE DRIVER TRAINING COURSE

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 5893) to authorize the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to borrow motor vehicles for use in a motor vehicle driver education and training course in the public schools of the District of Columbia, to excuse the owners of vehicles loaned to public, private, or parochial schools for driving-training purposes from the payment of certain fees and taxes during the period of such loan, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Board of Education of the District of Columbia is hereby authorized, in connection with the conduct in the public schools of the District of a motor vehicle driver education and training course in the safe and proper operation of motor vehicles, to borrow motor vehicles and to return the same to the lenders on such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon between the Board and the lenders.

Sec. 2. (a) Whenever the owner of a motor vehicle lends such vehicle to the Board of Education for use in connection with the said course on driver training, or to the person in charge of a nonprofit private or parochial school for use in any course on driver training which may be conducted in such private or parochial school, such owner shall, but only for the period such vehicle is actually under the control of said Board or the person in charge of said school and is assigned for use in connection with the said course in driver training, be excused from paying, with respect to such vehicle, the fees and taxes imposed by or under the authority of the following acts of Congress:

(1) Subsection (j) of section 6 of the act entitled “District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925,” approved March 3, 1925, as amended (sec. 40-608 (j), D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(2) Section 3 of title IV of the act approved August 17, 1937, as amended (sec. 40-103, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(3) The first section of the act approved February 18, 1938, as amended (sec. 40-201, D. C. Code, 1951 edition): *Provided*, That any such vehicle shall nevertheless be subject to inspection, as required by section 3 of article IV of the act approved July 16, 1947 (sec. 40-204, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), and the validity of such inspection shall expire upon the date such vehicle is returned to its owner.

(4) Section 6 of the act approved July 1, 1902, as amended (sec. 47-1212, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(b) For the purposes of this act, the term “nonprofit private or parochial school” shall mean any school the real property of which is exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia under the authority contained in paragraph (j) of the first section of the act approved December 24, 1942, as amended (56 Stat. 1089; sec. 47-801a (j), D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

Sec. 3. Each motor vehicle borrowed by the Board of Education or the person in charge of a nonprofit private or parochial

school for use in a driver training course shall, upon its return to the lender, thereafter be subject to the taxes and fees established or authorized to be charged by the acts of Congress listed in section 2 hereof.

Sec. 4. Whenever any motor vehicle is loaned to the Board of Education or to a nonprofit private or parochial school for use in conducting a course in driver education and training, said Board or the person in charge of such private or parochial school shall furnish the Commissioners of the District of Columbia with a certificate that the vehicle is to be used in connection with such course. The Commissioners are authorized, upon receiving any such certificate, to issue without charge to said Board, or to the person in charge of said school, special registration plates distinctively marked to indicate that the vehicle is being used in such course. Such plates shall be returned to the Commissioners when the vehicle is returned to its owner, or its use in connection with such course is terminated. Any vehicle not so certified and not so identified shall not be exempt from the fees and taxes listed in section 2 hereof.

Sec. 5. The Commissioners and the Board of Education of the District of Columbia are authorized to promulgate regulations to carry out the purposes of this act and to delegate any of the functions to be performed by them.

Sec. 6. This act shall become effective on and after the first day of September 1957, and the Commissioners are authorized to refund to the owner of a vehicle loaned to the Board of Education or to a nonprofit private or parochial school after that date, for use in a driver education and training program, the fees and taxes said owner paid to the District of Columbia with respect to such vehicle during the registration year beginning April 1, 1957, as may have been required by the acts of Congress listed in paragraphs numbered (1), (2), and (3) of section 2 of this act.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years the Board of Education of the District of Columbia has been carrying on in certain schools of the District a program for the education and training of students in the safe and proper operation of motor vehicles. This program first began in 1939 but was discontinued in 1941 because of World War II. The program was reinstated in 1947 when the District purchased 2 cars to be used in connection with courses at 4 schools, and the program has expanded until today the District is employing 11 cars in connection with programs conducted at 16 senior and vocational high schools, all of which cars have been loaned to the schools by motor vehicle dealers interested in improving the safe driving habits of motor vehicle operators in the District of Columbia.

The motor vehicle dealers who have been kind enough to lend vehicles for use in this program have been required, under existing law, to undergo considerable expense in connection with such loan. They are required to register the vehicle and to pay the 2-percent excise tax thereon in connection with such registration, and even though the vehicle is not in their possession for 9 months of the tax year they nevertheless must pay a personal property tax on such vehicle as part of their stock in trade. It has been the practice, however, since the vehicles are used as part of a public-education program, to excuse the dealers from paying the registration fee on the vehicle

during such time as it is made available to the Board of Education.

There has been some indication that the present arrangement under which dealers lend cars for use in connection with driver-training programs is becoming a considerable burden on these dealers, who not only must forego the use of the car but must pay out considerable money in connection with making it available to the program. The Commissioners, in the belief that the program is of great value to the citizens of the District of Columbia, feel that action should be taken to excuse public-spirited motor vehicle dealers from the payment of fees and taxes on motor vehicles which they make available for use in connection with driver-training programs for such period of time as the vehicles may be in such use. Accordingly the Commissioners are recommending that there be enacted legislation exempting motor vehicle dealers from the payment of certain taxes and fees on vehicles loaned by them to the school system for driver-training programs.

While the primary interest of the Commissioners in this matter is the securing of vehicles to be used by the public schools of the District, the Commissioners also realize that at least one private and one parochial school likewise conduct courses in driver training. For this reason, the legislation proposed by the Commissioners would also exempt from certain taxes and fees motor vehicles loaned to private and parochial schools for use in connection with such programs.

The bill also provides that upon the return of the loaned vehicle to the lender it shall become subject to the taxes and fees from which theretofore it has been exempt. Provision is made for the issuance of special registration tags by the Commissioners, and the Commissioners and Board of Education are authorized to promulgate regulations to carry out the purposes of this act.

The Commissioners hope that enactment of the proposed legislation will result in an increase in the number of vehicles being loaned to the public schools by public-spirited motor-vehicle dealers. Every such vehicle, it should be noted, is utilized during the school year in training between 100 and 140 students in safe-driving techniques and during the school year just ended 1,250 students received this type of instruction. The Commissioners and the Board of Education hope to be able to increase the number of students taking this course.

In view of the fact that the budget of the Board of Education for the fiscal year contains no provision for the purchase of motor vehicles to be used in connection with driver-training programs, the Commissioners feel that it is urgently necessary to secure legislation which will make the lending of motor vehicles to the schools more attractive to the motor-vehicle dealers.

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 THAT MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MAY BE REMOVED FOR CAUSE

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 192) to provide that members of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia may be removed for cause and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia," approved June 20, 1906 (D. C. Code, sec. 31-101), is amended by inserting immediately after the second sentence the following new sentence: "The judges of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall have power to remove any member of the board of education at any time for adequate cause affecting his character and efficiency as a member."

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to provide the judges of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia with power to remove any member of the board of education at any time for adequate cause affecting his character and efficiency as a member.

Under existing law the judges of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia have the powers of appointment of the members of the board of education with all of the responsibilities attached thereto and it felt that since the responsibility of appointment rests with the members of this court the power of removal shall also be vested in the same body.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Would the gentleman explain what the phrase "proper cause" means?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I shall give the gentleman the language in the bill and some of the background of the legislation. The members of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia are appointed by the District judges who, however, do not have the authority to remove them. At least, there is some question as to whether or not they have the authority to remove their appointees.

The matter was referred to the District Commissioners, who in turn referred it to the Corporation Counsel for the District of Columbia, who drafted the bill after other legislation of this character. The bill carries this language:

The judges of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall have power to remove any member of the board of education at any time for adequate cause affecting his character and efficiency as a member.

Mr. YATES. There is no definition in the statute from which that was taken

which indicates what the phrase "proper cause" means?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I cannot say there is such language.

Mr. YATES. Were any hearings held on this bill?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Yes, there were hearings on it. The proposed legislation was supported unanimously by the District Commissioners, by the Federation of Citizens' Associations, by the members of the school board, and a statement was sent by word by someone, I do not recall whom, from the District judges that they favored the bill. The bill was unanimously reported by the committee.

Mr. YATES. Does the committee have any particular person in mind, or is this just to apply generally?

Mr. ABERNETHY. No, the committee has no particular person in mind.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOLICITATIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 3400) to provide full and fair disclosure of the character of charitable, benevolent, patriotic, or other solicitations in the District of Columbia; and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

Mr. YATES. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain this bill?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to provide for the full and fair disclosure of the character of charitable, benevolent, patriotic, or other solicitations in the District of Columbia.

The need for this legislation stems from the fact that in the District, as in most large cities, numerous persons and organizations make solicitations, some of which are by unscrupulous persons more interested in enriching themselves than in providing charitable aid. In many cases the persons solicited have no way of obtaining, or find it difficult to obtain, accurate information as to the purposes of the solicitation, amounts to be raised, expenses of raising funds, amounts paid for fees, wages or commissions and to whom such fees, wages and commissions are to be paid.

The bill approaches the problem on the theory that any organization which desires to solicit for a charitable purpose should be permitted to do so if it makes available all pertinent information to the public which it solicits. This would

be done by requiring registration with the Commissioners of all soliciting organizations and the furnishing to the Commissioners of all necessary information.

The bill exempts from the prohibition of soliciting without registration those persons and organizations soliciting solely for religious purposes or soliciting exclusively among the membership of the soliciting agency.

The bill requires that any organization, association or other entity desiring to solicit contributions in the District of Columbia for charitable purposes shall apply to the Commissioners for a certificate of registration. The application must contain such information as the Commissioners shall by regulation require. The bill defines "charitable" as "philanthropic, social service, patriotic, welfare, benevolent, or educational—except religious education—either actual or purported." It is contemplated that the regulations would require the application to spell out such matters as the identities of the soliciting agency and its officers and managers; the purpose for which the solicitation is to be conducted; the amounts to be raised; the period of time during which the solicitation is to be conducted and the means to be used in raising the funds; the estimated cost of the solicitation; amounts to be paid for wages, fees and commissions; and the identity of persons to receive such amounts; and such other information as will enable the public to become fully informed as to the purposes of the solicitation and the disposition to be made of the receipts.

Any organization which furnishes all required information and pays the required fee would be entitled to a certificate of registration. Such certificate would authorize the organization to solicit for the period of time set forth in the certificate.

Any individual soliciting on behalf of a registered organization would, under regulations which the Commissioners are authorized to promulgate, be required to obtain a solicitor's card. Such a card would contain such information and be produced and authenticated in such manner as might be prescribed by regulation. Under such a regulation provision could be made whereby facsimiles of approved cards would be furnished by the registered soliciting organization and thus obviate the necessity for the agency administering the act to issue individual cards to each individual solicitor. It is understood that many organizations are presently furnishing identification cards to individuals who solicit for them.

Individuals soliciting by printed matter or publication of any kind, or by means of radio, television, telephone or telegraph, would be required to include in such publicity the data and information which is required to be set forth on the solicitor's information card.

No individual could solicit any contribution unless he exhibits his solicitor's information card and reads it to the person solicited or presents it to him for his perusal and allows sufficient opportunity for reading it, before accepting any contribution.

Any person soliciting by telephone would be required, before accepting any contribution from any person, to present to such person his solicitor's information card or a true copy thereof.

The bill prohibits any person from conducting, for pecuniary compensation, any solicitation by telephone for or on behalf of any actual or purported charitable purpose or institution.

Each organization and other entity holding a certificate of registration would be required, within 30 days after its solicitation period has ended, or within 30 days after demand made by the Commissioners, to file a report with the Commissioners stating what contributions have been secured and what expenses have been incurred in connection with the solicitation and what disposition has been or will be made of the contributions.

The bill authorizes the Commissioners to fix and collect fees for certificates of registration and other services rendered pursuant to the act. Such fees would be fixed in such amounts as, in the judgment of the Commissioners, approximate the cost to the District of Columbia of administering the act, but no fees would be fixed until after public hearing.

No regulations could be promulgated under the act until after a public hearing.

Section 12 of the bill prescribes a fine not exceeding \$500, or imprisonment of not more than 60 days, or both, for violations of the act or regulations made thereunder, or for the filing or causing to be filed with the Commissioners of any application or report containing a false or fraudulent statement.

Mr. YATES. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in this bill to protect the people of the country?

Mr. ABERNETHY. It deals with solicitations allegedly made for charity.

Mr. GROSS. A few minutes ago the taxpayers of all the country were mighty charitable to the District of Columbia. I just wondered if that sort of charity is recognized in the bill.

Mr. ABERNETHY. No.

Mr. VANIK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does this legislation indicate whether or not there is a promoter for a particular fund-raising activity and what his proportion of the solicitation is?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Does the gentleman mean what his "cut" would be, to use a common term?

Mr. VANIK. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. No. That question was raised, and there was some feeling in the committee that the solicitor should indicate what his commission would be, if any. It was suggested that some ceiling should be put on it. I think the suggestion had some merit. But we met with difficulty in arriving at what should be the proper formula. After discussing it with the District Commissioners and the Corporation Counsel, basing our opinion on their judgment, we

decided to leave it alone and leave that to their discretion.

Mr. VANIK. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Charitable Solicitation Act."

Sec. 2. As used in this act—

(a) The term "Commissioners" means the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, sitting as a board, or any agent or agency designated by them to perform any function vested in the Commissioners by this act.

(b) The term "registrant" means the holder of a valid certificate of registration duly issued under the terms of this act.

(c) "Solicit" and "solicitation" mean the request directly or indirectly for any contribution on the plea or representation that such contribution will or may be used for any charitable purpose, and also mean and include any of the following methods of securing contributions:

(1) Oral or written request;

(2) The distribution, circulation, mailing, posting, or publishing of any handbill, written advertisement, or publication;

(3) The making of any announcement to the press, over the radio, by television, by telephone, or telegraph concerning an appeal, assemblage, athletic or sports event, bazaar, benefit, campaign, contest, dance, drive, entertainment, exhibition, exposition, party, performance, picnic, sale, or social gathering, which the public is requested to patronize or to which the public is requested to make a contribution;

(4) The sale of, offer, or attempt to sell, any advertisement, advertising space, book, card, magazine, merchandise, subscription, ticket of admission, or any other thing, or where the name of any charitable person is used or referred to in any such appeal as an inducement or reason for making any such sale, or when or where in connection with any such sale, any statement is made that the whole or any part of the proceeds from any such sale will go or be donated to any charitable purpose.

A "solicitation" as defined herein shall be deemed completed when made, whether or not the person making the same receives any contribution or makes any such sale.

(d) "Charitable" means and includes philanthropic, social service, patriotic, welfare, benevolent, or educational (except religious education), either actual or purported.

(e) "Contribution" means and includes alms, food, clothing, money, subscription, credit, property, financial assistance, or donations under the guise of a loan of money or property.

(f) "Person" means any individual, firm, copartnership, corporation, company, association, or joint stock association, church, religious sect, religious denomination, society, organization, or league, and includes any trustee, receiver, assignee, agent, or other similar representative thereof.

Sec. 3. (a) The Commissioners are authorized and empowered—

(1) to administer and enforce the provisions of this act;

(2) to investigate the allegations of any application for a certificate of registration;

(3) to have access to and inspect and make copies of all the books, records, and papers of any person making any solicitation or on whose behalf any solicitation is made;

(4) to investigate at any time the methods of making or conducting any solicitation;

(5) to issue a certificate of registration to any person filing an application pursuant to this act;

(6) to suspend or revoke any certificate of registration or solicitor information card, on the ground that the holder of such certificate or card has violated any provision of this act or any regulation promulgated pursuant thereto. The Commissioners shall give to the interested person or persons an opportunity for a hearing after reasonable notice thereof before suspending or revoking any such certificate or card;

(7) to require by regulation that any individual who, as a registrant or as agent or employee of a registrant, desires to solicit shall obtain a solicitor information card, which card shall contain such information and be produced and authenticated in such manner as may be prescribed by regulation; and

(8) to publish, in any manner they deem appropriate, the results of any investigation authorized by this act.

(b) The Commissioners are authorized to prescribe and collect fees for the filing of applications, issuance of certificates of registration, and any other service which this act authorizes to be performed by the Commissioners. The Commissioners shall fix such fees in such amounts as will, in their judgment, approximate the cost to the District of Columbia of such services. In fixing such fees the Commissioners may, in their discretion, prescribe either uniform fees or varying schedules of fees based on actual or estimated amounts solicited or to be solicited by registrants or applicants for certificates of registration. No fees may be fixed pursuant to this section until after a public hearing has been held thereon pursuant to reasonable notice thereof.

SEC. 4. (a) No person shall solicit in the District of Columbia unless he holds a valid certificate of registration authorizing such solicitation.

(b) The provisions of subsection (a) of this section and of sections 6 and 7 shall not apply to any person making solicitations (1) solely for religious purposes or (2) exclusively among the membership of the soliciting agency.

(c) Whenever any solicitation has been made or is being made or is to be made for religious purposes, but in such manner as, in the opinion of the Commissioners, is intended to give or may give the impression to persons solicited or to the public that the purpose of such solicitation is, in whole or in part, charitable, then the Commissioners, if in their opinion the public interest will be served thereby, shall investigate such solicitation and give publicity to the findings resulting from such investigation in such manner as they may deem to be in the public interest.

SEC. 5. (a) Application for such certificate of registration shall be made upon such form or forms as shall be prescribed by the Commissioners, shall be sworn to and shall be filed with the Commissioners at least 15 days prior to the time when the certificate of registration applied for shall become effective. Each such application shall contain such information as the Commission shall by regulation require.

(b) If, while any application is pending, or during the term of any certificate of registration granted thereon, there is any change in fact, policy, or method from the information given in the application, the applicant or registrant shall within 10 days after such change report the same in writing to the Commissioners.

(c) The Commissioners shall issue a certificate of registration within 10 days after the filing of an application therefor: *Provided*, That, whenever in the opinion of the Commissioners the application does not disclose sufficient information required by this act or the regulations made pursuant thereto, to be stated in such application, then the applicant shall file in writing, within 48 hours, exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays, after a demand therefor made by the

Commissioners, such additional information as may be required by said Commissioners: *Provided further*, That the Commissioners, for good cause shown by the applicant, may extend the time for filing such additional information: *Provided further*, That the Commissioners may withhold the issuance of a certificate of registration until such additional information is furnished. Each certificate of registration shall be valid for such period of time as shall be specified therein.

SEC. 6. (a) No individual shall solicit in the District of Columbia unless he exhibits a solicitor information card or a copy thereof, produced and authenticated as provided in regulations made pursuant to this act, and reads it to the person solicited, or presents it to said person for his perusal, allowing him sufficient opportunity to read such card before accepting any contribution so solicited.

(b) No individual shall solicit in the District of Columbia by printed matter or published article, or over the radio, television, telephone, or telegraph, unless such publicity shall contain the data and information required to be set forth on the solicitor information card: *Provided*, That when any solicitation is made by telephone, the solicitor shall present to each person who consents or indicates a willingness to contribute, prior to accepting a contribution from said person, such solicitor information card or a copy thereof produced and authenticated as provided in regulations made pursuant to this act.

SEC. 7. Each registrant shall, within 30 days after the period for which a certificate of registration has been issued, and within 30 days after a demand therefor by the Commissioners, file a report with the Commissioners, stating the contributions secured as a result of any solicitation authorized by such certificate and in detail all expenses of or connected with such solicitation, and showing exactly for what use and in what manner all such contributions were or are intended to be dispensed or distributed.

SEC. 8. No person shall make or cause to be made any representation that the issuance of a certificate of registration or of a solicitor information card is a finding by the Commissioners (1) that the statements contained in the registrant's application are true and accurate, (2) that the application does not omit a material fact, or (3) that the Commissioners have in any way passed upon the merits or given approval to such solicitation.

SEC. 9. No person shall for pecuniary compensation or consideration conduct or make any solicitation by telephone for or on behalf of any actual or purported charitable use, purpose, association, corporation, or institution.

SEC. 10. The Commissioners may appoint an advisory committee to advise the Commissioners in respect to any matter related to the enforcement of this act, and the members thereof shall serve without compensation. Such committee shall consist of not less than 5 nor more than 9 members, whose terms shall be fixed by the Commissioners. The Commissioners are authorized to assign an employee of the District of Columbia to serve as secretary for the committee.

SEC. 11. The Commissioners are authorized to promulgate regulations to carry out the purposes of this act: *Provided*, That no such regulation shall be put in effect until after a public hearing has been held thereon.

SEC. 12. Any person violating any provision of this act, or regulation made pursuant thereto, or filing, or causing to be filed, an application or report pursuant to this act, or regulation made pursuant thereto, containing any false or fraudulent statement, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$500, or by imprisonment of not more than 60 days, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

SEC. 13. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any persons or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 14. Such appropriations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act are authorized.

SEC. 15. The provisions of sections 10, 11, and 14 of this act shall take effect upon approval of this act and the remainder thereof shall take effect 60 days after the promulgation of the first regulations made pursuant to section 11 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.

UNIFORM SIMULTANEOUS DEATH ACT

MR. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 3486) to provide that the Uniform Simultaneous Death Act shall apply in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act, providing for the disposition of property where there is no sufficient evidence that persons have died otherwise than simultaneously and to make uniform the law with reference thereto, shall be in effect in the District of Columbia on and after the date of the enactment of this act.

NO SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE OF SURVIVORSHIP

SEC. 2. Where the title to property or the devolution thereof depends upon priority of death and there is no sufficient evidence that the persons have died otherwise than simultaneously, the property of each person shall be disposed of as if he had survived, except as provided otherwise in this act.

SURVIVAL OF BENEFICIARIES

SEC. 3. If property is so disposed of that the right of a beneficiary to succeed to any interest therein is conditional upon his surviving another person, and both persons die, and there is no sufficient evidence that the two have died otherwise than simultaneously, the beneficiary shall be deemed not to have survived. If there is no sufficient evidence that two or more beneficiaries have died otherwise than simultaneously and property has been disposed of in such a way that at the time of their death each of such beneficiaries would have been entitled to the property if he had survived the others, the property shall be divided into as many equal portions as there were such beneficiaries and these portions shall be distributed respectively to those who would have taken in the event that each of such beneficiaries had survived.

JOINT TENANTS OR TENANTS BY THE ENTIRETY

SEC. 4. Where there is no sufficient evidence that two joint tenants or tenants by the entirety have died otherwise than simultaneously the property so held shall be distributed, or descend as the case may be, one-half as if one had survived and one-half as if the other had survived. If there are more than two joint tenants and all of them have so died the property thus distributed or descended shall be in the proportion that one bears to the whole number of joint tenants.

The term "joint tenants" includes owners of property held under circumstances which entitled one or more to the whole of the property on the death of the other or others.

INSURANCE POLICIES

SEC. 5. Where the insured and the beneficiary in a policy of life or accident insurance have died and there is no sufficient evidence that they have died otherwise than simultaneously, the proceeds of the policy shall be distributed as if the insured had survived the beneficiary.

ACT DOES NOT APPLY IF DECEASED PROVIDES OTHERWISE

SEC. 6. This act shall not apply in the case of wills, living trusts, deeds, or contracts of insurance, or any other situation where provision is made for distribution of property different from the provisions of this act, or where provision is made for a presumption as to survivorship which results in a distribution of property different from that here provided.

ACT NOT RETROACTIVE

SEC. 7. This act shall not apply to the distribution of the property of a person who has died before it takes effect.

UNIFORMITY OF INTERPRETATION

SEC. 8. This act shall be so construed and interpreted as to effectuate its general purpose to make uniform the law in those States which enact it.

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 9. This act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Uniform Simultaneous Death Act."

REPEAL

SEC. 10. All laws or parts of laws inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

SEVERABILITY

SEC. 11. If any of the provisions of this act or the application thereof to any persons or circumstances is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications of the act which can be given effect without the invalid provisions or application, and to this end the provisions of this act are declared to be severable.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, this bill is to make the Uniform Simultaneous Death Act, as amended, apply in the District of Columbia. The District of Columbia is without any orderly plan of distribution of estates in case of simultaneous death. The District of Columbia and the other courts of the Federal jurisdiction utilize the common-law rule when confronted with the problem of survivorship in common disaster cases.

The Federal courts, including the District of Columbia, in applying the common-law rule, encounter innumerable problems of proof, and the result of discarding presumptions and exacting evidence is to put the burden of proving survivorship on any party claiming to derive title to property from a deceased person whose ownership during life depends upon his outliving some other person who was deceased. The result is that if the party on whom the burden of proof rests cannot make his proof, his case fails.

The result of the common-law rule has been the burden of proof which resulted from it. Whoever had the burden of proving survivorship was faced with an impossible situation since, by the very nature of the problem, survivorship could not be ascertained.

In order to provide a solution to the problem of death in common disaster, resort has been to statutory enactment.

The pending bill is the Uniform Simultaneous Death Act, as amended, prepared some years ago by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws and amended by it.

Forty-one States have enacted the Uniform Simultaneous Death Act, including the neighboring States of Maryland and Virginia. This act provides that where title to property or devolution thereof depends upon priority of death and there is no sufficient evidence that the persons have died otherwise than simultaneously, the property of each person shall be disposed of as if he had survived, except as provided otherwise in the act. It further provides that if property is so disposed of that the right of a beneficiary to succeed to any interest therein is conditioned upon his surviving another person, and both persons die and there is no sufficient evidence that the two have died otherwise than simultaneously, the beneficiary shall be deemed not to have survived. And if there is no sufficient evidence that two or more beneficiaries have died otherwise than simultaneously and property has been disposed of in such a way that at the time of their death each of such beneficiaries would have been entitled to the property if he had survived the others, the property shall be divided into as many equal portions as there were such beneficiaries and these portions shall be distributed respectively to those who would have taken in the event that each of such beneficiaries had survived. The second sentence of section 3 constitutes an amendment of the original act adopted by the Commission on Uniform State Laws.

The bill further provides that where there is no sufficient evidence that two joint tenants or tenants by the entirety have died otherwise than simultaneously, the property so held shall be distributed, or descend as the case may be, one-half as if one had survived and one-half as if the other had survived; and that if there were more than two joint tenants and all of them have so died, the property thus distributed or descended shall be in the proportion that one bears to the whole number of joint tenants.

The bill further provides that when the insured and the beneficiary in a policy of life or accident insurance have died and there is not sufficient evidence that they have died other than simultaneously, the proceeds of the policy shall be distributed as if the insured had survived the beneficiary.

The act shall not apply in the case of wills, living trusts, deeds, or contracts of insurance, or any other situation where provision is made for distribution of property different from the provisions of the act, or where provision is made for a presumption as to survivorship which results in a distribution of property different from that provided in the act.

This bill has the approval of the bar association of the District of Columbia as well as the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

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.

DESCENDANTS' ESTATES

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 6503) to modify the Code of Law for the District of Columbia to provide for a uniform succession of real and personal property in case of intestacy, to abolish dower and curtesy, and to grant unto a surviving spouse a statutory share in the other's real estate owned at time of death, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 940 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 18-101), is amended to read as follows:

§ 940. Course of descents generally.—

"On the death of any person seized of an estate in fee simple in lands, tenements, or hereditaments in the District of Columbia, and intestate thereof, the same shall descend in fee simple to such person's kindred as follows: To those persons, who, according to the laws of the District of Columbia now or hereafter in force relating to the distribution of the personal property of intestates, would be the distributees to take the surplus personal property of such intestate, if he or she had died a resident of the District of Columbia and possessed of such surplus of personality; and such kindred (including the surviving spouse as such) shall take in the same proportions as are or shall be fixed by such laws relating to personal property, and shall take as tenants in common."

SEC. 2. The estate by the courtesy in the real estate of a wife dying after the effective date of this act, and its incidents, are hereby abolished.

SEC. 3. The right of dower, and its incidents, are hereby abolished; except that with respect to parties who intermarried prior to the effective date of this act, the wife shall retain her dower rights in all real estate whereof the husband, prior to the effective date of this act, was seized of an estate of inheritance at any time during the marriage. As to any such real estate of which the husband dies seized, the share of the wife therein, as provided in section 940 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 18-101), shall be in lieu of her dower rights unless she elects to take the same in similar manner and within the period as authorized in section 1173 of such act, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 18-211), providing for renunciation of devises and bequests under wills.

SEC. 4. (a) Section 953 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 18-103), is hereby repealed.

(b) Section 954 of such act, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 18-104), is hereby repealed.

(c) Section 955 of such act, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 18-105), is hereby repealed.

(d) Section 958 of such act, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 18-107), is hereby repealed.

(e) Section 962 of such act, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 18-111), is hereby repealed.

(f) Section 1175 of such act (D. C. Code, sec. 18-213), is hereby repealed.

(g) Section 1176 of such act (D. C. Code, sec. 18-214) is hereby repealed.

(h) Section 1159 of such act (D. C. Code, sec. 18-215) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 5. Section 1172 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901 (D. C. Code, sec. 18-210), is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1172. Devise or bequest to spouse.

"Subject to the provisions of section 1174 of this act, every devise of real estate or any interest therein, and every bequest of personal estate or any interest therein, to the surviving spouse shall be construed to be intended in bar of his or her share in decedent's estate (including dower rights, if any), unless it be otherwise expressed in the will."

SEC. 6. Section 1173 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 18-211), is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1173. Renunciation of devises and bequests to spouse.

"Subject to the provisions of section 1174 of this act, a widow or widower shall be barred of any rights or interest she or he may have in real or personal estate by any such devise or bequest unless within 6 months after administration may be granted on the deceased spouse's estate she or he shall file in the probate court a written renunciation to the following effect:

"I, A. B., widow or widower of _____ late of _____, deceased, do hereby renounce and quit all claim to any devise or bequest made to me by the last will of my husband or wife exhibited and proved according to law; and I elect to take in lieu thereof my legal share of the real and personal estate of my said spouse."

"If, during said period of 6 months, a suit should be instituted to construe the will of the husband or wife, the period of 6 months for the filing of such renunciation shall commence to run from the date when such suit shall be finally determined, by appeal or otherwise.

"By renouncing all claim to any and all devises and bequests, made to her or him by the will of her husband or his wife, the surviving spouse shall be entitled to such share or interest in the real and personal estate which she or he would have taken had the deceased spouse died intestate. Except in cases of valid antenuptial or post-nuptial agreements, and except in cases when it is expressly waived in a writing filed with the probate court within said 6 months' period, this provision for the surviving spouse shall apply with like effect (without formal renunciation) to cases where the wife or husband has made no devise or bequest to her husband or his wife, and also to cases where nothing passes by such devise or bequest."

SEC. 7. Section 1174 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901 (D. C. Code, sec. 18-212), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1174. If the surviving spouse does not renounce as provided in section 1173 of this act, she or he shall be entitled to receive the benefit of all provisions in her or his favor in the will of the deceased spouse and shall share, in accordance with sections 373, 374, 375, 376, and 940 of this act, in any estate of the deceased spouse undisposed of by the will."

SEC. 8. Section 1154 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901 (D. C. Code, sec. 30-201), is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1154. Married women—Power to dispose of separate property.

"Married women shall hold all their property of every description, for their separate use as fully as if they were unmarried, and shall have power to dispose of the same by deed, mortgage, lease, will, gift, or otherwise, as fully as husbands have the power to dis-

pose of their property, and no more; except that no disposition of her real or personal property, or any portion thereof, by deed, mortgage, bill of sale, or other conveyance, shall be valid if made by a married woman under 21 years of age."

SEC. 9. (a) Section 386 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901 (D. C. Code, sec. 18-714), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 386. No right in the inheritance to real or personal property shall accrue to or vest in any person other than the children of the intestate and their descendants, unless such person is in being and capable in law to take as heir or distributee at the time of the intestate's death; but any child or descendant of the intestate born after the death of the intestate shall have the same right of inheritance as if born before his death."

(b) Section 386a of such act (D. C. Code, sec. 18-715) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 386a. In no case shall there be any distinction between the kindred of the whole and the half-blood."

(c) Section 387 of such act (D. C. Code, sec. 18-716) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 387. The illegitimate child or children of any female and the issue of any such illegitimate child or children shall be capable to take real and personal estate by inheritance from their mother, or from each other, or from the descendants of each other, as the case may be, in like manner as if born in lawful wedlock."

"When such illegitimate child or children shall die leaving no descendants, or brothers or sisters, or the descendants of such brothers or sisters, then and in that case the mother of such illegitimate child or children shall be entitled to the real and personal estate of such illegitimate child or children, and if the mother be dead, the heirs or distributees of the mother shall take in like manner as if such illegitimate child or children had been born in lawful wedlock."

(d) Section 388 of such act (D. C. Code, sec. 18-717) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 388. If there be no widow or widower or relations of the intestate within the fifth degree, which shall be reckoned by counting down from the common ancestor to the more remote, the surplus of real and personal property shall escheat to the District of Columbia to be used by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for the benefit of the poor."

SEC. 10. Any provision of law inconsistent with the provisions of this act, or any amendment made by this act, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 11. This act shall become effective 90 days after the date of its enactment.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to modify the code of law for the District of Columbia to provide for a uniform succession of real and personal property in case of intestacy to abolish dower and curtesy, and to grant unto a surviving spouse a statutory share in the other's real estate owned at time of death, and for other purposes.

This bill would make substantial changes in the law relating to the descent of real property when the owner dies intestate. Rights in property known as "dower" and "curtesy" are abolished and in lieu thereof each spouse is given a statutory right to share in the deceased spouse's property.

Husband and wives will be especially affected because the bill proposes to abolish the ancient, feudal rights in realty known as "dower" and "curtesy." Today a healthy widow under 30 years old would get only one-sixth part of the value of any realty of which her hus-

band died intestate. If she were above 77 years old, she would get only one-twentieth part of that value. Under this bill, she would instead take, in either such case, at least one-third and perhaps all the husband's realty, outright, depending upon whether he was survived also by a child or other direct descendants, or only by relatives of more remote degree.

The bill would abolish all present distinctions as between the order of succession in the descent of real property and the distribution of personal property of an intestate. The bill provides that real property shall descend in the same order as personal property, under present law, is distributed. The laws in all States of the Union, except Delaware, North Carolina, and Tennessee, provide for uniformity in succession of real and personal property.

Husband and wife domiciled in this District will, under this legislation, acquire exactly reciprocal or equal rights or inheritance to all property of any kind owned by the one first dying, with the possible exception of real estate owned at death but located outside the District of Columbia, which would be governed by the law of its location.

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.

GUN MOUNTINGS AND GUN CARRIAGES FOR HISTORIC SITES AND MUSEUMS

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 2018) to permit any State of the United States or any political subdivision of any such State to purchase from the District of Columbia Reformatory at Lorton, Va., gun mountings and carriages for guns for use at historic sites and for museum display purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any State of the United States or any political subdivision of any such State is authorized to purchase from the District of Columbia Reformatory located at Lorton, Va., at fair market prices determined by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, gun mountings and carriages for guns for use at historic sites and for museum display purposes. Receipts from sales authorized under this act shall be deposited to the credit of the working-capital fund established for the industrial enterprises at the workhouse and reformatory of the District of Columbia to the same extent and in the same manner as provided for receipts from the sale of products and services of such industrial enterprises in the last paragraph under the heading "Adult Correctional Service" in the first section of the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1947 (60 Stat. 514).

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

The District of Columbia Reformatory at Lorton, Va., has developed a craft of manufacturing replicas of historic gun

mountings and carriages, using prison labor to produce these items. These guns have been very much in demand by certain District and Federal agencies and the reformatory from time to time has manufactured such guns for their use.

The purpose of this bill is to permit the sale of these gun mountings and carriages for guns for use at historic sites and for museum display purposes to any State of the United States or any political subdivision of any such State.

This legislation has the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, on January 5, 1957, I introduced H. R. 2018 to permit any State of the United States or any political subdivision thereof to purchase from the District of Columbia Reformatory, located at Lorton, Va., various gun mountings and carriages for guns for use at historic sites and for museum display purposes.

The purpose of this bill is not new to the Congress. The gentleman from New York (Mr. O'BRIEN) introduced H. R. 11967 on June 26, 1956, to permit the State of New York to make purchases of these items from the District of Columbia Reformatory. The bill was later reported out from the Committee on the District of Columbia on July 23, 1956, with an amendment which would not only permit the State of New York, but all of the States and any of their political subdivisions to make such purchases. As so amended by the committee the bill was passed by the House on the same day.

Technically, the bill as passed by the House last year and as reintroduced by me in the 85th Congress, constitutes an amendment to the first section of the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1947.

That law set up a working capital revolving fund of \$50,000 at the reformatory out of which might be financed such industrial enterprises as the Commissioners should approve. The price of any products or services of such enterprises is to be the fair market value thereof, and the receipts are to be deposited with the working fund, and at the end of the year profits arising from the year's operation of such fund are transferred to the general revenues of the District of Columbia government.

Sales, however, are limited by the law to departments and institutions of the Federal Government and of the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2018 would extend the instrumentalities to which sale of prison-made goods may be made, by extending the category to States and political subdivisions thereof; however, it carefully limits the type of goods which may be sold to these additional buyers to historic gun mounts and gun carriages.

Several general comments may be made in conjunction with the bill.

As late as 1946, the District correctional system did not provide vocational training. Setting up a prison industry

involves many difficulties, chief among which is the necessity to keep the prison industry out of competition with free industry. Yet there are three basic reasons why prison industry is necessary. First of all, it furnishes productive work for the prisoners, which all penologists consider essential in any well-run prison. Secondly, it furnishes a basis for individual training of prisoners in various skills and crafts. This contributes immeasurably to the personal rehabilitation of the prisoner. And lastly, it provides some income for the prison system.

It was with all these objects in view that a working capital fund was made available to the District Correctional System by the act of 1946 in order to start work projects within the prison system. The working capital fund had been judiciously used to accomplish the objectives outlined above; and on quite a number of fiscal years has made a return of profits to the general fund of the District.

Due to the prejudice against the products of prison industry, where the payments are only token amounts, equivalent to hardly more than "cigarette money," it is seldom that the supply can create its own demand. Yet here the inmates of Lorton Reformatory have developed a special product which has begun to command the attention of a market wider than that to which they are permitted to sell it. Under such circumstances these gun carriages and gun mountings are more than just saleable articles. They are a product whose psychological value to the prisoners is even greater than any price they may command in themselves or any profit they may make for the prison industries of Lorton Reformatory.

I hope H. R. 2018 will receive the unanimous approval of the House.

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. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, that concludes the business from the Committee on the District of Columbia.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1958

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6500) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6500, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Thursday last the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RABAUT) had 52 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. WILSON) had 1 hour remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RABAUT).

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER).

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia of the Appropriations Committee once again brings to the floor of the House for your approval the annual District of Columbia appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1958.

It has been a pleasure working with our chairman, the able and distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RABAUT), and the other members of this committee. Mr. RABAUT is one of the great men of this House, and he carries out his duties as chairman of this committee in a careful, industrious, conscientious manner. We were ably assisted by Francis Merrill, our staff assistant. 174 witnesses appeared to justify the amounts requested for 1958.

The budget requests for the District of Columbia totaled \$207,249,900 for fiscal year 1958. Here again we have the largest budget ever submitted for the District. This budget is twice as large as the 1948 budget which totaled \$81,744,086; twice as large as the 1950 budget which totaled \$98,331,274, and 50 percent larger than the 1953 budget which totaled \$113,589,327. The 1957 budget totaled \$198,253,379. We recommend a reduction in 1958 requests of \$14,719,600. The total amount recommended in the bill for 1958 is \$192,530,300. This is \$5,723,079 less than the amount appropriated for 1957. Every operating expense item submitted to our committee was reduced with the exception of the National Guard item. This increase of \$9,800 contained contribution to civil service retirement fund of \$7,200.

The District of Columbia is financed out of five separate funds—a general fund, highway fund, motor-vehicle parking fund, water fund, and a sanitary sewage fund.

The bill before us today calls for a Federal payment of \$20 million to the general fund. This is \$3 million less than the amount requested, and \$3 million less than the maximum authorized by law. This bill further provides for a Federal payment to the water fund of \$1,751,450, and \$753,000 to the sanitary sewage works fund.

The District of Columbia program will be financed by the Federal payment, Federal loan authorizations, and District of Columbia revenue.

From 1924 to 1957 the Federal payment to the District has ranged from \$4,539,295 to \$22 million. In 1951 the payment totaled \$9,800,000; in 1954 it totaled \$11 million, and under this bill we recommend the sum of \$20 million.

Washington is one of the great cities in the world, and as our Capital City it should be a model city in every respect. There are 39,040 acres in the District of Columbia. According to the General Services Administration, the Federal Government owns 11,297 acres of land in the District, excluding the streets, alleys, and parkways. This represents 28.9 percent of the total of 39,040 acres.

To share the cost of operating the District the Federal payment is made each year. The payment and local taxes are considered extensively. This same procedure applies to the payment and local revenues. Taxes in the District certainly do not compare with taxes in the States. Here, for instance, we have no State or county tax, and the city rate for real property is \$2.30 per hundred dollar assessment. Assessments are exceedingly low here, and this is the reason for the 3-year reassessment program underway at the present time. Last year we recommended, and the House approved, this program. During our hearings last year we requested information concerning the 10 highest assessed commercial properties in Washington and the sixth highest was one of the hotels, assessed at \$4,902,120. Within 10 days from the time the information was furnished for the record this hotel sold for slightly over \$12 million. This year the same information was requested, and on page 105 of the hearings you will find this same hotel again assessed for \$4,902,120, the same as 1956. This, of course, would not occur in the States, and certainly establishes the need for the reassessment program.

The population of our Capital City totals 866,000, and the metropolitan area consists of 1,300,000. In 1950 the District received \$58,406,590 from taxes on real property, and in 1956 the amount received totaled \$69,265,867. Total tangible personal property tax revenue for fiscal year 1956 totaled \$7,332,900, with the total assessment totaling \$366,645,049.

Our annual examination of the District budget discloses certain shortcomings in some of the departments which, in most instances, can be corrected by administrative action or financial assistance.

In 1950 District of Columbia personnel totaled 18,058, and on June 30, 1956, personnel totaled 21,340. New positions requested for 1958 totaled 1,128; 325 of this number are for the schools. We allowed funds for 162 new schoolteachers. We recommend an appropriation of \$37,160,000 for the public schools. This is \$570,000 less than the 1958 estimates. In 1950 we had 94,716 children attending the public schools in the District, and today there are 111,688.

As a member of this committee I have observed marked improvement in several departments of the District of Columbia. Three good examples are the Metropolitan Police Department, Public Library, and the Recreation Department.

The Metropolitan Police Department is today one of the most efficient in the United States. In 1950 we had 19,898 major crimes committed in the District. Homicide, rape, robbery, housebreaking, and so forth. The number increased to 20,428 in 1951. In 1952 and 1953 many changes took place in the Department. Major crimes decreased from 20,428 in 1951 to 18,316 in 1955. Still more improvement was shown in 1956 and major crimes decreased to 16,650. This is a decrease of 18 percent. Public Law 514 of the 84th Congress authorizes a police force of 2,500 for the District. The total force as of February 28, 1957 was 2,261. Recruitment of personnel is difficult due

to starting pay and better retirement and pension benefits in other Federal agencies. A private starts at \$4,193 and receives step-ups for 3 years until he receives \$4,990. This is the top for another 5 years, and then he receives \$129 per annum for each 5 years after the first 3. He can receive only 5 such increases. Six hundred and forty-five dollars plus \$4,990 is the most a foot patrolman can earn. Since Congress authorized a police force of 2,500 the Department has been able to show an increase of only 35 men. Following passage of Public Law 514 on May 9, 1956, establishing 2,500 men as the minimum strength of the Metropolitan Police Department, our Committee recommended to the House that the 1957 Supplemental Act appropriating \$758,100 for this purpose be passed. The House appropriated this additional amount over and above the regular 1957 budget requests, and we expected the police force to increase accordingly. The total police force on June 30, 1956, was 2,226. The total police force February 28, 1957, was 2,261. This was 11 days before our hearings began on the 1958 requests. This number still prevails notwithstanding the intensive recruiting program which has been underway for months. The additional amount appropriated for more men has, in the main, been expended to pay officers for the extra days service each week. This procedure, of course, is not the best and should be referred to the District Legislative Committee for solution. The problem may be more serious than we expect. The Chief of Police now says that the Metropolitan Police force, like most police departments throughout the Nation, will probably continue in the position of being unable to obtain and retain sufficient personnel to fill its authorized complement. Our committee believes that the police force in the District should have its full complement of 2,500 men, and when this takes place we will recommend the full appropriation necessary to pay these men. As pointed out, the amount recommended for 1958 will provide for a force of some 2,400 man-years of employment. Police officers assigned in the prevention of crime are permitted to work on their assigned days off. This procedure has stopped the men from going to other agencies for employment and has placed an additional 146 foot patrolmen on the streets of this city from 6 p. m. to 2 a. m. when they are needed most. They are paid straight time the same as they are paid for the other 5 days. No man works more than 8 hours on any 1 day, and the extra time would be on 1 of his 2 days off.

In distributing police personnel, 1,110 of the total force are assigned to prevention and detection of crime. An intensive recruitment campaign is underway at the present time and every assistance should be given the police department in their efforts to bring the force up to the full authorization. We should have the best police department in the country here in our Capital City. Millions of visitors are here each year, and our city should be so protected that these visitors can enjoy their visit and have no fear of being yoked, assaulted, or murdered.

The members of the police department are to be commended—they are doing a good job. For operating expenses of the police department we recommend \$18,100,000, a reduction of \$101,000 in the budget estimates for 1958.

The Public Library System in the District includes a central library, administrative headquarters, 14 branches, and bookmobile service. On June 30, 1956, there were 933,074 bound volumes in the collection. During the past fiscal year 2,123,703 books were borrowed from the library, an increase of 58,028 volumes over the previous year. The gain so far this fiscal year is 75,069. As pointed out by Harry N. Peterson, Librarian of the District, circulation of books for home reading is not as important as the reference and advisory assistance given by the library. The library system of the District is a distinct asset and in good hands.

The recreation department has a current expansion program underway which is the first step of a long-range program to provide maximum facilities and services in all areas of the city. New projects will be coordinated with public health, welfare, police, and community service agencies to combat the anti-school problems and to stimulate youth who are now delinquent and living in congested neighborhoods. We recommend \$2,145,000 for this department. This is a reduction of \$16,000 in the 1958 estimates. Milo F. Christiansen and his staff are doing a good job. The District of Columbia Recreation Board, composed of Henry Gichner, Grahame Smallwood, Jr., Mrs. Elinor H. McGuire, Mrs. W. B. Putnam, Walter L. Fowler, G. M. Thorneth, Col. West A. Hamilton, Mrs. Dagny R. Pettit, and Edward J. Kelly, are to be commended.

In addition to receiving testimony from the officials of the District we had before us representatives of parent-teacher associations, civic organizations, and the many organizations interested in the welfare of the Capital City. We carefully considered every request made for fiscal year 1958.

Mr. Chairman, our committee recommends this bill to the Members of the House.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NATCHER. I yield.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I notice that my distinguished friend from Kentucky has mentioned that since, I believe, in 1949, the appropriations for the District of Columbia have doubled.

Mr. NATCHER. That is correct.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. He also notes that \$20 million which the gentleman's committee recommended would be twice what we gave in lieu of taxes in 1950. Is that correct?

Mr. NATCHER. Yes.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Would the gentleman tell the committee if the money that is taken in by the District of Columbia from taxes has been increased? Have they increased their taxes in order to take care of their increasing burden of responsibility, increased it in the same proportion they have asked Congress to increase theirs?

Mr. NATCHER. That increase has not taken place according to the amounts appropriated by this Congress.

I would say to my distinguished friend from Tennessee that about a year ago the real estate tax rate here in the District was increased from \$2.20 per hundred to \$2.30; but the amount of tax revenues received in the District has not increased according to the amount of the budget submitted to this Congress.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. They have not increased in the same proportion their request to Congress has increased.

Mr. NATCHER. That is correct.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I notice that the gentleman stated that the committee has reduced their request for Federal contribution to the District budget by \$3 million.

Mr. NATCHER. That is right.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. In the opinion of the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, who has made a great study of this problem, does he believe this \$3 million cut is ample and carries out the same spirit and theory that has been developed in other fields with reference to economizing this year?

Mr. NATCHER. I may say to the gentleman that I think the \$3 million reduction is an adequate and a reasonable reduction at this time.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. It should not be any greater?

Mr. NATCHER. It should not be any greater. Further, I would like to say that the \$20 million appropriated as the Federal payment places this budget in balance.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Did I understand the gentleman to say that a hotel in the District of Columbia with a \$12 million valuation pays a tax on a valuation of only \$4 million?

Mr. NATCHER. \$4,902,120.

Mr. GROSS. What is being done about that?

Mr. NATCHER. A reassessment program is underway at the present time by the District of Columbia. This is a 3-year reassessment program. I believe this reassessment program will not only correct this inequity but others existing in the District of Columbia at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Can an inequity as flagrant as that be corrected without a survey?

Mr. NATCHER. In my opinion, it should be corrected and it will be corrected. It certainly is an inequity, as pointed out by my distinguished friend.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Our contribution—that is the Federal Government's—in 1948 was around \$12 million, was it not?

Mr. NATCHER. Yes.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Now it is \$22 million or more?

Mr. NATCHER. The total Federal payment at the present time as authorized by this Congress is \$23 million. This bill carries an appropriation for \$20 million, which is \$3 million less than the total amount authorized.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I wish briefly to address myself to some of the legislative provisions in this appropriation bill. It seems to me there are more legislative provisions in this bill than should properly be in an appropriation bill. I refer particularly, for example, to provisions regulating the use of taximeters in taxicabs, the rates for electric current used by the District of Columbia, the operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, including boats, in the District of Columbia, and such things as that. It seems to me that matters such as these should be left to the consideration of the proper legislative committee. I had intended to make a point of order against some of these provisions, or perhaps move to strike the provision concerning taximeters in taxicabs. It seems to me this is certainly legislation on an appropriation bill. However, I had occasion to look into the history of that particular provision and found that it has been in the District of Columbia appropriation bill since 1932. I understand that sometime in the past a point of order was raised against it but was overruled. I must confess I am puzzled as to why it was overruled because certainly it seems to be very clearly legislation. For the purpose of the record I refer to section 8 on page 35 of the bill, lines 6 through 14.

At this time I do not wish to discuss the merits or demerits of taximeters in taxicabs. I am not going on record at this time in favor of meters or as being opposed to meters. However, I certainly think it is a matter that should be thoroughly studied by the proper legislative committee. The reason I am not making a point of order against it at this time or making any move to strike it is that it is now under consideration by the legislative committee, and I do not feel we are prepared to debate the subject intelligently at this time.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALEY. This subcommittee is really the city council for the District of Columbia, and if that is the case, why does the gentleman object to this kind of legislation at any time?

Mr. HYDE. I would say to the gentleman that the legislative committee on the District of Columbia is more properly the city council than is the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia. I think legislative matters should be referred to the legislative committee, as we do with other subjects of legislation in the House. That is the only point I am making at this time.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, before I go further, I want to compliment the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] for the fine job he did in chairing this bill through the committee. Also I should like to compliment my other colleagues on the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] and the other Members on that side of the House, as well as my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JAMES].

I think we gave the department heads a very thorough going over. And while we did not get all the information we would like to have had, I think we got about all we could get, sometimes by methods almost like pulling a wisdom tooth.

Mr. Chairman, the committee is hamstrung due to the fact that department heads are not permitted to testify, to tell the whole story, but may only answer such questions as are directed to them. Sometimes it is pretty hard to hit the vulnerable spot.

I as one member of the committee and the oldest member of this committee am very much disgusted and dissatisfied with the functioning of the Office of General Administration. I served on the committee before we had the reorganization. We were told day after day, week after week, about how when the District government was reorganized and the Department of General Administration was set up we were going to effect so many millions of dollars of savings. Let me say here that those savings have been reflected in increased costs in most every department. They have failed to show us where they have created any savings; in fact, they admit now that the savings they had intended to show us were a mistake.

We all know that costs of government have increased, the District of Columbia being peculiar in many ways, having all of the functions of a State, county, township and city, naturally its costs have increased equally as rapidly as those of comparable units. We have come up with a balanced budget, and the bill provides for the same amount of contribution by the Federal Government to the District as was granted last year. It provides for a small working surplus, which we think will be adequate to carry them through fiscal 1958.

Recreation, as my good friend the gentleman from Kentucky has so well brought out, is going forward. I am very much sold on recreation for the youth of our Capital City. I have always operated on the theory that if you give the boys plenty of ripe apples they will not eat the green ones. That is all we are trying to do, open up a couple of recreation centers in newly populated areas and equipping them at minimum expense.

I want to compliment the Police Department of the District of Columbia at this point. Especially because of the tremendous job they did under very adverse circumstances in handling the transit strike a year or two ago in the District of Columbia. They did a marvelous job. They gave up their annual leave, they worked overtime, and they worked without any regard to the hours, and handled what could have been a very

disturbing situation here in a quiet and peaceful manner.

We are all looking for soft spots in these Federal budgets. I wish the members of the various subcommittees on appropriations would point out the soft spots in their bills so that those of us in the House who do not have access to all the expert testimony they have would know where to cut in case we want to cut.

I know of only one soft spot in this budget, and it cannot be very soft because since this item was injected into the budget and they asked me as chairman of this committee in 1953 for \$725,000, we have cut them down to \$86,000; so a cut from \$870,000 to \$86,000 does not leave a very soft spot.

That is about all I have to say. Just one additional thought: I have always been a strong and staunch advocate against home rule. The District of Columbia belongs to the Hoosiers, the people from Michigan, Illinois, Iowa, and all the others of the 48 States. God forbid that I shall ever vote away the authority of my constituents to control their Nation's Capital. For along with authority goes responsibility. I want my Nation's Capital to be the finest Capital in the world. I want us to have the finest schools and the finest police department. In pruning this budget request and allowing them considerably more than they had last year, I think we have adequately provided for improvements in the District of Columbia. I hope the House will support the subcommittee on appropriations and the full Committee on Appropriations and pass this bill as it is presented to you today.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. BEAMER. I want to compliment the committee and all the subcommittees working diligently to prepare the appropriation bills. I think this is in keeping with good economy and efficiency in Government. I note in the committee report, and I think it is unfortunate that those of us who are very much interested in this subject did not have an earlier opportunity to read the report, it seems there is a reduction of some \$5 1/4 million over the amount in the 1957 appropriation. But, I also note that principally there are 3 items which absorb this cut, and all of the other items show an increase over the 1957 budget. My question is this: Would the gentleman remind us where that increase comes? Is it by chance the result of increased personnel, or is it the result of mandatory legislation?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. The increase primarily comes from ingrade promotions. It comes from retirement pay. Many items are mandatory because of the very acts passed by this House. We are providing for these mandatory increases over which we had no control and we must provide the money if we are going to fulfill the laws passed by the District of Columbia. Then, in some cases, as I explained before, there are normal increases. There are such increases in your municipal governments and in your State governments. They are all experiencing an increase in cost

of construction, salaries, and so forth. Retirement pay has gone up.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. I would like to remind my colleague that additional teachers are also provided for.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I will explain that.

Mr. BEAMER. I was going to ask this question. You have increased the personnel, and if so, I wonder if it could have been explained in the committee report or on the floor.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. In all of the schools throughout the land, we are experiencing an increase in school enrollment. That is the postwar crop which goes up to as high as the 7th or 8th grades in some cases. Therefore, we had to provide new teachers to take care of the increase or else we would have to lower the school standards and increase the pupil-teacher ratio. The standard all over the United States is about 35 pupils per teacher in grade school; it is 25 pupils per teacher in high school. The District requested that we drop that ratio and thereby improve the standard. I think it was 30 per teacher in grade school and 20 per teacher in high school. We met them about half way and we felt that was just about as far as we could go at this time. Not all the schools in the United States have increased standards. In fact, we are just about on a par in the District of Columbia with the other schools in the United States. They are faced with identically the same problems. They do not have an adequate number of teachers to fill the jobs and an adequate number of schoolrooms for them.

Mr. BEAMER. I notice, in reading the report, several instances where the committee has reported they are reducing the personnel. For instance, on page 2, the committee has denied a request for increases for additional personnel in the Department of General Administration, and a little later on it indicates that they have been forced to increase because of the new highway bill. I think it bears out the point the gentleman is trying to indicate that mandatory legislation passed by some previous Congresses makes it necessary in this Congress to increase the appropriations whether we like it or not.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Every time we pass a public law adding some services to the District of Columbia or increasing the rates of pay or increasing the personnel, it is up to the Congress to provide the money to meet the obligations imposed by those laws.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. How much have taxes been increased in the District of Columbia?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. That is the problem of the legislative committee. The Appropriations Committee has no control over taxes. That is entirely up to the legislative committee. We merely appropriate funds which they raise, and try to keep a balanced budget. We have a balanced budget now with a small

working surplus if the other body does not up the appropriations.

Mr. GROSS. But a moment ago the gentleman referred to the fact that costs have gone up in States and local subdivisions of government. I remind the gentleman that taxes have also gone up.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. We had a general tax increase in the District of Columbia, to be sure.

Mr. GROSS. How many years ago?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Two years ago.

Mr. GROSS. But there is no tax increase in the works today? There has been none since 3 years ago and none is in the works today?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. We cannot increase appropriations unless the revenue is found; and we will not unless the majority votes to increase the revenue available.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that, but I am trying to find out whether there is any possibility of taxes being increased in the District of Columbia.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. That question should be directed to the legislative committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross], I think has reference to a study that is now being made of all real estate in the District of Columbia, with the idea of ascertaining what the real valuation should be, with the idea of setting up the tax rate by 1959. That study is going along in a big way and will be productive of results.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. How long has this tax study been under way?

Mr. RABAUT. We ordered this tax study 2 years ago. At that time it was agreed by the experts it would take about that long to do it. The study is progressing very well. It is to be completed by next June 30.

Mr. GROSS. So it will take approximately 4 years to put a tax increase into effect?

Mr. RABAUT. Well, it is a pretty big job.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Kentucky points out there is a hotel in the city of Washington with a valuation of \$12 million and it is being assessed at \$4 million. It is not a hard job to figure out that there should be a tax revision.

Mr. RABAUT. Nobody discovered that except the committee that is before you today.

Mr. GROSS. It does not take that long out in your State or my State.

Mr. RABAUT. It is not a question of finding out about one piece of property. It is a question or reassessing the entire city. This was one of the things that was brought out in our subcommittee hearings several years ago.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. It has been 40 years since we have had a complete assessment of the real property of the District of Columbia. But it is not the result of negligence on the part of the Committee on Appropriations. However,

we are looking into it because we want to know whether they are paying their fair share or not. If they are, then we can satisfy ourselves as to the Federal contribution. If they are paying more than their fair share, we might be inclined to increase the Federal grant.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take a lot of time, but as has been indicated, I think the Committee on Appropriations has probably done a fine job. However, I do say that the property in the District of Columbia is not contributing to the extent that property in our local communities is contributing. I served for 6 years on the District of Columbia Committee, and I finally gave up when it appeared that pressures on the committee prevented any bill authorizing an equalization of tax rate from being favorably reported. I believe this action must be taken on the floor of the House.

I was not able to get the tax rate raised here in the District of Columbia. I think the only way we are going to get it raised is to refuse to approve the size of the Federal contribution that the Appropriations Committee has recommended. Then the District of Columbia is going to be forced, just as our local communities are forced, to increase their local revenues, through a fair and equitable tax rate.

A \$2.30 property tax in the District of Columbia is ridiculous, regardless of what basis of assessment there is. Even with an assessment of \$4,900,000 for a property that sold for \$12 million, a \$2.30 tax rate is not as much as I pay in my hometown for schools alone, not counting anything else.

I cannot in good conscience vote for a higher Federal contribution for the District of Columbia when the residents of the District of Columbia, the property owners, are not making a contribution comparable to what the people in my community are making. To me the only way we can correct this situation is to have the District of Columbia property owners subject to a tax and pay a tax that is equal to or comparable with what we are paying out in the country.

I am not objecting to the amount of the Federal contribution; I know that it has to be made, but I want it to be fair. To me it cannot be fair as long as the local people are not paying their fair share.

I am serving notice that I am going to vote against this bill today as a protest, if the \$20 million figure is not reduced. I am not in position at this time to offer an amendment to cut the amount of the Federal contribution. I am working on an amendment which I hope will make the tax-rate increase mandatory.

I tried to go through the hearings. I notice there is an inconsistency in this report on page 12 where it shows a statement of revenue, general highway funds, and so forth, for the various years, and it sets out for 1957 estimate of property taxes for real estate as \$44,750,000; 1958, \$45,500,000; yet I turn over here to page

106 of the hearings and find that the figures were put in here at the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], as follows:

Mr. Commissioner, I wonder if you have inserted in the record at this point a table showing the total amount received from taxes on real estate for the past taxable year, and also for the years 1950 through the last taxable year.

The table inserted on this page shows that for the year 1956 the tax was \$69,265,867.

There is a \$20 million discrepancy in the two sets of figures. So you are not going to get anywhere trying to reconcile the figures.

The point I would like to make is that real property in the District of Columbia is not paying taxes comparable to amounts being paid on real estate in other sections of the country, and that is my reason for voting against the Federal contribution.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. I take this time to direct the attention of the chairman of the sub-committee to page 35 of the bill, section 10, and I shall only read a part of it:

Sec. 10. All motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles (including watercraft) owned by the District of Columbia shall be operated and utilized in conformity with section 16 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 77, 78), and shall be under the direction and control of the Commissioners, who may from time to time alter or change the assignment for use thereof.

And we turn to page 36 and we find this language:

"Official purposes" shall not apply to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or in cases of officers and employees the character of whose duties makes such transportation necessary, but only as to such latter cases when the same is approved by the Commissioners.

What I am trying to find out is what this applies to.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. It applies to the fire-boat and to the police harbor boats. It applies only to boats.

Mr. GROSS. What does it do?

Mr. RABAUT. As the gentleman knows, the fire boat at times has gone down the river in display formation having the fountain afloat, and it refers to its use for display purposes.

Mr. GROSS. It goes no further than that? I assume what you are doing is striking "Official purposes" out of the restriction of the act of August 2, 1946, but are you not eliminating the restriction to official purposes for watercraft for other forms of transportation as well? I would like to have a good answer to this because I am sure it would go out on a point of order and I do not want to make a point of order if this language properly belongs in the bill and serves a useful purpose.

Mr. RABAUT. It is a tie-up to activities of the District because it says "whose duties" referring to the Commissioners "make such transportation necessary." It refers to the duties of the

Commissioners to make transportation necessary. It is not for personal purposes.

Mr. GROSS. It says for official purposes. What do these words mean in relation to making available transportation.

Mr. RABAUT. It applies to the duties of the Commissioners. "Duties" is a reference to a position, not to anything personal. I think the language is proper.

Mr. GROSS. Are you not striking out the restriction which limits them to the use of this transportation for official purposes and saying they can use it at their pleasure?

Mr. RABAUT. No. They can use it for such operations as would come under their duties as Commissioners. It would be the same thing as if the mayor of a city ordered something to be done in the city that was for a certain purpose, but he might use it for some other purpose on some other occasion. This is more intimate to the District of Columbia than to any other city because of the great number of people who come here from the States of the Union who have, in reality, a real interest in the city.

Mr. GROSS. They could not use this transportation for personal purposes?

Mr. RABAUT. No. Where is the word "personal" used?

Mr. GROSS. I did not say it was, but the "official purpose" clause is removed.

Mr. RABAUT. The word "duty" is implied in there. It refers to their official positions as Commissioners.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask the gentleman another question. Is there any money for bridges provided in this bill?

Mr. RABAUT. No money is provided for bridges.

Mr. GROSS. What about the planning for the Constitution Avenue Bridge, is that in here?

Mr. RABAUT. That was provided in the past 2 or 3 years. Of course, they will continue to use money that was provided for the purpose.

Mr. GROSS. Is there money for the building or the planning of parkways to be built solely by Federal funds? I am getting more and more interested in this all the time as the result of the \$15 million bridge voted last year, the \$10 1/2 million bridge voted a couple of hours ago, and maybe \$25 million for the Constitution Avenue Bridge next year. I am really getting interested now.

Mr. RABAUT. We just carry out the actions of this House.

Mr. GROSS. I know, but I have to vote on this bill sooner or later and I would like all the information I can get.

Mr. RABAUT. We are going to give it to the gentleman in a minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RABAUT. Does the gentleman have the hearings?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. Refer to page 649.

Mr. GROSS. Six hundred and forty-nine?

Mr. RABAUT. The Southwest Freeway; the Anacostia Freeway; east-west crossing Soldiers' Home; Dean Avenue; east-west crossing, Park Place to Klingle Road; Rhode Island Avenue; North Capitol Street; Michigan Avenue NE.; Vermont Avenue; Park Place; 14th and 17th Streets NE. and SE.; Bladensburg Road, 24th Street to the District line; Alabama Avenue SE.; Nichols Avenue to 12th Street; and so on. Everything here is within the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROSS. And being built out of Federal funds, is that correct?

Mr. RABAUT. Financed by the District of Columbia, just the same as the division is between the States and the Federal Government.

Mr. GROSS. Well, then, it is not financed by the District of Columbia.

Mr. RABAUT. It is partly financed by the District of Columbia, just as it would be in my State or yours.

Mr. GROSS. Ninety-ten, sixty-forty, or fifty-fifty?

Mr. RABAUT. It depends on the project.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I understand. Is the bridge across the Anacostia River completed?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. What was the total cost, does the gentleman know, of that bridge?

Mr. RABAUT. About \$13 million.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. That's about right.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. RABAUT. The Clerk may read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

Department of General Administration, including District government employees' compensation; administrative expenses, workmen's compensation, to be transferred to the Bureau of Employees' Compensation for administration of the law providing compensation for disability or death resulting from injury to employees in certain employments in the District of Columbia; unemployment compensation for District government employees; rental of postage meters; and affiliation with the National Safety Council, Inc.; \$4,525,000, of which \$130,000 shall remain available until expended and \$75,190 shall be payable from the highway fund, \$15,000 from the water fund, \$2,950 from the sanitary sewage works fund, and \$800 from the motor vehicle parking fund: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for advertising, for not more than once a week, for 2 weeks in the regular issue of 1 newspaper published in the District of Columbia, the list of all taxes on real property, water charges, sanitary sewer service charges, and all special assessments, together with penalties and costs, in arrears, the cost of such advertising to be reimbursed to the general fund by a charge to be fixed annually by the Commissioners for each lot or piece of property advertised: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for refunding, wholly or in part, school tuition, lost library books, building permits, cigarette and alcoholic beverage tax stamps, occupational and professional fees which have not been earned, and other payments which have been erroneously made during the present and past 3 years: *Provided further*, That the unexpended balance of the appropriation for District government employees' compensation contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1957, under the head of "Compensation and retirement fund expenses" shall be

transferred to this appropriation for the same purpose as appropriated: *Provided further*, That, for the purpose of assessing and reassessing real property in the District of Columbia, \$10,000 of this appropriation shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not in excess of \$100 per diem.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 4, line 20, strike out "\$4,525,000" and insert "\$4,424,000."

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, the reason I am offering this amendment is that I expect to offer an amendment on page 10 increasing the amount for the Police Department in the same amount. You will note, if you read the report of the hearings, that an increase was made for this Department of \$725,000, and it seems to me that we could at least permit the Police Department to use \$100,000 of that amount.

I have a chart before me showing that the Police Department of Washington has done one of the finest jobs of any police department in the United States. Crime has decreased here by 14 percent, while it has increased throughout the United States by 18 percent. I just cannot understand why their appropriation should be reduced at this time. I am certain that every Member of this House from time to time has had an opportunity to call on the Police Department here for assistance. Just last week I had four schools visit the District of Columbia. The Police Department helps to take care of all of these schools, and they tell me they assist with all the schoolchildren that come here and try to protect them.

On last Saturday night one of my constituents, working for the Department of Agriculture, was walking up 14th Street just after dark on her way up to Hahn's shoestore to buy a pair of shoes. Some man walked up behind her and caught her by the neck and threw her to the sidewalk. She screamed so loud that the man ran. However, the Police Department was good enough and efficient enough to catch this man.

Now, for that type of service we should surely try to reward the Department and not take money away from them. I want to compliment the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], the chairman of this fine subcommittee, and all the members of his subcommittee for the cooperation they have given my committee. Mr. Chairman, I have been a member of the House District Committee for 18 years. I have never known a committee to give us better cooperation than this subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. The chairman of the subcommittee called me and advised me concerning certain provisions of proposed legislation on this bill. Because he was so good as to tell me about that, I am not going to make any point of order on any of these provisions for proposed legislation on this appropriation bill.

I do not believe there is anyone in this House who would object to reducing the fund for General Administration by \$101,000 and adding that amount to the

Police Department, whose funds were reduced by \$101,000. I do not want to vote to increase the total of this appropriation bill. But with all the experience that I have had with the District Government I think the Department of General Administration can take a little reduction. Just a few years ago the committee of which I have the honor to be chairman created this Department of General Administration with the understanding that the expenses of the District government would be reduced. I have a statement here from the District government showing that since that time expenses have increased approximately \$62 million. I realize that \$35 million of that amount was for salary increases and other increases provided by law. This Department of General Administration seems to have a number of high-priced officials and some of them could be spared much more easily than we could spare one policeman. I realize that the Police Department has not recruited up to the 2,500 strength, but the chief has told me that he has been working some of his men 1 extra day a week, 6 days instead of 5 days, which is the reason we have the efficient force that we have today. The Department requires the total of the appropriation which was requested.

I hope that this Committee will approve my amendment so that we may, in turn, when we get to page 10 of the bill, vote to provide the Police Department the same amount of increase, without changing the total amount in this appropriation bill.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not rise actually to strike out the last word, but I use that technical expedient in order to get the floor.

I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that this Committee has under consideration an appropriation bill, amounting to a total of \$192,530,300, for the financial operation of the District of Columbia Government—a sizable sum, Mr. Chairman, at any time, a most sizable sum indeed at a time when the country is demanding economy.

I looked around the House 2 minutes ago and found that there were just 62 Members on the floor. One has come in since I counted and one has left. I am going to make the point of no quorum, and shall continue to insist on a quorum throughout the sessions, when we are in the second stage of reading for amendment, any appropriation bill. I think it is shocking to find less than 70 Members on the floor of the House when we are talking about spending \$192 million.

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-five Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[ROLL NO. 53]

Adair	Ashley	Bass, N. H.
Alexander	Aspinwall	Baumhart
Alger	Bailey	Becker
Anderson,	Barden	Bentley
Mont.	Barrett	Betts

Boland	Elliott	Magnuson
Bosch	Engle	Martin
Bowler	Farbstein	Morano
Boykin	Fino	Moulder
Breeding	Flynt	Osmers
Brown, Mo.	Fogarty	Patterson
Buckley	Frazier	Philbin
Burdick	Friedel	Powell
Byrne, Pa.	Fulton	Prouty
Cannon	Garmatz	Reece, Tenn.
Carrigg	Grant	Rogers, Colo.
Cederberg	Green, Pa.	Rogers, Tex.
Celler	Gregory	Roosevelt
Chenoweth	Gubser	Sadlak
Chudoff	Gwynn	Santangelo
Clark	Harris	Scrivner
Coffin	Healey	Simpson, Pa.
Coudert	Hillings	Smith, Miss.
Cramer	Holtzman	Spence
Cretella	Jackson	Springer
Davis, Tenn.	Jenkins	Steed
Dawson, Ill.	Kearney	Teller
Delaney	Keating	Thornberry
Derounian	Kelly, N. Y.	Walter
Dies	Keogh	Whitten
Diggs	Kluczynski	Willis
Doilinger	Lane	Wilson, Calif.
Donohue	Latham	Withrow
Dooley	Lennon	Young
Dorn, N. Y.	McConnell	Zelenko
Durham	McCormack	
Eberharter	McCulloch	

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill, H. R. 6500, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called when 321 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN].

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN].

Mr. Chairman, I dislike to find myself in disagreement with my distinguished friend from South Carolina, chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, who is one of the able Members of this House and my very good friend.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by my distinguished friend from South Carolina reduces the amount on page 4 of the bill, \$101,000. That is the general fund item.

Then, as pointed out by the gentleman, later on in the reading of this bill an amendment will be offered granting that \$101,000 to the Metropolitan Police Department.

Mr. Chairman, the Metropolitan Police Department in the District of Columbia, in my opinion, is one of the most efficient police departments in the United States. I say that advisedly. We have here in the District of Columbia, Mr. Chairman, one of the finest chiefs of police of any police department in the United States. As I pointed out to the committee in my general statement a few minutes ago, crime has decreased in the District of Columbia by some 18 percent which was brought about as the result of the fine Police Department we have in the District. But at the same time I want to point out to you that we recommend an appropriation for the Metropolitan Police Department of \$18.1 million for the fiscal year 1958.

Now, what about 1957? In 1957 the Metropolitan Police Force received \$13,773,000, almost \$5 million less than the amount this bill carries. Then, Mr. Chairman, in 1956 the Metropolitan Police Force received \$13,648,300; in 1955, \$12,877,520; in 1954, Mr. Chairman, \$12,608,683; in 1953, \$10,097,000. So, Mr. Chairman, from 1953 up to this good day, the amounts appropriated for the Metropolitan Police Department have grown from \$10,097,000 to \$18,100,000.

Mr. Chairman, on May 9, 1956, Public Law 514 was passed by the Congress. Under this law, the minimum force of the District is now 2,500. Since that law was passed in May of 1956 an intensive recruitment program has been under way and only 35 men have been added to the force. Under this bill, regardless of the fact that there are only 2,261 members on the force, we recommend that the Congress appropriate \$18.1 million, which will give the Metropolitan Police Force 2,400 man years.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. McMILLAN. First I want to commend the gentleman for all the good work he has done and for the cooperation he has given my committee. I would be the last one to criticize any statement he made, but I think he should explain to the House that about \$5 million of this was for salary increases that the Congress authorized.

Mr. NATCHER. I will say to my distinguished friend from South Carolina that last year, after the 1957 appropriation came onto the floor, we had a 1957 supplemental bill and under that bill \$758,100 was appropriated for the Metropolitan Police Department. That carried the total force up to 2,492. With this intensive recruitment program under way they have only been able to add 35 men. They have 2,261 on the force today under an authorization of 2,500, and we have granted and recommended over \$18 million.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to add just a little to what my distinguished friend from Kentucky has said. In this bill we have allowed for 2,400 man years, which is getting pretty close to what they asked for. But, I think it means much more than that. I think if we actually recruited 2,500, we would lose an awful lot of experienced policemen, because we have provided for those men who have families and cannot give their families the standard of living they wish. We have men working on their days off. They are experienced people. If we did not leave some vacancies for these people, some would be compelled to quit their jobs and seek employment elsewhere. We find today that many of them are working in grocery stores, driving taxicabs, working 20 to 30 extra hours a week in order to give their family a little better standard of living. I hope we shall always leave room in the District police force for those ex-

perienced policemen to supplement their income and better their standard of living by working extra hours. I recommend that we approve this bill as it is and defeat the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 6 minutes following the time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS], 3 minutes to be allotted to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER], and the balance of the time to the committee.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] has offered the solution which he felt he was offering with reference to this amendment. He has just pointed out the great advantage which accrues to the police department by giving these men an opportunity, these men who are already on the force, to put in this extra time. That is, indeed, a great advantage. But with \$101,000 cut out of the police department funds, the committee has removed the opportunity for the chief to put these men on their beats in uniform and to make this extra time. That is the reason the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN] has offered this amendment to cut \$101,000 from the Department of General Administration, which is getting an increase of \$741,000 for 1958 over 1957 so that, without increasing the appropriation under this bill \$1 the police department may be given this \$101,000 to do the very things which the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] has said ought to be done all the time.

Too much cannot be said for the efficiency and the fine law-enforcement work which the Metropolitan Police Department is doing for the citizens of the District of Columbia. I know, because I headed a special committee to investigate crime in this district, which resulted in our passing 34 amendments to the criminal law of the District of Columbia, to assist the police department and the courts in enforcing the law in the District.

Chief Murray is one of the finest police chiefs I know of. I appreciated the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], when he talked about Chief Murray of the Metropolitan Police Department. They need the \$101,000 very much to put these uniformed men on the beat. Chief Murray and other police officials will tell you that one of the greatest deterrents to crime is to have uniformed policemen on the beat.

Washington is one of the most crime-ridden cities in the United States. Every day the papers are full, and have been

for years, of news items concerning yoking, items where burglaries take place, where robberies take place, assaults and rapes and crimes of violence of every kind. There is no economy in cutting \$101,000 out of the Police Department funds, when every dollar of it will be used, and the Chief says so, to put uniformed men on the beat.

I believe in economy, and I think the Members of this House know it. But this is not any place to economize when it means lessened law enforcement.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to associate myself with the gentleman in what he is telling the Committee, because it is absolutely the truth. I hope that this amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman very much. I trust also that this amendment will be adopted and that the next amendment which the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMillan] offers, to put \$101,000 back into the Police Department funds, will be adopted. It will mean much better law enforcement in the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER] for 3 minutes.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I join with my two colleagues and others of you from the District Committee who know from practical experience the very fine job that is being done by the Police Department of the District of Columbia.

I remember when it was not so good. About 3 years ago we had quite a shakeup in the District that has resulted in the Police Department's now being one of the best police forces in the United States.

I have watched with interest the activities not only of the Police Department, but the Department of Education, the Fire Department, and like services of the District. If there are any of these services that I would be here in the well to speak for today, it would be the Police Department and the \$101,000 involved in this amendment.

We have the responsibility here in the District with these thousands of our youth from all over the Midwest and the East visiting this city. We have had some sad experiences in the District with these boys and girls that come here to spend 1, 2, or 3 days. If there is anything I want to see, it is that these youths are given every protection to which their parents, you, and I feel they are entitled.

Something has been said here about the doubling up, on extra duty by many present members of the force. Last year we not only decreed in the Congress that the Police Department should have a minimum of 2,500 members, but we also gave them a salary increase. They are about 35 men short of the 2,500, and that has been due to the fact that they have not been able to recruit the necessary 35 men. The result has been that

the Chief has had to double up on many occasions.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIER. I yield.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. It is 271 short instead of 35.

Mr. WIER. When you count the doubled up men you come within the 35. That is the problem that is involved in this \$101,000 more, that is, to give the men the 40-hour workweek that they have been given by the Department here, instead of doubling up these few men that want to go out and make some extra money. I thought we were providing a salary that was quite satisfactory to the Police Department; at least, they displayed their interest in the raise we gave them, without having to go out and drive taxicabs and work beyond their 40 hours.

So I urge and hope and pray that the House will sustain the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina. I am sure you will get a good return from the Police Department of this community.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] to close debate.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, it is proposed under the caption "Department of General Administration" to reduce the amount by \$101,000 but eventually increase the funds available to the Police Department by the same amount. We have given the Department of General Administration the same amount of money they had last year. The sum truly is higher, but the increase includes \$482,000 transferred into the Department from the old retirement fund appropriation. Also \$206,500 for the civil service retirement fund, the increase for administrative expenses, workmen's compensation is \$13,500, and so on. So you are going to go below the 1957 level and disturb the whole Department if you take the money out of this Department.

As to the Police Department, they have no better friends in this House than the members of this Appropriations Subcommittee. The Police Department under our appropriation has funds available for approximately 2,400 man-years of employment. Actually they have on the rolls only 2,260. So there is a difference of 140 man-years. The cost is about \$4,200 per man. Multiplying \$4,200 by 140, they have on hand extra funds at the present time under this appropriation of \$588,000. They had \$14,531,000 including the supplemental appropriation in 1957. This year we are recommending \$18,100,000. When there is \$18,100,000 involved and someone comes in and says, "I want \$101,000 more" I think this House in its fine judgment, that it always has, will see the point of this committee who have done so much for the Police Department and for the elimination of crime. I hope that this amendment will be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

All time for debate on the pending amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McMILLAN) there were—ayes 51, noes 67.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I spoke a while ago about the Federal contribution in this appropriation bill, which is in the amount of \$20 million. I also pointed out at that time that the tax rate for real estate in the District of Columbia is \$2.30. I would like each Member to kindly recall what your tax rate is in your district. At the proper time, I am going to move to recommit this bill and to strike out the figure \$20 million and substitute \$11 million. I have decided to ask for this \$9 million cut because they are anticipating real estate taxes of \$45 million. With an increase of only 20 percent, which would bring the tax rate to \$2.76, you could raise that \$9 million through taxes on real estate and save the \$9 million which the taxpayers of the whole Nation are forced to pay in order to give the taxpayers in the District of Columbia a free ride. Now, if you want to get some economy, and if you want to treat the people in the District of Columbia like you treat the people in your own hometown, you will vote for the motion to recommit when it is offered.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

METROPOLITAN POLICE

Metropolitan Police, including the inspector in charge of the traffic division with the rank and pay of deputy chief; one captain who shall be assigned to the traffic division with the rank and pay of inspector; one inspector who shall be property clerk; the lieutenants in command of the homicide squad, robbery squad, general assignment squad, special investigation squad, with the rank and pay of captain while so assigned; the detective sergeants in command of the automobile squad, and the check and fraud squad with the rank and pay of lieutenant while so assigned; the present acting sergeant in charge of police automobiles with the rank and pay of sergeant; the present lieutenant in charge of purchasing and accounts with the rank and pay of captain; the lieutenant in charge of the Metropolitan Police Boys' Club with the rank and pay of captain; not to exceed one detective in the salary grade of captain; civilian crossing guards including uniforms and equipment, at rates of pay and hours of employment to be fixed by the Commissioners; compensation of civilian trial board members at rates to be fixed by the Commissioners; allowances for privately owned automobiles used by deputy chiefs and inspectors in the performance of official duties at \$480 per annum for each automobile; relief and other allowances, as authorized by law, for policemen; rewards for fugitives; photographs, rental, purchase, and maintenance of radio and teletype systems; expenses of attendance, without loss of pay or time, at specialized police training classes and pistol matches, including tuition and entrance fees; expenses of the police training school, including travel expenses of visiting lecturers or experts in criminology; expenses of traffic school; official equipment, including cleaning, alteration and repair of articles transferred from one individual to another,

or damaged in the performance of duty; purchase of passenger motor vehicles; and the maintenance of a suitable place for the reception and detention of girls and women over 17 years of age, arrested by the police on charge of offense against any laws in force in the District of Columbia, or held as witnesses or held pending final investigation or examination, or otherwise; \$18,100,000, of which amount \$1,952,850 shall be payable from the highway fund and \$88,600 from the motor vehicle parking fund, and \$35,000 shall be exclusively available for expenditure by the Chief of Police for prevention and detection of crime, under his certificate approved by the Commissioners, and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McMILLAN: On page 10, line 7, after "otherwise", strike out "\$18,100,000" and insert "\$18,201,000."

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to try to give our magnificent Metropolitan Police force some encouragement. I agree with the chairman of the committee that they have been treating the Police Department in a good manner and I am certain there is no intention on their part to cripple them, but with conditions as they are in the District of Columbia, and I am in a position to know, we need all the policemen we can get and all the encouragement we can give our Chief of Police.

I do not think anyone can vote against this amendment of additional funds for the Chief of Police.

I want to show you a chart and show you how crime has been reduced during the past year since we increased the force to 2,500, while every section of the United States on the average crime was increasing by 18 percent. We all know that the District government cost has increased in the last 3 years in the amount of \$62 million. About \$35 million of that was for salary increases that this Congress granted. I can see no reason for us to squabble over an additional \$101,000 for the Police Department, which everyone agrees is doing a good job. If the Chief of Police can handle the situation with 2,500, by giving the men who are working 5 days a week an extra day, with the success that he has secured by this method, I see no reason why you should vote against the amendment.

I hope this committee will vote for this amendment and show the Chief of Police in Washington that we are 100 percent behind him. The following figures should prove to you that general administration plan is not reducing the budget as we were promised when the act was passed.

Mr. Chairman, at this point in the RECORD, I am including some figures which show the trend of expenditures in the Government of the District of Columbia since 1953. I am wondering if the Appropriations Committee questions the new Department of General Administration officials relative to this extraordinary increase in expenditures here in the city of Washington.

The total appropriation for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1957 was \$198,299,121. This amount comprises appropriations made for both operating costs and capital items for the general fund and the four special funds of the District. These special funds are the highway, water, sanitary sewage works, and the motor-vehicle parking funds.

The appropriation for the fiscal year 1953 for the same purposes was \$137,173,813, which represents an increase of \$61,125,308, or 44.6 percent.

Capital items appropriated for in 1957 amount to \$48,110,029, as compared with \$22,232,200 in 1953, an increase of \$25,877,829, or 116.4 percent. This is mainly because of the borrowing program authorized for the highway, water, and sanitary sewage works funds. There was \$175,765,000 appropriated during the 5 years 1953 through 1957, of which \$45,787,000 was borrowed under authorization by Congress—Public Law 364, 83d Congress. This was the result of the public works program proposed by the Commissioners and approved by the Congress in this same public law.

The operating appropriations for the District in 1957, including all funds, were \$150,189,092, as compared to \$114,941,613 in 1953, an increase of \$35,247,479, or 30.7 percent. This increase was distributed \$30,373,904, or 29.0 percent increase in the general fund; \$2,077,100 or 36.3 percent increase in the highway fund; \$814,370 or 18.6 percent increase in the water fund; \$1,707,366 or 100 percent increase in the sanitary sewage works fund—this fund was established in fiscal year 1955—and \$274,739 or 206.5 percent increase in the motor-vehicle parking fund.

Of the \$35,247,479 increase in operating expenses, \$18,481,305 was recurring costs due to beneficial legislation for employees. This amount is composed of the following actions:

Police and fire salaries were increased in 1954 and again in 1955 at an annual cost of \$3,872,547 and increased benefits to retired policemen, firemen, widows, and minor dependents in 1954 and 1955 resulted in further annual costs of \$773,000.

Teachers' salaries were increased in 1954 and 1955 at an annual cost of \$4,535,668.

Wage-scale employees salaries were adjusted in 1954, 1955, 1956, and 1957 at a total annual cost of \$2,942,926.

Classified employees received a salary increase in 1955 and costs of the fringe benefits and judicial salary increases added another annual cost of \$3,736,264.

Group life insurance and the District's contribution to the teachers' and civil-service retirement fund accounts during this period resulted in an annual increased cost of \$1,655,900.

These increases are common to all funds in most respect except for the police, fire, and teachers. Fifteen percent of the increases of the police salary increases and additional force are chargeable to the highway fund. The balance of the policemen's cost, as well as those for the firemen and teachers, are charges of the general fund.

The remaining \$16,766,174 increase in operating expenses result from the following:

Increases in costs of United States courts	\$700,000
Increases in care of District of Columbia insane at St. Elizabeths Hospital	1,550,000
Expansion of police force to 2,500 men, staffing of new welfare institutions, hospital facilities, additional fire stations, housing code enforcement, and other necessary personnel increases	5,138,134
Reallocations (approximately)	1,000,000
Additional supplies for operating requirements and for new institutions, cost of annual step increases in salaries, rising prices for materials, etc	8,378,040

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. As I pointed out a few minutes ago, I dislike to find myself in opposition to my distinguished friend from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN], but I think it is necessary that I point out to the Members of this body that on May 19, 1956, the Congress passed Public Law 514. Under that law the total authorized force for the Metropolitan Police Department was increased to 2,500. In other words, the minimum force was established under that law at 2,500.

At the time that law was passed, in the District of Columbia they had 2,226 members on the police force. Since that law was passed an intensive recruitment program has been under way but there has been a net increase of only 35 men to the force. Right at this time they have 2,261 members on the force.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, we recommend under this bill approximately 2,400 man-years of employment. The \$18,100,000 recommended under this bill provides for 2,400 man-years.

This \$101,000 amendment, Mr. Chairman, simply increases the total of this bill by that amount. As I pointed out a few minutes ago, I think Chief Murray is a fine Chief of Police, and I say to you advisedly that the Police Department here in the District of Columbia is one of the finest police departments in the United States of America. I also say to you that since I have been a member of this subcommittee we have done everything we could to help the Police Department.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Do I understand that they have more money than they have spent?

Mr. NATCHER. I say that at the present time the police force numbers 2,261 men.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How much is provided in the bill?

Mr. NATCHER. The amount provided in this bill is for approximately 2,400 man-years of employment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. NATCHER. I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that if the Police Department of the District of Columbia could be 2,500 members I would be for that number,

but I say to you if you increase this bill \$101,000 they will not be able to use it.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NATCHER. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. I just want to say in addition to what the gentleman has said that the balance in the general fund of the District of Columbia is \$154,900. If this amendment should pass it would reduce the cushion for the District to a figure of \$53,900. That is too close to the bottom.

This amendment should be defeated.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NATCHER. I yield.

Mr. WIER. I want to clear up some of these figures about man-years.

The facts are as the gentleman has said that we figured last year on a 2,500 minimum police force.

Mr. NATCHER. That is right.

Mr. WIER. The gentleman then reported that we had about two-thousand-and-two-hundred-some-odd members on the force.

Mr. NATCHER. If the gentleman will permit me I will read Chief Murray's statement.

Mr. WIER. I am just getting at the man-years' cost. You are doubling up on the amount.

Mr. NATCHER. If the gentleman will permit me I will read Chief Murray's statement. It is found at page 380 of the hearings. I read the following figures on personnel:

	Number of men
Total force, June 30, 1956	2,226
Appointed to the force	+136
Returned from military leave	+2
Transferred from White House Police	+1
Resigned	-59
Retired	-26
Dismissed or dropped during probation	-6
Separated to military leave	-2
Transferred to White House Police	-8
Deceased	-3

Mr. WIER. Let me ask the gentleman one more question. Is this not \$101,000 less in your budget than the Chief requested?

Mr. NATCHER. If this \$101,000 amendment is adopted it would give the Metropolitan Police Force \$18,201,000. That would be \$101,000 more than we recommend, and it would be a smaller amount than requested; yes.

Mr. WIER. The answer to that is "Yes."

Mr. NATCHER. The answer to that is "Yes."

Mr. WIER. It is \$101,000 less than the Chief requested?

Mr. NATCHER. I would like to point out to the Members of the House that we have 2,261 men on the force, we are recommending an appropriation bill that carries money for 2,400. I say to you it is not good practice; it is not good procedure to appropriate an amount of money to any department that does not have the full complement of employees. You, Mr. Chairman, know that in the case of other departments of the Federal Government under no circumstances would you do it. We have a fine police department. The crime wave is down 18 percent and the visitors who come to

the Nation's Capital can walk the streets during the day and early evening hours with safety. They are doing a good job and I say to you we are appropriating an adequate amount.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 3 minutes after the gentleman from Georgia has completed his statement.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I know something about this authorized strength and the manner in which it has been utilized because I introduced the bill which brought the authorized strength from 2,250 to 2,500.

The Committee on the District of Columbia of the House went into this question very thoroughly and determined that this increase in authorized strength was needed. The House considered the matter very carefully when the bill was before the House for consideration. The membership of the House and the Senate decided that the crime situation in the District of Columbia necessitated that increase.

It has been determined beyond any question of doubt that the Metropolitan Police Force ought to have 2,500 policemen working to enforce the law in the District of Columbia. I do not think there is any Member who doubts that that strength is needed, the 2,500 policemen in the District of Columbia.

Now, what is the actual situation? Let us have a look at it. The gentlemen on the subcommittee who brought in this bill say that they are authorizing 2,400 man-years. Two thousand five hundred man-years is the number that has been determined to be needed. They may have only 2,261 men on the force, as is shown on page 380 of the hearing, but Chief Murray has been doing his best to protect the lives, the liberty, and the property of the people of the District of Columbia by putting men who are already on the force on an extra day over their 5-day week and paying them the regular price, not overtime, just their regular salary, and letting them work this extra day. That is how they have had 2,400 man-years. They could not have 2,400 man-years with 2,261 employees except by doing that.

They had this \$101,000 in the bill this year. Is the crime situation here in the District of Columbia such that we can afford to cut \$101,000 off of what they had to spend in order to have uniformed men on the streets this year? The crime situation beggars my command of the English language to describe. You who read the newspapers know what goes on here. How could it occur to anyone that we can afford to cut \$101,000 off the uniformed force on the beats here with the crime situation such as it is in the District of Columbia? It is beyond me.

The gentleman from Kentucky told you what Chief Murray said as to the strength of the police department, but he did not tell you what he said about his recommendation to increase it. He said that they need not \$101,000 but \$360,774 for full employment during the fiscal year 1958.

If this \$101,000 is put in there, they still will not have enough to bring them up to full employment. He said in his testimony before the committee that they need \$360,744 and that is shown on page 379 of the hearings.

Now, are we playing fair when we cut down the strength of the police force here? You are simply inviting more crime and you are telling the dope fiends and the robbers and the burglars and the attackers and those who commit crimes of violence in this District that we are cutting down and we are crippling the force this coming year by \$101,000.

I think it is a dangerous thing to do, and I want to raise my voice again to say that this \$101,000 ought not to be cut from the police fund this year.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, there are 28 items in this bill plus the capital outlay and only in one case is there lacking a cut in the budget estimates. That is in the estimate for the National Guard.

This is a year when we here are crying for economy. You hear it in the halls and it echoes in this Chamber. We have proved to you here this afternoon that the Police Department has been unable to recruit the manpower with the money we have given them. As a result they are assigning voluntarily their own people on their off days.

That brings about the matter to which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER] addressed himself about man-years and expenditures. Man-years are based on the 8-hour day. Now, if this \$101,000 is allowed for the Police Department, you are going to take it under the language of the amendment from the balance in the general fund which is, under our bill, \$154,900. Is there anybody in this room that thinks that the government of the city of Washington should have a cushion of but \$53,900? That is where you leave them. That is where you leave them if you pass this amendment.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. McMILLAN. I have full confidence in the chairman, as I have stated several times today. He has been very cooperative. He stated that there was only one item that was increased, and I was wondering about the operating expenses.

Mr. RABAUT. Under what caption?

Mr. McMILLAN. Operating expenses. In the Department of General Administration you have \$741,000 with a plus before it. What do you mean by that?

Mr. RABAUT. I do not know what you are talking about.

Mr. McMILLAN. The report.

Mr. RABAUT. What page?

Mr. McMILLAN. Page 2. I think that puzzles some of us.

Mr. RABAUT. Operating expenses? Well, we had an appropriation for 1957 of \$323,000 for the executive office. We have an estimate for 1958 of \$373,800. Now, some of those increases are mandatory. Is that what the gentleman is talking about?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. All time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McMILLAN) there were—ayes 44, noes 59.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC WELFARE

Department of Public Welfare, including relief and rehabilitation of indigent residents, maintenance pending transportation of indigent persons, burial of indigent residents of the District of Columbia, temporary care of children while being transferred from place to place, care of women and children in institutions, including those under sectarian control, burial of children dying while beneficiaries under this appropriation, repairs and improvements to buildings and grounds, purchase of passenger motor vehicles, transportation between Children's Center and Laurel, Md., of schoolchildren of employees residing on the reservation, maintenance of a suitable place of detention for children under 18 years of age arrested by the police on charge of offense against any laws in force in the District of Columbia or committed to the guardianship of the Department of Public Welfare, or held as witnesses or held temporarily, or pending hearing, or otherwise, and male witnesses 18 years of age or over shall be held at the District of Columbia General Hospital, subsistence in lieu of salary for employment of persons for the purpose of securing training and experience in their future vocations, supervision of students performing voluntary services for the purpose of obtaining training and experience in their future vocations, compensation of consulting physicians and veterinarians at rates to be fixed by the Commissioners, and care of boys committed to the National Training School for Boys by the courts of the District of Columbia under a contract to be made by the Commissioners or their designated agent with the Attorney General at a rate of not to exceed the actual cost for each boy committed, \$12,450,000: *Provided*, That when specifically authorized by the Commissioners this appropriation may be used for visiting any ward of the Department of Public Welfare placed outside of the District of Columbia and the States of Virginia and Maryland: *Provided further*, That employees using privately owned automobiles for the transportation of indigent persons or the placing of children may be reimbursed as authorized by the act of June 9, 1949 (63 Stat. 166), but not to exceed \$900 for any one individual.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. My point of order is with reference to the language on page 16, line 9, beginning with the word "*Provided*" down to and including the word "Maryland" on line 13. That is legislation on an appropriation bill in that it requires additional duties of the Com-

missioners and also is unlimited as to amount. It may be used in visiting any ward of the Department of Public Welfare anywhere in the United States. The language says outside the District of Columbia and the States of Virginia and Maryland. That would permit them to travel anywhere.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, this language has been carried in the bill for probably 4 years. The language itself indicates its purpose. If the gentleman insists on his point of order, I will have to concede the point of order.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, of course I insist on the point of order; otherwise I would not have made it.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL GUARD

National Guard of the District of Columbia, including compensation to the commanding general at not to exceed \$11,600 per annum; attendance at meetings of associations pertaining to the National Guard; expenses of camps, and for the payment of commutation of subsistence for enlisted men who may be detailed to guard or move the United States property at home stations on days immediately preceding and immediately following the annual encampment; reimbursement to the United States for loss of property for which the District of Columbia may be held responsible; cleaning and repairing uniforms, arms, and equipment; instruction, purchase, and maintenance of athletic, gymnastic, and recreational equipment at armory or field encampments; practice marches, drills, and parades; rents of armories, drill halls, and storehouses; advertising incident to recruiting; care and repair of armories, offices, storehouses, and machinery; alterations and additions to present structures; purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; construction of buildings for storage and other purposes; \$155,300.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seven Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I wonder why, in the light of some things that are happening over the world, there is an appropriation in this bill or any other bill for the support of the National Guard or any other military forces in the amounts we are expending.

I noticed in yesterday's paper a Reuters dispatch from London from which I should like to quote briefly:

A trade mission representing five British rubber machinery manufacturers and electrical engineering firms returned here tonight from Moscow—

That is, returned to London from Moscow—

with an order from the Soviet Union worth "many millions."

J. G. Mackay, 51, technical director of Francis Shaw & Co., Ltd., of Manchester, led the delegation.

When completed—

Said Mr. Mackay—

this tire factory to be built in Russia will be the largest in the world outside the United States.

It was my belief that rubber was on the strategic list, yet the British are going over to Russia to build and equip, by their own admission, the biggest tire factory outside the United States.

What are we doing appropriating for the National Guard in the District of Columbia or anywhere else, if there is no longer any danger of war from Russia? That must be the case if the British are going to build up Russian industry.

Then I note in today's New York News a story which is headed as follows:

BRITISH TO CUT UPPER BRACKET TAX

LONDON, April 7.—A substantial cut in the income tax levied on Britain's hard-hit upper and middle classes is expected to highlight Tuesday's annual budget.

Earlier this afternoon a bill was reported to the floor of the House, and it will probably be called up later this week or next, to waive the interest and principal payments on the huge debt owed to the United States by Great Britain. In other words, you are going to be called upon to forget and forgive the British interest payment now due and overdue on their debt to the United States, plus the principal payments.

Mr. HOFFMAN. We would not need so much for the National Guard if they would pay that.

Mr. GROSS. That is exactly right.

You are going to be confronted very shortly with economy in reverse, that is, aid the British so they can reduce the taxes on their upper class citizens and finance the building of the biggest tire plant outside the United States, in Russia. You can vote any way you choose, but I am going to vote against it. I am against the waiving of these interest and principal payments.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What about Great Britain cutting her armed forces? Would that not lessen the necessity of the National Guard appropriation here in the District of Columbia?

Mr. GROSS. It certainly ought to—that is the point I am trying to make and I thank my friend from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And there are some other things too, which the gentleman has not cited, which I am sure he has in mind.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time. In due time we will get to those other things which the gentleman mentioned.

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC BUILDING CONSTRUCTION

Capital outlay, public building construction: For acquisition of public school sites; preparation of plans and specifications for the following buildings: Elementary school in the vicinity of 10th and F Streets NE, branch library building in Fort Davis, training school for Fire Department at Blue

Plains, warehouse and utility buildings replacement at District of Columbia Village, utility building at Glenn Dale Hospital, and school building at District Training School; erection of the following structures, including building improvement and alteration and the treatment of grounds: Elementary school in the vicinity of Texas Avenue and C Streets SE, Taft Junior High School addition, senior high school in the vicinity of Congress Heights area Southeast, elementary school in the vicinity of Mount Olivet Road and Holbrook Street NE, Payne Elementary School addition, Moten Elementary School addition, branch library building in Washington Highlands, remodeling three structures for use as dormitories, and a chapel at the Reformatory, dormitory and addition to the hospital at the Workhouse, and a laundry addition at District of Columbia Village; improvement of sewage disposal plant; equipment for new buildings; survey of mechanical and utility services at District of Columbia General Hospital; purchase of new fireboat; improvement of various recreation units, including preparation of architectural plans and erection of recreation structures without regard to the act of August 24, 1912 (40 U. S. C. 68); \$590,900 for purchase of equipment for new school buildings; and permanent improvement of buildings and grounds (including purchase and installation of furnishings and equipment, elimination of fire hazards, and road construction) of schools, firehouses, hospitals, welfare institutions, and other District of Columbia buildings; to remain available until expended, \$10,496,000 of which \$4,803,000 shall not become available for expenditure until July 1, 1958, and \$569,475 shall be available for construction services by the Director of Buildings and Grounds or by contract for architectural engineering services, as may be determined by the Commissioners, and the funds for the use of the Director of Buildings and Grounds shall be advanced to the appropriation account, "Construction services, Department of Buildings and Grounds."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Amendment offered by Mr. RABAUT: On page 25, line 20, after the word "Northeast," insert "warehouses for public schools and Department of Buildings and Grounds (including shop facilities and record center) in the vicinity of Adams Street and Queens Chapel Road NE."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the committee denied construction funds for these two projects, but allowed funds for the plans and specifications. This amendment provides language to allow the District of Columbia government to use the funds provided for the purposes named in the amendment. It is a good amendment and it is a corrective amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RABAUT: On page 27, line 7, after the word "Grounds" and before the period, insert "Provided, That the provision contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act of 1918 prohibiting the construction of any buildings at Gallinger Municipal Hospital that would interfere with the future extension of Massachusetts Avenue is hereby repealed."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is self-explanatory and

arises as the result of committee investigation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to, and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6500) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Indiana opposed to the bill?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WILSON of Indiana moves to recommit the bill H. R. 6500 to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. When a Member makes a motion to recommit and the Chair asks him if he is against the bill, would the proceedings during the afternoon when he is for the bill—

The SPEAKER. The Chair never questions a Member about his motives or whether or not he is telling the truth.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I was just asking for information.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana offered a motion to recommit. The motion always goes to the minority if they desire it, and the gentleman qualified by saying he was opposed to the bill.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I was just trying to get some information.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 54]

Adair	Dies	Kluczynski
Alexander	Diggs	Krueger
Alger	Dollinger	Lane
Anderson,	Donohue	Latham
Mont.	Dooley	Lennon
Andresen,	Dorn, N. Y.	McConnell
August H.	Doyle	McCormack
Aspinwall	Durham	McCulloch
Barden	Eberharter	Magnuson
Barrett	Elliott	Martin
Bass, N. H.	Engle	May
Baumhart	Fallon	Morano
Becker	Farbstein	Patterson
Bentley	Fino	Philbin
Betts	Flynt	Powell
Bosch	Fogarty	Reece, Tenn.
Bowler	Frazier	Rogers, Mass.
Breeding	Friedel	Rogers, Tex.
Erown, Mo.	Fulton	Roosevelt
Buckley	Garmatz	Sadlak
Byrne, Pa.	Grant	Santangelo
Carriag	Green, Pa.	Scrivner
Celler	Gregory	Simpson, Pa.
Chenoweth	Gubser	Spence
Chudoff	Gwynn	Springer
Clark	Harris	Teller
Coffin	Healey	Thornberry
Coudert	Holifield	Vursell
Cramer	Holtzman	Walter
Cretella	Jackson	Williams, Miss.
Cunningham,	Kearney	Wilson, Calif.
Nebr.	Keating	Withrow
Davis, Tenn.	Kelly, N. Y.	Young
Delaney	Keogh	Zelenko
Delay	Kilburn	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 326 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SECRETARY BENSON'S ATTACK ON THE DEMOCRATS

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, an article in Post Scripts of the Washington Post and Times Herald of this morning mentioned Secretary Benson's slambang attack on the Democrats here and included a statement that he was preparing to ask Congress to "kill all mandatory farm-price supports." The article stated "He has never liked supports in any form."

It appears to me that Mr. Benson wants to kill all chances for Republican Congressmen in the Corn Belt. Certainly the farmers of America realize the

terrible impact on themselves as well as on our country as a whole by having the rug pulled out from under them. I should think Mr. Benson would have more sympathy and consideration for his colleagues in the Republican Party who come to Congress from the Corn Belt.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that those Republican Congressmen from the Corn Belt who have not seen it yet may read "and weep":

Agriculture Secretary Ezra T. Benson, normally a mild man, last week delivered a slam-bang attack on the Democrats at a political meeting here. Second-guessers are questioning his strategy since Congress is still in Democratic hands and another election is still a long way off.

Even more provocative was Benson's press conference announcement that he was preparing a Department statement to ask Congress to kill all mandatory farm-price supports.

He has never liked supports in any form, but his opposition has been more diplomatic in the past. Now he seems ready to ask for much greater flexibility than any Secretary in recent years has dared think was possible.

Whether the President or Republican leaders in Congress will permit Benson to make his request is doubtful. Most GOP farm Congressmen favor support programs in some form. They remember the seats lost last year and fear more trouble ahead in 1958 if Benson has his way.

A PROGRAM OF HEALTH INSURANCE FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. LESINSKI. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill that is designed to bring the Federal Government up to date with private industry in making available to Federal employees and their dependents health-insurance benefits comparable to those provided employees in private industry, financed through payroll deductions and Government contributions.

While the major emphasis of the bill is to provide for basic health insurance to cover full costs of normal in-hospital medical and surgical care, provision is also made for a program of major medical benefits to cover exceptionally expensive medical conditions.

A central feature of the bill is free choice by the employee from among four alternative competing types of plans. The participant may elect to enroll in, first, a uniform national plan providing benefits on a "service" basis, along the Blue Cross-Blue Shield lines; second, a uniform national plan providing benefits on a "cash indemnity" basis, of the type underwritten by commercial insurance carriers; third, a plan sponsored or underwritten by a national association of Federal employees, where the employee is a member of such an association; or fourth, a group practice prepayment plan—such as the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York—in those communities where such plans are locally available.

In keeping with the practice of private employers, to encourage and facilitate the broadest possible coverage, and to keep the cost within the means of the employees, the bill provides for a substantial Government contribution to the cost of the insurance. The Government will pay, in the case of active employees, one-half the cost of the basic plan and the full cost of the major medical benefits within stated limitations.

In recognition of the fact that retired employees cannot ordinarily obtain adequate health insurance protection except at prohibitive costs which their reduced incomes cannot normally support, provision is made for an increased Government contribution in the case of retired employees.

A health insurance fund will be established into which the Government contributions and sums from payroll deductions will be paid. All premiums or subscription charges will be paid from this fund which will also serve as the mechanism of advance funding for any added costs involved in the continuation of coverage after retirement.

To assure employees that they will have an adequate voice in the operation of the program, a Federal Employees Health Insurance Advisory Council will be established, the majority of which will be composed of employee representatives. The other members will be persons experienced in the operation of prepaid health programs.

I believe that this program is essential and will benefit not only the employee but the Government as well. With improved health and morale on the part of employees, greater efficiency will be achieved. In addition it will bring the Federal Government one step closer to the practices of private industry in the field of employee-employer relations, a field in which the Federal Government has been sadly lagging in many respects.

TO BRING APPELLATE PROCEDURES OF VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT WITHIN SCOPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES ACT

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 by bringing the appellate processes and provisions of said act within the scope of the Administrative Procedures Act.

The basic purpose of the bill is to strengthen the appellate procedures and provisions of the Veterans' Preference Act. Under existing procedure the Civil Service Commission has no authority to subpoena witnesses and, consequently, a preference eligible appellant is unable to persuade agency employees, who have knowledge of the true facts, to voluntarily appear as a witness in the appellant's behalf. Under the rules of the Administrative Procedures Act the

preference eligible appellant would also benefit from the exclusion of hearsay evidence or testimony submitted by an agency or department. The present civil-service rules governing admission of evidence are very loose and frequently operate to the disadvantage of the veteran appellant.

Under existing appellate procedures of the Veterans' Preference Act the hearing examiners of the Civil Service Commission, as well as members of the Board of Appeals and Review, exercise a quasi-judicial function when adjudicating appeals of veterans preference eligibles and this bill would provide additional safeguards for those hearings by bringing the appellate procedure of the Veterans' Preference Act under the Administrative Procedures Act.

ORGANIZATION FOR TRADE COOPERATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, the evidence grows almost daily that the President and the State and Commerce Departments are playing for keeps in seeking Congressional approval of the OTC.

OTC stands for the Organization for Trade Cooperation. This is a sugar-coated name for a pill of poisonous contents so far as Congress is concerned. There can no longer be any doubt about the results that would follow Congressional approval of United States membership in this proposed international trade organization. It would mean the stripping of Congress of its power to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States.

The latest and conclusive evidence was provided over the last week when the President rejected two more recommendations of the Tariff Commission under the escape clause of the Trade Agreements Act and sent a third case back to the Commission for additional information.

This Executive action came after his previous rejection of a unanimous decision of the Tariff Commission in the groundfish fillet case in December 1956, his rejection of the Commission's recommendation in the lighter flint case and his setting aside of another unanimous decision in the velveteen case in pursuance of an arrangement made with Japan outside the law and in outright disregard of the existing laws adequately covering the situation.

Together with his rejection of the Commission's recommendation in the fluorspar case, these Presidential actions completely blanketed and nullified the Commission's arduous work of a whole year.

The Tariff Commission is an agency of Congress, created by Congress to assist

in the regulation of our foreign trade, including tariff adjustments. The President himself appointed 5 of the 6 members now sitting on the Commission, yet he nullified the Commission's finding of facts.

What has this record to do with the OTC?

It must be clear to anyone who has carefully observed the Executive actions in this field, as monitored by the Departments of State and Commerce, that there is afoot a well-defined plan extending back to 1945 to wrest control over foreign commerce from Congress. This plan is deeply entrenched in the Department of State. In essence it means depriving the American people of their right of determining for themselves through their Congress what our foreign-trade policy is to be. It reflects a deep distrust in the State Department of the capacity of the American people to govern themselves, at least so far as determining foreign-trade policy is concerned. In the meantime and by contrast, the State Department has been in the forefront in promoting the establishment of new self-governing nations in the remote corners of the world.

In view of this State Department attitude we may ask again what difference it would make if the United States should become a member of the OTC.

It would make all the difference in the world. It would mean that the State Department attitude had triumphed. It would mean that Congress itself, the only remaining bulwark, had finally thrown in the sponge and had run out on its responsibility. It would mean that Congress had betrayed its trust and made a cowardly surrender. The people who elect us have a right to expect better of us.

Why would approval of the OTC mean this? Is it not clear that the executive already does as it pleases in this field? Is it not obvious that Congress to all intents and purposes has already been set aside in the regulation of our foreign commerce? I am afraid so.

It is only too true that Congress has been flouted by the executive, including the State Department, in the name of a delegation of power under the Trade Agreements Act that has been abused and stretched beyond recognition by the executive. But far from compounding this outrage, far from accepting, blessing and confirming it, through one final act of ignoble submission, Congress should flatly and firmly reject it. We should reject it in such unmistakable fashion that it would not be tried again.

It is not as if we were acting without experience. Congress no doubt in good faith entrusted certain powers to the President by trade agreements legislation. The State Department, acting for the President, saw its opportunity and undertook so to elaborate and to interweave this power with international commitments that Congress should never again be able in a practical world to repossess itself of its authority, no matter how badly the delegated powers had been abused.

Congress began to show concern as far back as 1950, or earlier, and in that

year refused to approve United States membership in the International Trade Organization, known as the ITO. In 1951, or 1 year later, it passed the escape clause amendment to the Trade Agreements Act. It also passed peril-point legislation. All such actions showed restiveness over State Department policy and administration and sought to strengthen the loosened and rapidly slipping Congressional grip on foreign-trade regulation. They should have been heeded by the State Department as distinct warnings of Congressional dissatisfaction over the manner in which the powers it had delegated to the executive were being carried out.

These clear reflections of Congressional sentiment, however, did little or nothing to chasten the State Department. That Department only sought new means by which it could curb Congress to prevent it from recapturing a semblance of its original authority. The Department went right ahead with GATT, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, after 1950, that is, after the defeat of the ITO, seeking to save as much of the rejected charter as it could. It should be pointed out that GATT had much of the unsuccessful ITO charter in it. Yet GATT was carefully if not defiantly withheld from Congress. If Congress had so flatly rejected the ITO charter as it did, the fate of GATT if submitted to Congress was obviously highly doubtful. The thing to do then was not to submit it; and that is the reasoning that explains the withholding of GATT from Congress. Well justified fear of GATT defeat kept it from coming before this body.

In the years since the ITO debacle the State Department schemers were not idle. Never once did they relinquish their search for means of strapping the hands of Congress securely to its sides, in full view of the clear constitutional powers bestowed upon Congress in this field by the people of the United States. In 1954 a brilliant idea to revise GATT and to make it secure was born. A scheme was hatched by which Congress would seemingly be left in possession of its power while actually it would be clinging only to an empty shell.

The OTC was the offspring of this scheme. GATT was revised in the winter of 1954-55 and "strengthened." On the side the articles of agreement setting up the OTC were signed for the United States by the signing officer of the State Department in March 1955.

The OTC was to be nothing more than an agency to administer GATT—a sort of compliance body. But it was to have an assembly no less than a secretariat and a Director General. It contained a provision authorizing it to become a specialized agency of the United Nations. It was to give effect to the purposes and objectives of GATT. Nothing in it changed GATT, including the built-in powers of GATT to amend itself.

Here then was a scheme by which the Executive could gain all of GATT without submitting GATT itself to Congress. Should Congress approve the OTC it would obviously have given its approval to GATT since the OTC is to give ef-

fect to the purposes and objectives of GATT.

Much was made of a provision that OTC could not impose new obligations on its members without a member's consent. This safeguard overlooked the power of GATT to amend itself without the consent of a particular member.

The Ways and Means Committee in 1956 after hearings amended the resolution of approval by adding that our own consent to new powers could be given only by Congress; and otherwise added a few other safeguards. Obviously, however, none of these amendments altered the Articles of Agreement themselves and would if adopted only be in the form of reservations.

In the future, situations could readily be created through international commitments that would make one reservation or another internationally embarrassing to us, and Congress could be coerced by moral implications to vacate such reservations. The State Department would be calling the tune. The President would simply echo it and Congress would have to dance accordingly or default on United States leadership of the free world.

The gambit is a little too obvious. In trying it the State Department revealed its low opinion of the perception of Congress and, I believe, outsmarted itself.

At the outset I referred to the President's last seven actions on Tariff Commission recommendations. In them the OTC casts its shadow before, for all to see.

Obviously once we were in the OTC, Geneva and not Washington would be the seat of power.

Already American producers who are vitally involved with import competition find themselves completely frustrated despite acts of Congress to come to their rescue. The executive departments have expertly constructed many blind alleys designed to wear down the petitioners and make their efforts of self-defense both futile and costly. It is no doubt the hope that the petitioners will give up in despair. Just think what the situation would be if they had to go to Geneva. The State Department could laugh at any who would object to its policies and it need no longer have any fear of Congress. The responsiveness of Congress to its constituents would be a dead letter.

Such is the unsavory picture of executive administration of the trade agreements program as it comes to us from many sources and from direct experience. Such is the manner in which the trusteeship of the delegated power has been conducted. The State Department has used the ball of twine lent to it by Congress not only to tie the hands of Congress but to tangle domestic producers in a web of futility.

Now, in a desperate grasp at straws to save this OTC scheme attention is drawn to the proposed European free-trade area, to be composed of six nations, and to the common market that might attract other European countries.

Now more than ever, says the OTC promoters, the United States will need the OTC in order to take care of itself. Presumably we would be facing a Europe

hostile to our best interests. Lost to sight is the fact that we would have 1 vote against 6 among the nations of the free-trade area and possibly a dozen or more if the common market attracted other European countries. How much good would the OTC do us then? It seems to me that it would place a perfect weapon into the hands of Europe if they wished to use it.

We should jump quickly to protect ourselves, say the OTC advocates. Yet, at best it would be 12 to 15 years before the free-trade area would materialize, should it be ratified by the signatory nations.

On the contrary, we should not only reject the OTC; we should demand that GATT itself be brought to Congress for ratification.

It is high time that Congress sees to it that the abuses of the executive in the administration of the trade-agreements program be stopped. It begins to reflect on Congress itself when it allows its constituency to be subjected to the shabby treatment that the executive has accorded to them in these tariff and trade problems. The grievances are real. We want to settle them at home instead of going back beyond 1776 when we had to go overseas to gain a hearing. We do not want to go to Geneva, hat in hand, to ask how and what we should do in order to give decent and adequate protection to our industries and their workmen against unfair competition.

Above all, we must keep the channels clear so that changed sentiment in this country may successfully express itself through Congress. This is no less important in the field of foreign commerce regulation than in other fields that are of vital concern to the American people.

I say, keep the channels open. The State and Commerce Departments, and the President in taking his cue from these Departments, want to block the channels by entry into the OTC. So far as regulation of import competition is concerned, it would be useless to hold elections in this country should the State Department succeed. The OTC-GATT combination would resolve all these questions of trade. No constituents need worry Members of this body again about their import problems. There would be nothing you could do for them. The State Department would be satisfied. The Congress and the people of this country would be taking a back seat.

This must not come to pass.

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION, WASHINGTON, PUBLIC NOTICE

SAFETY PINS

(Investigation No. 53 under sec. 7, Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended)

In response to the request of the President on March 29, 1957, the Tariff Commission is assembling additional information relating to investigation No. 53 under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, with respect to safety pins. The President's request reads as follows:

"DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have carefully studied the Commission's report of January 30, 1957, on its investigation under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, regarding safety pins.

"Additional information on a number of points raised by the Commission's report would be helpful to me in reaching a decision in this case.

"It would be very useful to have the production, sales, employment, and profit data on the two safety pin producers not presently included in the Commission's report as would similar data on the industry's operations on uncapped pin wires. In addition, I would like to have data on the other products made on safety pin machines and on the firms producing plastic-capped safety pins.

"Supplemental information on the industry's profit experience would also assist me: annual data for safety pin operations and for the total operations of the plants involved for 1935-39 and for 1946-50; the basis for the industry's allocation of costs, particularly administrative and selling costs, to its safety pin operations; and the impact upon the industry figures of the one firm which reported losses in 4 years since 1950 and whether that firm's operations have been materially affected by factors other than imports. Finally, clarification of the nature and source of the industry's overcapacity, referred to in the Commission's report, would be desirable.

"I would appreciate the Commission's supplying this additional information. It may, to the extent necessary to avoid improper disclosures, be submitted in confidence. With these points clarified, I would be in a better position to make a decision.

"Sincerely,

"DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER."

By order of the Commission:

DONN N. BENT,
Secretary.

Issued April 3, 1957.

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

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I commend the gentleman from West Virginia for the vigilance which he continues to show in this field and for the fight which he continues to make for the prerogatives of the Congress of the United States in this field.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma. I wish to say that anything I can do to suggest to the President of the United States and to the Department of State that there is no better time for them to bring on their proposed OTC bill because I feel that the Congress is in the right frame of mind to defeat it. I would like to have it out of the way once and for all so if they want to bring it up, it is perfectly all right with the gentleman from West Virginia.

IF FLOODED OUT AND YOUR PROPERTY DESTROYED, WAIT A YEAR AND YOU CAN BUY INSURANCE AGAINST SOME FUTURE CATASTROPHE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, last August the Congress enacted the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956, a very important and significant forward step in behalf of the people of this country who suffer from periodic flood disasters.

Except under the authority of this law, there is no such thing as flood insurance. Private companies have not been able to underwrite it. That is why the Congress

stepped into this field. That is why the Banking and Currency Committee approved the Federal flood insurance bill and was instrumental in writing Public Law 1016 of the 84th Congress.

As a representative of the St. Louis area, I was particularly interested in this legislation and was most anxious to see it passed. I am most anxious now to see it made actually effective.

Many of our business firms in the St. Louis area face the spring rains with a feeling that they are sitting on a keg of dynamite. What will the Mississippi do? What will that rambunctious Missouri River do?

This year, they lived in hope that our promise of a Federal flood insurance program would become a reality. They were promised sympathetic administration of the program, and prompt action.

On Lincoln's Birthday, I wrote to the Commissioner of the Federal Flood Indemnity Administration, Mr. Frank J. Meistrell, to inquire about progress in putting the law into effect, in determining rates for the policies which are to be issued, and otherwise in getting this program into actual operation.

I received an answer on March 5 indicating that there were so many policy decisions which had to be made, so many conferences which had to be conducted, so many computations which had to be worked out, that it would be late spring before the agency would be in a position to start offering its services to those anxious to buy the insurance we provided under Public Law 1016.

FLOODS WILL NOT WAIT FOR REDTAPE TO BE UNRAVELLED

Mr. Speaker, those of us who live near major rivers, or represent districts subject to periodic floods, know that the floods do not wait for redtape to be unravelled in some Government agency. The rains come in April or earlier, with just as much or more violence as they do any other time of the year. Early spring is floodtime in many communities—a time for leaving one's possessions behind to be ripped and torn and covered with mire and filth by the overflowing river, while fleeing for your life.

It will be of very little consolation to the people whose possessions are wiped out by floods in the next few months to know that sometime in the future they will be able to buy Federal flood insurance to help them over the financial disaster of some subsequent flood.

They are worried right now about the flood which may come tomorrow or the day after—and they cannot yet buy any insurance against such a disaster, even though the law which authorized such insurance was enacted last August and even though we have appropriated \$500,000 for planning the start of the program and working out these details of coverage, rates, and so forth. And we have also authorized the Federal Flood Indemnity Administration to borrow up to \$500 million from the Federal Treasury for this program. Not a cent of that money has so far been borrowed by the Agency, however.

Nor have any formal requests been made to Congress for the money needed

to engage or work with private insurance people to actually sell the policies, although the President's budget says that \$100 million is going to be requested for that purpose.

MANY NEW PROBLEMS PRESENTED

The moral of all of this is: if you live or have your business in a flood zone—just arrange for it not to rain, at least until the Federal Flood Indemnity Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency can work out every little detail of its proposed program, and dot every "i" and cross every "t" and make some slide-rule computations and talk to some more insurance people to get their opinions on rate structures, and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, I do not like to be overly critical of a Government agency when it is faced as this particular one is with a variety of new and really unprecedented problems. It is working in a no-man's land in that this kind of insurance just has not been offered before, and the law does require that the rates be reasonably related to the actual costs of insurance.

But it seems to me that there is a difference—or there should be—between instituting a new program with a determination to get it into operation as promptly as possible, working out the problems as they arise, or coasting along as if there is no hurry—insisting on having the answer to every single possible detail or contingency before moving off dead center.

In this instance, I think it is urgent that those who are in the path of periodic floods be protected immediately—now—when the floods are imminent.

Admittedly, this is a tough problem for the agency which administers the program. I do not for a moment pretend it is simply. It is not.

WHY NOT BINDER CONTRACTS PENDING RATE STRUCTURE?

But I think if there is a determination to do the best that can be done for those who now face imminent damage from seasonal spring floods, that a way can be worked out to issue policies on a binder basis—assuring those who apply for coverage that they are covered and will be covered under terms and conditions to be announced later.

A private enterprise insurance company could hardly issue such a binder in a situation such as this, although I understand it is sometimes done on certain types of policies. But it could not begin to assure coverage against floods for the same reason no private firm ever does issue flood insurance.

The customer, furthermore, would be hesitant about buying such a pig-in-a-poke insurance policy from a private firm without knowing or having any idea in the world what the price would be—the cost of the premium or the terms of coverage. Then why do I suggest—why have I suggested to Mr. Meistrell—that the Government issue such a pay-later insurance policy at this time?

The answer, Mr. Speaker, is that the law under which this insurance is to be issued, Public Law 1016, specifies that the rates must be as reasonable as possible, as fair as possible, as accurate as

possible in reflecting the anticipated cost of such insurance protection. The customer, the homeowner or businessman threatened by floods, knows that this policy is and will be not only the best and most reasonable but actually the only kind of flood insurance he will be able to buy—and that it is being put on the market as a service to him, not as a means for some private company to make profits.

If he is in the market for flood insurance, he knows already that he is probably going to want this policy when it is issued, no matter what it eventually costs or what the terms of coverage may be.

SAID TO BE PROHIBITED BY "CIRCUMSTANCES"

I am sure that many of those eligible for coverage would be glad to contract now to buy this insurance even though the rates are not yet set and the details of coverage not complete. Why not afford such individuals an opportunity to do just that? I made that proposal to Mr. Meistrell on March 21.

Mr. Speaker, the answer I have received is that a variety of circumstances prohibit it—lack of appropriated funds to pay agents, inability to adjust claims so quickly, lack of trained personnel, lack of a system for distributing literature on the program, or publicizing it, and so on.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the most important reason has been left out—lack of sufficient concern for those willing and anxious to buy this insurance—because they feel desperately in need of this protection. It was for the benefit of the public that we enacted this program. Now I fear very much that the needs of the people are being relegated to a secondary position. This program can be a profitable cooperative venture for the private insurance companies which participate in it—that's all right. But primarily this is to be a service for the public. It must be set up with that in mind.

HEARING PROPOSED BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE

Mr. Speaker, in view of the seriousness of this situation, the seasonal threat from flood disaster in every part of the country, and the relative slowness in which the Housing and Home Finance Agency is moving in this field, I am today urging the chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency to arrange a hearing for the officials of the Federal Flood Indemnity Administration so that we can get to the bottom of these delays—so that we can find out what is holding up this program.

Mr. Meistrell has written me in reply to my letter of March 21 that funds are "being requested" for the program—but I don't know if that means he has made a request to Mr. Cole, his superior in the HHFA, or whether it is in the Budget Bureau or the White House, or where—or whether it is going to be killed by Mr. Humphrey in the Treasury Department.

He has also written me that without a specific additional appropriation by Congress, they cannot actually put the program into effect. I have not so understood the law we passed, but it would be worthwhile to have him explain that. After all, we did provide full authority

for borrowing up to \$500,000,000 from the Treasury, and not a cent of that has been borrowed.

WE SHOULD ACT BEFORE MORE DISASTERS STRIKE

Mr. Meistrell adds that even if they did have additional funds appropriated to them, this does not mean "there would be no bar to immediate acceptance of binding applications" for policies, because of the need for distributing forms, completing arrangements with participating insurance companies, sending out instructions to agents, and so forth. He added:

These tasks are time-consuming and they are necessary precedents to launching the program in final form or to the acceptance of binding applications for insurance if it were attempted as a temporary expedient pending completion of our plans—

And so on. Mr. Speaker, it means that after you have been flooded out often enough, and lost your property often enough from these disasters, you might be able to take heart out of the fact that some day you may be able to buy a flood insurance policy, providing you then have anything left to protect.

I am submitting for inclusion in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, my letter of February 12 to Mr. Meistrell, his reply of March 5, my follow-up letter of March 21, and his reply dated April 4, which came to my office Friday.

We have seen enough delay. The headlines say rain and flood in the St. Louis area and many other parts of the country. Let us get busy on flood insurance before more homes and businesses are washed away. Otherwise, we can just turn this whole thing over to the Red Cross and make it not flood insurance but flood relief—and that is not good enough.

FEBRUARY 12, 1957.

MR. FRANK J. MEISTRELL,
Commissioner, Federal Flood Indemnity Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MEISTRELL: As a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I was an enthusiastic supporter of the bill which originated in my committee for a Federal flood insurance program. I know that the legislation provided many problems for your agency, but, as I understand it, you were hopeful that the program could be put into effect early this year.

I wonder if you can give me a report on the current status of the program, including any decisions that may have been reached on specific details of coverage and rates, or any other material of that kind.

If any material is available so far that I can forward to people in my district who are very interested in this, I would appreciate having that too.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,
LEONOR K. (MRS. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress, Third District,
Missouri.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY,
Washington, D. C., March 5, 1957.
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: It is a pleasure to reply to your request of February 12 for a report on the status of the Federal flood indemnity program. I am aware of your particular interest in flood insurance and I am sending you under separate cover some in-

formational material for distribution in your district.

Although we have made substantial progress, more work needs to be done before we shall be able to offer contracts to interested property owners. We have tentative drafts of the policy, procedures, rules and regulations for the direct flood insurance. We have laid out a marketing plan that contemplates maximum utilization of the private insurance facilities: Insurance agents and brokers throughout the country will sell the insurance; fire and casualty insurance companies will issue the policies and collect the premiums; and losses will be handled by private claim adjustment facilities. We have been successful in negotiating with the industry to have these services and facilities made available to us at cost; without profit or allowance for administrative expenses or other expenses normally incident to the operation of their business. These operations will be subject, of course, to our supervision and control.

We are now moving toward a solution to one of our most difficult tasks, that of promulgating an appropriate rating structure in the absence of useful experience data, a factor that has contributed in a great part to the inability of private insurers to underwrite flood losses.

Two approaches to the problem have been made: The insurance industry, from whom we have had the utmost in cooperation, has been studying this problem as well as an intergovernmental agency group including hydrological experts from the United States Geological Survey, Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Weather Bureau and the Corps of Engineers and we have been developing data on various aspects of the rate problem. We are hopeful that we will have rates developed shortly.

We are glad to know of the interest among your constituents in Missouri in this program and I hope you will assure them that we are making every effort to put it into operation. We anticipate that we will be in a position to make the insurance available in the late spring.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK J. MEISTRELL,
Commissioner, Flood Indemnity Ad-
ministration.

MARCH 21, 1957.

MR. FRANK J. MEISTRELL,
Commissioner, Federal Flood Indem-
nity Administration, Housing and
Home Finance Agency, Washington,
D. C.

DEAR MR. MEISTRELL: Some of our people in St. Louis are terribly worried over the prospect of spring floods and frustrated by the fact that they are not able to purchase Federal flood insurance because the rate structure has not been worked out as yet. As you know, I wrote to you about this matter last month and read your reply with much interest.

But some of our businessmen, particularly, feel as if they are in the position of a man dying of thirst while the well diggers temporarily stop operations in order to argue over how much to charge for the product of their labors. They feel that late spring may find them being offered flood insurance after they have suffered serious damage from a flood. One businessman tells me that he feels as if he is sitting on top of dynamite because the Mississippi has gone into flood on four previous occasions since 1943 and usually, early in the spring.

That raises this question in my mind: Why can't you begin now to take applications for flood insurance from individuals and firms who know they will be customers no matter what the rate is, since this is a form of insurance they have been anxious to buy for many years and since they are sure the Federal rate will be as reasonable as

possible under the circumstances? In other words, why can't you offer our business firms, or other individuals endangered by floods, a policy which declares them covered but postpones decision temporarily on the final rates they are to be charged? Perhaps they could pay a temporary or tentative rate subject to later amendment.

Surely, now that we have a program for Federal flood insurance and there is nothing holding up its effective date except negotiations and studies of possible costs, it would be the height of bureaucratic cruelty, I believe, to hold up putting the program into operation until the 1957 flood season was over. I would never be able to explain to any flood victim in my district that this insurance was not available when it could have helped him because the Government agency assigned responsibility for the program still had some "I's" to dot and some "T's" to cross and some slide rule computations to make and some conferences to hold with some insurance people to get their opinion on the rate structure.

Can't we put the program into effect now?
With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LEONOR K. (MRS. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress,
Third District, Missouri.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY,
Washington, D. C., April 4, 1957.
Hon. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: Thank you for your letter of March 21, 1957, suggesting that we accept binding applications for Federal flood insurance before we are ready to authorize the issuance of the formal policy. We considered this step very carefully as we are fully aware of the need for protection to those who may be subject to loss occurring before our program is complete. We found, however, that a variety of circumstances prohibit it.

The solicitation and acceptance of binding applications would be handled in substantially the same manner as will the solicitation and issuance of formal policies. The services of insurance agents and brokers, and the insurance companies are essential to the performance of these functions and, as you know, we are prohibited by statute from engaging their services until funds are appropriated for the purpose. We are requesting those funds now although, of course, we are unable to commit those funds before they are made available to us.

Further, we would be unable to adjust a claim arising under a binding application before our arrangements with the established claim adjustment facilities were completed. Adjustment of loss is a specialized undertaking requiring the services of trained personnel. We could not engage them, and obligate ourselves to the payment of their fees, in the absence of specific congressional appropriation of funds for this purpose.

I do not intend to infer from the foregoing that there would be no bar to immediate acceptance of binding applications were the funds made available to us today. Following appropriation of funds, additional time will be required for distribution of the applicable forms, the concluding of agreements with insurance companies, the sending of instructions to agents and brokers and, of course, the nationwide publicizing of the availability of the protection.

These tasks are time-consuming and they are necessary precedents to launching the program in final form or to the acceptance of binding applications for insurance if it were attempted as a temporary expedient pending completion of our plans.

Final adoption of an appropriate rate structure is not the only obstacle to the launching of the program. We have made

substantial progress in that direction and also have under consideration other problems inherent in a program of this scope and novelty. I am most grateful at the progress we are making.

I am highly sympathetic with the anxieties of those in whose behalf you have written. I assure you that we are doing all in our power to make the protection of this insurance available at the earliest possible time.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK J. MEISTRELL,
Commissioner, Flood Indemnity Ad-
ministration.

HENDERSON HIGH SCHOOL BAND OF HENDERSON, KY.

Mr. NATCHER. 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 Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, one of the highlights of the annual Cherry Blossom Festival is the Cherry Blossom parade and National Championship High School Band Contest.

On Wednesday of last week, a crowd of 115,000 spectators lined K Street NW, to see the annual parade. Two hundred and fifteen units with 7,500 marchers passed before the reviewing stand at 17th and K Streets in the colorful event which lasted nearly 4 hours. More than 70 bands participated. Dozens of drill teams with scores of floats and hundreds of majorettes passed in review.

Earlier in the day, the National Championship High School Band Contest was held on the Ellipse. This was the day of full glory not only for the beautiful Japanese cherry trees that line the Tidal Basin, but also for the Henderson High School Band which was awarded a beautiful trophy for winning second place in the concert division, and confirmed the faith shown in them by the people of Henderson, Ky., who raised several thousand dollars to give their outstanding band the chance to take part in this national competition.

Henderson, Ky., is one of the great small cities in this country. It is a beautiful city located on the Ohio River, owning its own utilities with industrial plants producing plastics, hosiery, furniture, dresses, toys, chemicals, fertilizers, and other products. In its beautiful natural surroundings, Henderson has developed a number of imposing churches of all denominations, beautiful homes, and nice schools. The members of the Henderson High School Band clearly exemplify the fine characteristics of the people who reside in Henderson, Ky., and their victory was another milestone along the road of progress for this fine city and the splendid high school that they represent. The director of this band, Robert Morton, is to be commended for his fine work.

During my tenure as a Member of Congress, I have had the pleasure of seeing a Kentucky Princess crowned as Queen of a Cherry Blossom Festival and the Henderson High School Band of Henderson, Ky., declared one of the winners in the concert band division of the National Championship High School Band Contest.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, for today, on account of illness.

Mr. KRUEGER (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), from April 10 through April 12, on account of official business.

Mr. ASPINALL (at the request of Mr. McCARTHY), until April 17.

To MESSRS. MOULDER, DOYLE, FRAZIER, KEARNEY, and MCINTOSH (at the request of Mr. MOULDER), from April 9 to April 16, on account of committee hearings scheduled by Committee on Un-American Activities in New York.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mrs. SULLIVAN, for 15 minutes, on today, and to include certain letters.

Mr. O'NEILL, for 10 minutes, on tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. KEE and to include an article.

Mr. FISHER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOYLE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HUDDLESTON.

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. DINGELL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIEMINSKI (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 9, 1957, 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:

710. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting the Annual Report of the United States Soldiers' Home for the fiscal year 1956, and a photostatic copy of the annual general inspection of the home, 1956, by the Inspector General of the Army, pursuant to the act of Congress approved March 2, 1883, as amended (24 U. S. C. 59 and 60); to the Committee on Armed Services.

711. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 15 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

712. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, relative to a contract which was negotiated with National Park Conces-

sions, Inc., for the temporary operation of the McKinley Park Hotel, Mount McKinley National Park, Alaska, covering the period May 14 to September 30, 1957, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271), as amended by the act of July 14, 1956 (70 Stat. 543); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

713. A letter from the Acting Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the abbreviation of the record on the review or enforcement of orders of administrative agencies by the courts of appeals and the review or enforcement of such orders on the original papers and to make uniform the law relating to the record on review or enforcement of such orders, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

714. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

715. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use in food of chemical additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

716. A letter from the Governor, Canal Zone Government, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 216 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for appointments of cadets from the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, Virgin Islands, and the Canal Zone"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 223. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 3476, a bill to facilitate the regulation, control, and eradication of plant pests; without amendment (Rept. No. 309). Referred to House Calendar.

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 224. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 3377, a bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities and the acquisition of land by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research; without amendment (Rept. No. 310). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 225. Resolution for consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 72, joint resolution to implement further the act of July 15, 1946, by approving the signature by the Secretary of the Treasury of an agreement amending the Anglo-American Financial Agreement of December 6, 1945; without amendment (Rept. No. 311). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 3654. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to price support for extra long staple cotton; without amendment (Rept. 312). Referred to the Committee

tee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 6659. A bill to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing, to improve the availability of mortgage credit, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 313). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 6701. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Tennessee River Basin water pollution control compact; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ALBERT (by request):

H. R. 6702. A bill to provide for the purchase of certain cattle to carry out the provisions of section 32 of Public Law 320, 74th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 6703. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to eliminate certain inequities and restrictions and permit a more effective distribution of Federal funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 6704. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize municipal corporations in the Territory of Alaska to incur bonded indebtedness, and for other purposes," to exclude from the 10 percent limitation on indebtedness contained therein any indebtedness incurred by a municipal corporation under the Alaska Public Works Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6705. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize public-utility districts in the Territory of Alaska to incur bonded indebtedness, and for other purposes," to exclude from the 10 percent limitation on indebtedness contained therein any indebtedness incurred by a public-utility or school district under the Alaska Public Works Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6706. A bill to increase from 75 percent to 90 percent the maximum United States share of the cost of approved airport projects in Alaska; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 6707. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to eliminate certain inequities and restrictions and permit a more effective distribution of Federal funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 6708. A bill to implement a treaty and agreement with the Republic of Panama, by amending the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 6709. A bill to implement a treaty and agreement with the Republic of Panama, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 6710. A bill relating to Canal Zone money orders which remain unpaid; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois (by request):

H. R. 6711. A bill to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 6712. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 6713. A bill to increase from \$600 to \$700 the income-tax exemptions allowed for a taxpayer, his spouse, and his dependents, and the additional exemptions allowed for old age and blindness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H. R. 6714. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act of March 28, 1956, in order to provide for greater utilization of the technical services and facilities of the State game and fish agencies in the administration of the conservation reserve and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 6715. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 6716. A bill to prohibit the severance of a service-connected disability which has been in effect for 10 or more years, except when based on fraud; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H. R. 6717. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of the area from Cuckold Creek through Neale Creek and Neale Sound to the Wicomico River, Charles County, Md., to determine the feasibility of establishing an inland channel for the navigation of small boats; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 6718. A bill to provide for Government contribution toward personal health-service benefits for civilian officers and employees in the United States service and their dependents, to authorize payroll deductions for participants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 6719. A bill to provide certain adjustments in organization and salary structure of the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 6720. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Cape Cod National Park, in the State of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PORTER:

H. R. 6721. A bill to require the Postmaster General to adjust the compensation of star route, panel body, and mail messenger contractors, by reason of added costs imposed upon them by statute, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 6722. A bill providing for price reporting and research with respect to forest products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 6723. A bill to amend the act of April 19, 1950, to permit the Navaho Indian Tribe to lease tribal lands for residential and other purposes for a term of not to exceed 99 years, to transfer trust property of the tribe to any corporation owned by the Navaho Tribe or to municipal corporations within the boundaries of the Navaho Indian Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RILEY:

H. R. 6724. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit schoolteachers and administrators to deduct expenses of attending classes to acquire additional training or education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 6725. A bill to adjust the tax rates on light sparkling wines in relation to those

imposed on other wines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 6726. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act to provide for a system of appeal from adverse actions taken by any Federal department, agency, or the Civil Service Commission; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 6727. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the basis of restricted stock options which the employee has not exercised at death and the basis of stock acquired upon exercise of such options after death; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6728. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 10-year net operating loss carryover for certain regulated public utilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. J. Res. 297. Joint resolution establishing a Federal Motor Vehicle Commission for the purpose of making uniform laws pertaining to operation, ownership, and control of motor vehicles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. J. Res. 298. Joint resolution providing for a study to be conducted to determine and report to the Congress on ways and means of expanding and modernizing the Foreign Service of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. J. Res. 299. Joint resolution providing for a study to be conducted to determine and report to the Congress on ways and means of expanding and modernizing the Foreign Service of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FORD:

H. J. Res. 300. Joint resolution providing for a study to be conducted to determine and report to the Congress on ways and means of expanding and modernizing the Foreign Service of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. J. Res. 301. Joint resolution providing for a study to be conducted to determine and report to the Congress on ways and means of expanding and modernizing the Foreign Service of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. J. Res. 302. Joint resolution providing for a study to be conducted to determine and report to the Congress on ways and means of expanding and modernizing the Foreign Service of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. J. Res. 303. Joint resolution providing for a study to be conducted to determine and report to the Congress on ways and means of expanding and modernizing the Foreign Service of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. UTT:

H. J. Res. 304. Joint resolution providing for a study to be conducted to determine and report to the Congress on ways and means of expanding and modernizing the Foreign Service of the United States, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. Res. 226. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation with respect to the real property owned by the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. Res. 227. Resolution to provide for the appointment of a special committee to investigate and report upon the need for a new House Office Building at this time; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. GROSS: Memorial of the 57th General Assembly of the State of Iowa, urging that excise taxes on transportation of persons and property be removed by the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: House Concurrent Resolution No. 30 of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas urging Congress to submit certain constitutional amendments to the States for ratification or rejection; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to submit certain constitutional amendments to the States for ratification or rejection; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to construction, operation, and maintenance of the western land boundary fence; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 5134, a bill to provide assistance to the States in the construction, modernization, additions, and improvements of domiciliary and hospital buildings of State veterans' homes by a grant to subsidize, in part, the capital outlay cost; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Tennessee, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the development of a navigable waterway connecting the Tombigbee and Tennessee Rivers by the construction of a canal in the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States that the Senate of the Territory of Alaska denies the false and misleading charge that the Legislature of Alaska has a desire to exclude residents of the continental United States from participation in the Alaska fishery; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting that the Congress, in accordance with the mandate of the people of Alaska, act at once to transfer control of the commercial fisheries of Alaska to the government of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U. S. C. A., 669 et seq.) and the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act (16 U. S. C. A., 777 et seq.) to authorize the Secretary of the Department of the Interior to cooperate with the Territory of Alaska by allotting Alaska's share of these Federal funds for the conduct of sport fish and game restoration to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to expressing to the Governor of Guam and the military commands located on Guam the loyalty and co-operation of the people of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARENDTS:

H. R. 6729. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Dilles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOWLER:

H. R. 6730. A bill for the relief of Katherine Au-Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 6731. A bill for the relief of Harry Slatkin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 6732. A bill for the relief of Min Kuk Hwi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 6733. A bill for the relief of George Wm. Rueff, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 6734. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property in Lake

County, Fla., to O. H. Dudley; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 6735. A bill for the relief of Maria Goldet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H. R. 6736. A bill for the relief of Diego Moncado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCRACKEN:

H. R. 6737. A bill for the relief of Miss Hilda M. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 6738. A bill for the relief of Kazuo Masaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 6739. A bill for the relief of Arctic Maid Fisheries, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6740. A bill for the relief of William Peck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 6741. A bill for the relief of Kate Lorenz; 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:

200. By Mr. BUSH: Additional petition of citizens of Williamsport, Pa., urging the Congress to pass legislation taking alcoholic beverage advertising off the air and out of the channels of interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

201. Also, additional petition of citizens of Williamsport, Pa., urging the Congress to pass legislation taking alcoholic beverage advertising off the air and out of the channels of interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

202. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Clerk, Board of Chosen Freeholders, Trenton, N. J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting enactment of the bills H. R. 6, H. R. 2474, and S. 27 and S. 386; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Commonwealth Status Preferable for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1957

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, a group of California businessmen, according to the Minister of Natural Resources for the Provincial Government of Saskatchewan in Canada, are to invest \$40 million in a pulpwood project. These Americans have an option on 12,000 square miles of timberland, and a 300-ton-a-day wood-pulp mill will be constructed soon with a further arrangement for doubling the timber rights and capacity of the mill for production of both pulp and newsprint.

Why are these American investors going to Canada as against Alaska, where vast timber resources exist which are available with ample water for such a new development?

The answer, I venture to say, lies in a carefully conducted study which shows the relative present costs and future projected conditions in both locations. Venture money goes to the area of greatest opportunity for profit.

Why would the Province of Saskatchewan and Canada offer greater returns on an investment than the Territory of Alaska?

The answer, of course, is in labor and living costs, transportation expense, and taxes. Alaska cannot compete with other areas of North America, and what is more, statehood will increase this cost of doing business and retard development for decades to come.

If certain political leaders in Alaska would sacrifice their personal ambitions to represent a new State of Alaska in Congress, this situation, it seems to me, could be changed. In other words, if Alaska would ask for commonwealth

status and forego for a time the right of having voting representatives in Congress, she might be given complete self-government in all other respects and, in addition, exemption from Federal income taxes. This exemption for corporations would offset the high cost of operating industry in the northland, and Alaska's rich resources of timber and minerals would induce investors to put their millions into Alaska rather than locations such as I mentioned in Canada.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government could continue with a program of roads and highways in Alaska, and likewise in the costly work of conservation of her fisheries which a limited treasury such as the new State would possess could not allow.

The Members of the House of Representatives, it seems to me, should study the full facts before we turn over Alaska's resources to the possible selfish control of certain politically inspired factions which exist in the Territory of Alaska, and which may seek to discriminate against nonresidents in order to benefit themselves. Let us not forget that the fish, timber, water, and minerals of the Territory belong to all the people of these United States—not just those who live there.

Public School No. 11 of Jersey City, N. J., Celebrates a Century of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1957

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is said that Public School No. 11 on Bergen Square in Jersey City stands on the oldest site continuously dedicated to education in the United States. Dutch settlers used the land almost 300 years ago to set up a school in 1662.

Since then five schools have been built on the same spot. Public School No. 11 is the fifth of these schools. A statue of Peter Stuyvesant flanks the entrance to the school.

It is thought that no site in the country has served as a seat of learning for so long a time. This in spite of the first Latin grammar school founded in New England in 1635 and Harvard College in 1636 and William and Mary in Virginia in 1693. Does not the Good Book say the children shall lead them?

That is why I rise at this time, Mr. Speaker, to thank Mayor Berry and the able and distinguished and the alert and the brave City Commission of Jersey City for taking the time and the initiative to help Public School No. 11 celebrate a century of education.

In a few days, on April 10 and 11, the mayor and the city commission and the people of Jersey City, its children, parents, teachers, businessmen, and all the residents of the community will take part in the 100th anniversary activities of Public School No. 11. It promises to be a magnificent manifestation of a people's love for learning and for leading their children into courageous inspired and useful lives.

The people of Jersey City will attest on April 10 and 11 their faith in the public-school system. It has formed a single people out of many races, nations, and creeds. We see the spirit of that system at work on the floor of this House. God preserve it.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, may I say that Public School No. 11 holds a dear place in my heart. I started school there at the age of 6 in 1917. I reported for military service there in 1942. In April of 1950, I campaigned for Congress in its auditorium. In March of 1951, after my election to Congress and my return from Korea, in this same auditorium, I expressed my profound appreciation to the people of Jersey City for their helpfulness in all things worth while. The noble, the religious, and the democratic are at work in our hearts when our educational sys-

tem is at its best. Was it not Jefferson who said:

Enlighten the people generally and tyranny and oppression of both mind and body vanish—education makes a people easy to lead but difficult to drive, easy to govern but impossible to enslave.

So be it. This salutes, too, the mayor and the City Commission of Jersey City for building 5 new schools in 6 years.

Should Reduced Nonessential Federal Spending Begin in Our Own Congressional Districts?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1957

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, last week I offered an amendment to an appropriation bill to cut out a new Federal program of making outright grants to local communities to help the local people pay for their sewage disposal systems. The amendment would have saved \$50 million during the next fiscal year, and if continued would eventually save the taxpayers \$450 million.

The amendment, initially approved by a teller vote of 162-to-140, was defeated on a record vote by a substantial majority. That was the considered action of the House, to which those of us who favored the amendment respectfully bow. Members entertain honest disagreements as to what spending is essential and what is nonessential.

This amendment has been referred to in the press as an example of legislative actions that stem from the people themselves who become aroused when Federal funds are about to be cut off from local communities.

The Washington Star commented:

Already more than 900 applications by cities and counties had been approved, at least 1 in each of the 435 congressional districts.

The news that money for these projects had been denied brought overnight a wave of protests from local organizations and officials in dozens of districts.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a letter from a Texas citizen who believes that bold action is necessary by the Congress if we are to achieve substantial reductions in nonessential spending. The letter follows:

DALLAS, TEX., April 4, 1957.

Hon. O. C. FISHER,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CLARK: This morning the Dallas News carried an account of your initial success in the House in an economy move, eliminating at least for the time being Federal handouts to States and cities for sewage disposal plants.

I would simply like to express my admiration for your action. I am sure that there are some cities in your district which could use some of this Federal money; but pursuing the philosophy for which you are rather widely known, you demonstrate that

if we are to achieve economy, all of us have to start at home. I have always had less than no patience at all with the citizen who screams for economy and bemoans high taxes and simultaneously seeks Federal money for his own particular pet project. You are going at it in the right way.

Although I know you are motivated solely by your conscientious convictions, permit me to express the opinion that your move is the best there is in the way of practical politics. Contrary to a great deal of popular opinion, the Congressman who will oppose wasteful or unnecessary Federal expenditures in his own district adds far more to his political strength than he loses. In such a stand, he will inevitably antagonize a selfishly interested minority; but the great majority usually admires his courage, regards him as of increased stature, and forgets the details and votes for him at the next election. The average voter has come to regard him as a man of strength and character without reference to any particular local interests.

The most recent illustration of the foregoing that comes to my mind is BRUCE ALGER's last race here in Dallas County. Incidentally, I am firmly of Democratic persuasion, and supported Bruce's opponent in that election. Contrary to what a few of us thought was sound politics, the Democratic candidate (no doubt with the hearty approval of a majority of his advisers) tried to capitalize on some of Bruce's voting in the interest of economy, even at the expense of 1 or 2 Dallas projects, and tried to drive home the point that Bruce has gotten nothing for his district. The results speak for themselves. Dallas County actually is still strongly Democratic in formal party alignment—a point clearly enough proved in the election last Tuesday. Bruce nevertheless won his race last summer by what was for this county a heavy majority. I am sure that he was a part of your support mentioned in the attached news clip.

Best regards.

Sincerely,

TOM SUGG.

Equalization of Retirement Benefits, the Congressional Intent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1957

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer again briefly to H. R. 689, a bill which I introduced on January 3, 1957, and which is entitled "A bill to clarify paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, 56 Statutes, page 368." On February 14, 1957, I was privileged to give the House a short résumé of the bill, and some comment on its intent and its method of achieving that intent. I shall not now repeat that explanation, but will merely emphasize a few of its major points.

First, let me emphasize that this bill neither expands nor otherwise amends the intent of Congress when it enacted this measure originally in 1942, nor its intent in its reenactment in the Career Compensation Act of 1949. My bill would serve simply to restate the plain intent of the Congress that there shall be no discrimination between regulars

and reserves with comparable service. That intent has been both confirmed and denied by conflicting administrative and legal decisions, and as it remains therefore in doubt this bill appears needful to terminate this confusion.

The Congress has repeatedly said that there shall be no discrimination between regulars and reserves with comparable service. Notwithstanding this long-established policy and the clear, unambiguous words effectuating it, the administrative agencies have persistently applied the 1942 law and its 1949 reenactment only to Regular officers. Evidence is clear and unequivocal, and includes statements of two Senators who served on the committee of the Senate which drafted this measure in 1942, including the chairman of the subcommittee which was charged with it, that it was intended to apply without discrimination to Reserve as well as Regular officers with World War I service.

H. R. 689 reads as follows:

Paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 368) is clarified to read as follows: "The retired pay of any officer of the Armed Forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, who served in any capacity as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States prior to November 12, 1918, heretofore or hereafter retired with pay under any provision of law, shall, unless such officer is entitled to retired pay of a higher grade, be 75 percent of the active duty pay of his rank and length of service."

The only purpose of this bill is to clarify the 1942 law and its 1949 reenactment, and to confirm the expressed will of Congress. Neither the intent of Congress nor the legal significance of the 1942 and 1949 acts is changed in the least. As confirming and emphasizing this fact, I have received only this last week a letter from a man whose word must necessarily be regarded as the highest possible authority available as to Congressional intent in the original enactment of the 1942 act. That man, former Senator and former Governor of Colorado, the Honorable Edwin C. Johnson, now retired, was the Senate sponsor of the 1942 act, and also chairman of the subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee which considered the bill. It is a privilege and an honor for me, with the indulgence of the House, to be able to put into the RECORD the statement of former Senator Johnson, whose letter to me, dated March 30, 1957, reads as follows:

H. R. 689 AND S. 1085

DENVER, COLO., March 30, 1957.

Hon. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, Jr.
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am advised that you have introduced in the present Congress a redraft of a former bill clarifying paragraph 4, section 15, of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 and confirming the applicability of that bill to qualified Reserve and National Guard officers.

As the Senate sponsor and the chairman of the subcommittee handling the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, and as a member of the Senate-House conference which wrote the very paragraph which is the subject of your bill, I say without reservation that it was clearly the understanding and intention of

the Senate in 1942 that there be no discrimination between Regular, Reserve, or National Guard officers in pay for similar military service.

I think the Comptroller General and the Court of Claims were in error in holding otherwise.

However that may be, I believe the Congress should correct the matter now and remove all doubt with respect to such discrimination by the early enactment of your bill.

May I commend you for sponsoring the bill and wish you success in its passage.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

EDWIN C. JOHNSON.

Permit me to point out that, the congressional intent having been established beyond question by former Senator Johnson's statement, the only other objection raised to the enactment of this measure has been its allegedly prohibitive cost. In sober fact, there are about 7,000 Reserve component officers, otherwise qualified for retirement, who are or may become entitled to 75 percent retired pay for World War I service. By actuarial computation, they are dying off at the rate of something over one a day, and nearly all will be gone within the next 25 years. The average annual cost as to them will be approximately \$6,956,-400, which cost, of course, was anticipated by Congress when the law was passed in 1942 and reenacted in 1949. According to highway engineers of whom we have inquired, this sum is about enough to defray the cost of 8 miles of a normal, modern four-lane highway. It amounts to considerably less than one one-hundredth of 1 percent of the Federal budget currently under consideration by this Congress.

It is universally acknowledged that a strong, vital, enthusiastic, and experienced Reserve is absolutely essential to our national defense. Since we as a Nation are committed to the utmost use of voluntary service in that defense, we must assure its personnel that fairness will characterize their Government's treatment of them throughout their participation in their country's defense, and afterward.

The Congress has many times declared its adherence to the principle of equal treatment as to retirement for all components of the armed services. The enactment of H. R. 689 will serve to establish this principle once and for all in the organic laws of the land.

Federal Program To Aid Depressed Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1957

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is a well-known fact that many communities in the United States have not shared in the general economic growth and development which most of the people in the country have enjoyed. According to the United States Department of Labor there are at present 77 communities with a labor surplus. To paraphrase the polite

language of the Department of Labor, this means that there are scores of cities in the United States where unemployment is a major problem and where a considerable portion of the labor force cannot secure productive jobs. Many of these communities have appeared on this Department of Labor list year after year since the Department started to keep these data in 1951.

In addition there are hundreds of rural counties in the United States which have really never enjoyed the standard of living which is supposed to be the birthright of every American. We find counties in the United States where the per capita income is a third of the average in the rest of the country, sometimes even less than a third. The United States has a responsibility to alleviate conditions in these communities. Eleven years ago, Congress recognized in the Employment Act of 1946 that it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to assure the existence of maximum production and employment in the country. This means that it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to help eliminate conditions of unemployment and underemployment.

It is with this purpose in mind that I have introduced H. R. 5302. The bill in brief provides for a comprehensive Federal program to aid depressed areas. The major provisions of the bill are as follows:

1. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The bill provides technical assistance to depressed areas, to help them to appraise their human and natural resources and their economic potential. Such service would help communities to plan their economic development realistically in terms of their resources and potentials.

2. LOANS

Communities with a labor surplus normally have difficulty raising needed capital. It is therefore imperative that the Federal Government supply the needed capital to create new activity and to stop the economic decline from snowballing. H. R. 5302 provides for a revolving fund of \$200 million to be equally divided between rural and urban communities. Distressed industrial areas and low income rural areas would benefit from these funds. Business desiring to expand or to locate new businesses in these areas could get as high as 75 percent of the total funds required for the projects. The loans would be made at a reasonable rate of interest, not exceeding one-half of 1 percent above the cost of the money to the Government.

But in order to gain new business communities must have the necessary public facilities to make themselves attractive to new business. This may require the development of industrial parks or other public facilities that new business may deem essential. The Dingell bill provides for a revolving fund of \$75 million which may be used to extend loans for public facilities. The interest rate on these loans is the same as for the other type of loans.

3. GRANTS

Some communities which have been subject to chronic unemployment for a

long period may not be in a position to pay interest on or repay loans. The bill therefore provides that in extreme cases of community need, the Federal Government would make grants instead of loans. For this purpose the bill establishes a \$50 million fund from which grants could be made to communities.

4. VOCATIONAL TRAINING AND COMPENSATION

Bricks and mortar are not sufficient to make a community attractive to new or expanding industry. An industry moving into a new location needs the necessary skills in order to start operations. In depressed economic areas this problem becomes even more acute because the new industries may not be able to use the skills that were developed by the industries which have ceased operations or moved out. The bill, therefore, provides for a vocational training program which would help the people in the community to learn new skills. It is, however, unrealistic to expect that persons who have been unemployed for a long period of time and have no resources could undergo effective training without any means of subsistence. The bill, therefore, provides also that persons undergoing training would be entitled to receive subsistence compensation for a period not exceeding 13 weeks. The amount of compensation would be equal to the average unemployment benefits in that State, and the funds would be paid by the Federal Government.

The purpose of the bill is to aid depressed areas. It provides, consequently, for strict eligibility requirements which would limit the benefits of the program to needy communities. In order to qualify for assistance under H. R. 5302 a community must have had 12 percent unemployment for a year prior to the application for benefits, or 8 percent for 15 months out of the preceding 18 months or 6 percent for 8 months during each of the preceding 2 years. In case of rural communities, the bill provides that only the poorest low-income counties would qualify for aid.

In order to ensure that the program provided in this bill would be carried out energetically the bill provides that a special agency be established to carry out the above provisions. Furthermore, the program involves business, labor, and agricultural groups as well as the welfare of the public at large. It is, therefore, deemed desirable that the administration of the program be placed in a separate agency rather than in one of the established agencies like the Departments of Commerce, Agriculture, or Labor, each one of which has special responsibilities to particular groups.

Our experience during the last decade has shown that depressed communities remain with us even in a period of prosperity and economic growth. Rapid economic change, deterioration and exhaustion of resources and changes in technology are some of the major factors which cause certain communities to decline economically. The Federal Government can help these communities from deteriorating and thus prevent overall recession. H. R. 5302 will, if

adopted into law, not only help depressed communities, but will raise the economic level of activity for all of the United States.

Economy Does Not Mean Cutting Our Benefit Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1957

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news column entitled "Keenotes":

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

The place to begin effecting economies in Government spending should not start with those programs which affect the welfare of an overwhelming majority of the American people. Traditionally, however, this would seem, unwise, to be the point where most efforts to cut the Federal budget usually begin, and for the most part end. The economy drive which is now on in Congress, and properly so, to cut the largest budget ever submitted in this country's peacetime history, is proving, unhappily, to be no exception to the rule.

So far, in this session of the Congress, the House has passed 6 appropriations bills, one, the urgent deficiency bill to help Government Departments and agencies meet their underestimated expenditures for the balance of the 1957 fiscal year; and the other 5 to provide funds for the fiscal year 1958, beginning July 1, 1957. A comparison of House action on these 6 bills will, I feel, offer a clear illustration of the point I wish to make in this issue of "Keenotes."

On February 5, the House passed the urgent deficiency appropriation bill for 1957. As approved, the bill provides (in round figures) \$335 million for the United States Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, and Health, Education, and Welfare, the Small Business Administration, and the legislative branch for the last quarter of this fiscal year. The only floor action by the House, beyond approval of the Appropriations Committee's recommendations, was to adopt an amendment placing a limitation of \$15,728,000 on the amount that may be spent for State and local administration of public assistance grants. The bill is still in conference between the House and Senate. But if this limitation is upheld, it will mean that, instead of the Federal Government providing 50 percent of the cost of administering the public assistance program in the States, only 35 percent will be paid for the balance of this year.

This could gravely affect the public assistance program in West Virginia, where grants to the needy have already had to be cut because of the increase in the number of individuals on the relief rolls. Obviously, the more needy there are to serve, the more the cost of administering the program increases.

On February 20, a bill appropriating funds for fiscal 1958 for the United States Treasury, the Post Office Department, and the Tax Court passed the House. This bill authorized appropriations totaling more than \$3,884,000,000 for these three agencies. This was a little over \$80 million less than the President requested in his budget. But it is

almost \$251 million more than was appropriated for these same agencies in fiscal 1957.

On February 26, \$454,395,700 was appropriated for the Interior Department, some \$61 million less than the budget request, but only about \$3.7 million less than was appropriated for fiscal 1957. On March 13, the House approved slightly over \$16 million in appropriations to run the Office of the President, which was nearly \$5 million under the budget request.

Then on March 20, the first really big cuts in the President's spending proposals were approved when the House sliced over \$500 million from the appropriations requested for 19 Federal agencies comprising the so-called independent offices of the Government, such as the Federal Civil Defense Administration, the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, and other boards, commissions and corporations. This represents a reduction of almost \$600 million under what was appropriated for fiscal 1957. Veterans' Administration funds account for 82 percent of all funds appropriated for the independent offices.

Then, on April 4, after 7 days of strenuous debate on the floor, the House passed the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations bills. I think I may safely say that, with the exception of the Veterans' Administration, these two departments of the Federal Government more closely and intimately serve the well-being of a greater number of Americans than all of the other agencies and departments put together.

By this time, every newspaper reader, TV and radio listener, knows that the House Appropriations Committee approved cuts amounting to \$118,774,700 from the budget requests for these two departments; and that subsequent action on the House floor increased this amount to more than \$134 million, almost \$19 million under the appropriations for 1957.

But what I fear has not been made clear to the American people is just how these cuts will affect the businessman, employed people, retired workers, the older age groups, and the public assistance, public health, and other essential service programs that benefit the entire community. For example, the reduction in the funds available to the Bureau of Employment Security will curtail research programs invaluable to the average businessman. West Virginia, in particular, has special interest in several of these programs—one of which keeps track of the effect of tariff policies (the lowering of tariffs) on our domestic industries. Another program provides assistance to the "one industry" surplus labor commodity by affording studies and data as to how its resources can be used to provide diversified industrial development and greater employment opportunities.

One of the most consequential restrictions written into the bill has serious implications for West Virginia. This is the ceiling of \$104 million placed upon the Federal share of administering the costs of the public-assistance program—aid for the needy aged, the blind, dependent children, the physically handicapped, and the permanently and totally disabled. By law, the Federal Government pays half the administrative cost of these programs on a 50-50 matching basis with the States. If the Senate upholds the House-passed limitation, every State will automatically be compelled either to drastically curtail these programs or to carry the added cost alone.

Only the most vigorous fight I have seen waged in the House in many a long year saved a ruinous cut in the funds available to run the Food and Drug Administration in the next fiscal year. The Food and Drug Administration is literally the policeman, the sure protector of the fit-to-eat food we put on our tables, of the purity and safety of the medicines we give to our children and

other loved ones. As a mother and housewife, as well as the Representative of the people in the Fifth Congressional District of West Virginia, I gave of my best efforts to prevent a cut which, to my mind, would have been calamitous for the health and welfare of every family in this country. I am happy to report that this cut, tentatively approved by a voice vote, was defeated when a rollcall or registered vote was demanded by the floor managers of the bill.

What to me would have represented another catastrophic cut was likewise saved by the demand for a rollcall vote. This was the first tentative move on the House floor to repeal the Water Pollution Control Act by denying the Public Health Service funds with which to administer its provisions. This act provides Federal aid to local communities to build sewage treatment plants and so assure uncontaminated, pollution-free water for consumption of the local citizen. It renders an absolutely vital service for thousands of our cities and towns built along the rivers and harbors of the Nation.

I am economy-minded. I believe that untold sums of money can be saved by efficient administration, by eliminating any excessive profits on the part of those who supply goods and services to the Government and by doing away with the war-essential "rapid tax-write-off" programs intended to induce industry to expand in a period of national emergency. I also believe that only that overused rubber stamp "classified" prevents Congress and the public from knowing of possible waste, extravagance, and duplication in the Department of Defense, and the foreign-aid programs.

But the service agencies and departments of the Federal Government that cope with the problems, the often-tragic needs and the health of the average citizen, the small-business man, the veteran and the aged, have no "classified" stamp to use. They are the easy prey of the indiscriminate budget-cutter who swings a meat-ax—let it fall where it may—without thought for the consequences—to all of us who willingly pay our taxes for the benefits and advantages this richest and most blessed of all lands can well afford its people.

United States Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 8, 1957

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by me before the Advertising Council at Washington, D. C., on Monday last.

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

SENATOR MORTON'S ADDRESS BEFORE THE ADVERTISING COUNCIL

Good evening. It is a pleasure for me to have the opportunity to be here with you tonight and to be able to discuss important matters relating to the foreign policy of the United States with this group which is so intimately connected with the formation, dissemination and instrumentation of ideas and policies. Beyond this, your Advertising Council has in the past year been instrumental in the expenditure of nearly \$150 million in public service advertising. You have

given your time, effort and money to aid neighborhood improvement, to obtain better schools for our young, to help the Red Cross and the CARE food crusade and numerous other causes as well as special efforts in the Hungarian crisis. I understand you are attempting to increase your work this year. For your efforts and achievements I salute you—as a citizen, I thank you. No group would know better that friendship and co-operation have few borders.

As you so well know, there is no longer any question as to whether or not this country has a major and permanent role in the affairs of men. In his inspiring inaugural address last January the President of the United States clearly laid down the responsibilities of this Nation to the totality of mankind. The question is rather—how can we best conduct and discharge this obligation with honor and justice in an enlightened self interest and in the interest of all the peoples of the world?

George Washington's Farewell Address has often been quoted as a warning against what have been termed "foreign entanglements." A letter from Washington to Lafayette, dated August 15, 1786, has received considerably less attention. In this letter Washington wrote: "As a member of an infant empire * * * and as a citizen of the great republic of humanity at large, I cannot help turning my attention sometimes to this subject * * * I cannot avoid reflecting with pleasure on the probable influence that commerce may hereafter have on human manners and society in general. On these occasions I consider how mankind may be connected, like one great family, in fraternal ties. I indulge a fond, perhaps an enthusiastic, idea that * * * the period is not very remote when the benefits of a liberal and friendly commerce will pretty generally succeed to the devastations of horrors and war." I propose, ladies and gentlemen, that this time is surely now upon us.

There has been a great deal of discussion recently about the foreign policy of the United States. Some voices have been raised in the suggestion that we have no clear foreign policy or that it is a changing one without basic cohesiveness. I suggest, rather, that we have been going through a period of evolution in world affairs and that, concomitantly, our foreign policy has been evolving in response to the new world conditions and necessities.

Historically the foreign policies of nations have been based on certain aspirations and interests—many of these have been self-interests. There have been considerations as to territory, resources, strategic position. There have been particular loyalties toward certain peoples or nations, or antipathies toward others. There have been noble motives and other motives. Indeed, the list of reasons for policies may be as long as the number of policies or alliances of all history. I do not tonight condemn these reasons or considerations but merely point them out as factors which have existed and influenced the foreign policy of many nations throughout the ages.

I do tonight come before you with the firm belief that we have reached the time when the basic underlying principle of the foreign policy of the United States has evolved and can be clearly defined. It is the principle of principle. Woodrow Wilson once said, "Let us remind ourselves that we are the custodians in some degree of the principles which have made man free."

We find ourselves in a very unique position in the history of mankind. Our birth as a nation was in itself unique. Our creation was in response to a purpose based on principle. History has thrust upon us the

role of leader of the free world. This is not a role that we as a people sought or even wanted. We are faced by a militant and amoral Communist force that has as its avowed intention the enslavement of the peoples of our world. Ours is a time when nationalism has reached fervent heights in all parts of the world. We see in our time the birth of new nations—all with high hopes, many with old cultures, few with any experience in self-government or the conduct of foreign affairs. For these reasons we must have a policy which goes beyond the basis of loyalty or friendship, or of cultural, racial, or religious ties. This policy can only be based on principle.

What do I mean by policy based on principle? Any definition, in full form, would be rather broad and I shall elaborate on it throughout the course of my remarks. However, I believe that this principle which must now guide us has an essence. It means that we must strive, in our relationships with the rest of the world, to work always for that harmony, understanding and accord which will epitomize the highest and noblest aspirations, not only of our own Nation, but of the entire world. And if we feel that there are, in the American way, things of universal value which could benefit all mankind we must dedicate our efforts to helping others to adapt such of these as may be beneficial to their way of life.

We must never confuse friendship, or even leadership, with paternalism or self-righteousness. We must make it abundantly clear that our motives are honest and sincere, and we must be prepared to state them clearly.

We desire a world at peace, where all men may live according to their own cultural traditions in societies of their own choice. We want all people to possess the freedom of thought, belief, and choice to which every human being is entitled and we want for all a fuller and richer daily life. And we hope that through mutual understanding, clear expression, and dedicated effort we will all come closer together.

It has become generally accepted that the task of free world leadership has fallen to the United States. It is essential that we discharge this task with the conscience of principle. Our policies must not be based on affection for or antipathy toward any nation or people. Particular loyalties must not be allowed to overshadow the tremendous burden of principled world leadership. We cannot be permitted the indulgences that biased likes or dislikes forbode.

There will be times when public opinion at home is influenced by cultural, racial, or religious loyalties to friends abroad. At such times, although our road will be even more difficult, we must be prepared to bear the additional burden.

We recently have had just such an example. I refer to the Suez crisis, when principle forced us to take a strong stand against our traditional allies in their use of force to settle the dispute in that area. I firmly believe that our stand in this instance was just and correct. It was an example of leadership by principle. Nevertheless it shows that it is more difficult to lead by principle than by loyalty, friendship, or interest.

I am understanding of those who motivated by loyalty supported the position taken by our historic friends in the Suez matter and were sharply critical of the position taken by this country. But I point out that none of these persons or nations has the unique responsibility that rests on the United States in the troubled and explosive world of today. That responsibility is constant and must be consistent. I do not mean to imply that loyalty does not have its place in our dealings with other nations.

Loyalty we admire and disloyalty we deplore. In this country and elsewhere the strongest loyalty is the family loyalty. We recognize this in our own judicial processes. We do not require husband or wife to testify one against the other. Yet in the discharge of our unique responsibility there can be only loyalty to principle. This concept does not relieve us of any commitment into which we may have entered. Certainly we will be loyal and faithful to our obligations to our many allies just as we have been in the past. However, we cannot discharge our responsibility by condoning any action taken by a member of the family of nations just because that nation happens to be a member of a friendly alliance. All actions must be measured against the yardstick of principle.

Let me again quote our illustrious first President who said in his farewell address, "It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. * * * In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that, in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges toward another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. * * * The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim." Once more the wisdom of Washington is clear.

This policy of principle which I have tried to describe and to illustrate by reference to George Washington was clearly put to the test by the tragic chain of events which has taken place during the past 8 months in the Middle East. In my judgment those responsible for the conduct of the United States foreign affairs faithfully applied the measure of principle to the actions of other nations. Our reaction to this chain of events was in keeping with our own tradition of justice and our avowed purpose to achieve the settlement of such disputes by peaceful means.

In charting our course this country did not take the easy way. Principle demanded that we take the hard way and stand in firm opposition to our very closest traditional friends and allies. During these trying months we made it clear both within and without the United Nations that if our friends would abandon forceful intervention in Egypt we would undertake definite responsibilities. Now we cannot allow Colonel Nasser to think we will turn away from our responsibility just because he turns so readily from his own country's international responsibility. As a small nation and early in our history we stood up to powerful tyranny. Surely as a great nation we will now stand up to petty tyranny.

In the formation and execution of this policy based on principle we must avoid the influence of inveterate antipathies or prejudices of the past. We must be on guard against our natural tendencies to condemn the political and social systems of those who do not completely agree with us. We have a deep belief in our own form of government and political system. I share this belief. But the role of world leadership demands a willingness to work with others toward whom we may be unsympathetic or whose systems differ from our own.

This country has worked out a successful program of what has been termed person-to-person diplomacy. This means that as a nation we are willing to sit down face to face, as if man to man, to discuss agree-

ments, disagreements and many matters of mutual concern. And yet recently a head of state who had traveled to this country for just such a talk was publicly insulted upon his arrival. At this very moment, other heads of state whose visits might prove of ultimate benefit to all peoples cannot participate in this new dynamic diplomacy for fear of similar acts of shortsightedness.

I do not wish to imply that we should spread the welcome mat for the architects of the international Communist conspiracy. Nor should we do so for those who illegally hold innocent American nationals imprisoned. I do maintain that we should be big enough to overcome prejudice in talking to those whose political system we may not approve or whose neutralist stand we may not favor.

I do not suggest that we abandon any of our traditional beliefs or standards. On the contrary, we should attempt to foster and strengthen these standards where we may. I do say we must be openminded and accept other peoples with their standards and traditions. However, I wish to state very plainly that this respect for tradition does not mean that we shall ever fail to acknowledge the natural and just desires of all people for freedom and personal dignity. And we shall never fail to recognize the validity of natural and just change and progress.

I contend that no nation has any cause to doubt such intentions on our part. We have never sought to conquer or to annex. We seek no one's territory or interests. We have such abundance that seeking is not necessary. Instead we must wish to give, not so much of substance as of those eternals which we have always held self evident. We will not hurt ourselves by so doing. In fact, we will greatly help ourselves, both practically and as men of good will.

We must seek greater intercourse with less restriction, greater clarity with faith in its return, and better understanding based on deeds and acts. And through all, our primary consideration must be, not race, not religion, not color, not similarity of culture, not propinquity, not community of interest, but principle, absolute and yet understanding, as right alone can be.

I would like to conclude by quoting a distinguished American writer whose words seem particularly appropriate: "American freedom has its being in principles which do not belong to America but to the world. Our whole evolution is based on the action of these principles, and our hope of future solutions rests upon our further ability to apply them. To withdraw is to undermine ourselves. And to define our defense in purely military terms is to deny ourselves the further development of our own free institutions.

"In the last analysis, then * * * the formulation of a sound policy for America involves spiritual as well as military and economic considerations: * * * in the sense that we must continually rediscover within ourselves, and continually learn to implement, those universal human principles of which our version of freedom has been created. Without these principles we cannot hope to be free. Yet we cannot hope to understand them if we consider them exclusively our own. The isolationist cliche that America should serve her own ends exclusively has little meaning when viewed in this light. We must so frame our policies that we may discover in ourselves, as individuals, and learn to implement, that which we hold in common with all humanity.

"There come times in the history of every people when destiny knocks on their door with an iron insistence. In the history of America, destiny has knocked thus three times; once when we faced the seemingly impossible odds of British power to gain our

independence; once at Fort Sumter, when we faced the bloody task of preserving our Union; and it is knocking today.

"It is true that on other grave occasions Americans have heard the knock of destiny. They heard it in 1917 when they sent their first expeditionary force to Europe. They heard it even more loudly in 1941, when they roused out of an isolationist lethargy to fight—again against odds—one of the most brilliant and important wars in history. Yet on neither of those occasions did the knocking have the iron clang that we hear today. In World War I, and even in World War II, a mold existed into which we could pour our vast energies. Our power—and in the second war our leadership also—was essential to victory. But it was not our task to make the mold. It was not our task to determine either the geographical contours or the moral content of the battle. That had already been done by the rest of the world.

"But today, though we again have allies, though we have the United Nations, though we have access to resources all over the world, it is we who must shape the struggle; we must make the mold. That is the meaning of the iron clang. Our outlook is the same as it was at the time of the Revolution, and again at the time of the Civil War; the shape of things to come depends on us; our moral decision, our wisdom, our vision, and our will." Thank you.

Text of Preliminary Statement of House Un-American Activities Subcommittee As Read by Subcommittee Chairman Clyde Doyle, California, at Chicago, Ill., Subcommittee Hearings Beginning March 26, 1957

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 8, 1957.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent heretofore having been granted me so to do, I am pleased to present for your information, as well as the information of all my colleagues and any others who read this, a true and correct copy of a preliminary statement made and read by me on Tuesday, March 26, 1957, at subcommittee hearings of the House Un-American Activities Committee, over which I presided, beginning on said date at Chicago, Ill.

The statement follows:

INVESTIGATION OF THE DISSEMINATION OF COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DOYLE. The committee will please come to order.

I have a preliminary statement that I wish to read. It is customary so to do in these hearings.

In these hearings in Chicago with this subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities beginning this morning, it is our purpose to obtain further information for legislative purposes about the extent, character, and objects of the Communist propaganda in the United States, including subversive activities of the Communist Party. This is our official duty and obligation under the expressed terms of Public Law

601, enacted by the United States Congress in 1946 during the 79th session thereof.

The primary purpose of our inquiry today and tomorrow here in the Chicago area is the extent to which the press is Communist dominated so far as foreign language papers are concerned or the subversive conspiracy is implemented thereby. We expect to investigate today and tomorrow the extent to which this foreign language press, which is printed or distributed in or from the Chicago area, is the tool of the Communist subversive propaganda activity.

We recently made a very successful investigation on the same important subject of the New York City area. It is the Communist infiltration of the foreign language press of which we will be concerned chiefly.

Evidence which the committee has already received in hearings in other cities on this same subject indicates clearly that the propaganda operations of the Communist Party in the United States among minority groups serve as one of the most powerful means and methods of subversion.

The activities of the Communist Party right here in the Chicago area takes on a new significance in view of the recent announced decision of the Communist Party of the United States to transfer its headquarters nationally to Chicago.

The Communist Party and Communist front organizations which already exist here in this important industrial area are among the most virile and extensive in our entire beloved Nation.

An examination of Communist propaganda publications is sure to prompt the cry from the Communists and the Communist controlled fronts and Communist controlled press that we are attempting to exert a censorship of the press. This is, of course, false and unfounded, and the Communists know that such an attack on this committee has no foundation in truth or in fact.

I want to make it clear that this committee has no intention of seeking censorship of newspapers, magazines, or books, in interfering in any way with the operation of genuine and free publications. But we are definitely instructed by the United States Congress and by Public Law 601 to investigate and report the extent and character of Communist subversive propaganda and activities wherever it sticks its ugly head. The Communist publications are another matter. To the extent that any foreign-language newspaper that we are investigating today and tomorrow is controlled by Communist philosophy it is not a free press. They are but the mouthpiece of a foreign ideology from a foreign source of a subversive conspiracy against the free press or against free speech in the United States.

The constitutional right to advocate change in an orderly manner is fundamental. We recognize it as such. But orderly change in our constitutional law is not the subversive intent of the Communist Party in the United States. There are constitutional guarantees of free speech and free press, and thank God there are, but there are no constitutional guarantees protecting subversive, fraudulent propaganda, designed to forcibly and violently overthrow our constitutional government or prohibit the Government of the United States from dealing with it in the legal manner.

Indeed, there are already existing laws against such types of publications. It is apparent that these laws are frequently being violated and circumvented in many ways and that these laws need to be strengthened.

The committee subscribes wholeheartedly and vigorously to the premise that any American citizen has the established right to say and to write what he pleases and to present his grievance in a legitimate way to the

representatives which he has democratically chosen to govern him, but at the same time the people of the United States and the Government of the people of the United States have a right and a duty to learn the identity of those who illegally and subversively abuse the freedom of speech and the freedom of the press in order to bring about subversive destruction of our constitutional form of government.

At this point I wish to incorporate in the record the authorization of the full House Committee on Un-American Activities for this series of subcommittee hearings and the order by the chairman of the full Committee on Un-American Activities, to wit, the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, in which he appointed this subcommittee consisting of three members, to wit, the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FRAZIER], who is absent this morning; the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER], who is on my right; and myself, CLYDE DOYLE, of California, as subcommittee chairman.

The reason I insert this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is not only that I learn that many of the Chicago and Illinois Members in this great body have received communications from that area from constituents falsely charging what was in my preliminary statement, but likewise charging that it, and the hearings growing out of same, were a deliberate interference with the freedom of the press.

This is not the first time that false, deceitful statements have come to my attention as having been received by Members of this great body from geographical areas where subcommittees of the Un-American Activities Committee have held hearings, but I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that there is a definite, systematic and malicious program in being from Communist philosophy undergrounds and on surface members and sympathizers to misinform and mislead Members of Congress and other legislative bodies as to what is said in preliminary statements by subcommittee chairmen of our House Un-American Activities Committee. Therefore, in presenting this to your attention and consideration I do so with the cordial invitation to you who read the same to communicate to me any suggestion, criticism, or any comments which you desire to make to me about the same. I will cordially welcome the receipt thereof.

Of recent date I have furnished to all of the Members of this great legislative body from the Chicago area a true and correct duplicate of this text this day called to your attention.

Mr. Speaker, little wonder is it that these distinguished Representatives in Congress from the Chicago area have received false and baseless and untrue communications attacking my preliminary statement and the said subcommittee public hearings. I say this for the reason that at said hearings it was proven that in a foreign-language paper, named Vilnis Weekly Review, there appeared the following article under date of Friday, June 27, 1952:

ESCAPED KOREAN POW'S EXPOSE UNITED STATES CRIMES

PYONGYANG (Hsinhua).—Open letters by three escaped Korean prisoners of war to the

Korean People's Army were published by the local paper "People's Army News" on May 22. The authors of these letters are Cpl. Choi Song Ok, Pfc. Li Hun Si and fighter Yun Chang Il, all of whom escaped from Compound No. 76 of the POW camp on Koje Island. Based on personal experience, they have exposed the American crime of manhandling, torturing and butchering captured personnel and have blown skyhigh the American lies about voluntary repatriation, humanitarian principles and the like.

CHOI SONG OK'S LETTER READS: ISLAND OF HORROR

I joined the Korean People's Army when the Syngman Rhee brigands and American imperialist forces started invading North Korea. In a battle, I lost consciousness from a wound and was captured by the Americans. I was flung into a POW camp in the Pusan area and later transferred to Koje Island.

I really cannot find words to describe all the horrors that my comrades and I suffered in the Koje POW camp. But I assure you that this POW camp run by the American Army is literally a hell. I escaped from this camp on May 7.

Compound No. 76 of the POW camp is dark and poorly ventilated. Its quarters are in utter darkness, devoid of bedding. It has 18 torture rooms and six steam rooms in which Americans put the captives to death by live steam. In addition, there are four gallows.

The American gangsters treated the POW's like beasts. They starve prisoners and imposed forced labor on us every day, despite our hunger. Our two meals daily were inadequate and consisted of coarse food. We had rice only once a week.

The American robbers tortured captured personnel on the flimsiest pretexts. They also often starved prisoners to death.

As was the case with other captives, the American gangsters tried to make me sign the so-called petition in blood, but I refused.

DON'T WANT TO SERVE AMERICANS

On April 14, Brigadier General Dodd, camp commander, a colonel and three other officers came to our compound. The prisoners were assembled to listen to Dodd. The meeting ground was heavily guarded. Dodd announced that all POW's would be registered. Then forms were distributed to the prisoners to be filled in and signed. He said that the United States Army command wished to release those prisoners who wished to serve the United Nations forces and so they were required to sign an anti-Communist petition in their own blood.

We immediately started shouting. "Send us home. We don't want to serve the Americans. Observe Geneva Convention. We refuse to join United Nations forces." The POW's rose as one man in their wrath.

Dodd beat a hasty exit. The American guards encircled us and fired. Eighteen POW's were killed and 37 wounded.

Next day they carried out individual interrogation of POW's, and I was interrogated. An American colonel asked me whether I knew which POW's were members of the Nodong Dang and who had started the riot. He wanted me to give their names. The colonel said: "If you tell me the facts, I shall give you 800 United States dollars and release you. Then you can live a free life in Seoul."

ELECTROCUTION

I stubbornly refused to answer these provocative questions, on the ground that international law did not require me to answer such questions. Then they dragged me out of the interrogation room and thrust me into a dark cellar. There I was stripped, bound, and whipped.

Other comrades were suffering the same torture in the cellar.

I lost consciousness several times. The sadists poured hot water on my body and kept whipping me. Finally, the American gangsters put me into a cell so small I could not turn around. They said menacingly: "If you don't tell us who shouted Communist slogans at yesterday's meeting, you will be electrocuted."

I was filled with burning hatred for these monsters and resisted the interrogation and torture in silence.

At last I got an opportunity to escape from the POW camp. I crossed the 38th parallel and returned to the free soil of my motherland.

I can never forget the terror in the American POW camp on Koje Island, and my deep hatred of the American brigands will never diminish. I will do my utmost, and even give my life, to drive the foreign aggressors out of my country.

TRUTH OF UNITED STATES SCREENING

Following is the text of a joint letter by Li Hun Si and Pun Chang Hi:

We are filled with indignation and loathing for the shameless violation by the American and Rhee brigands of all international law, and their vicious oppression of our captured personnel on Koje Island.

On May 4, we escaped from the American prisoners of war camp on Koje Island and returned to our motherland. Now we are happily breathing the fresh air of freedom.

We want to accuse the American butchers of atrocities on Koje Island before all people of good will. We ask the people of our country and people throughout the world unanimously to support our brothers on Koje Island who are being beaten and maltreated by the American forces.

The American interventionists' cruelties in the POW camps on Koje Island are perpetrated to force our captured personnel to become cannon fodder for the Syngman Rhee and Chiang Kai-shek brigands, and slaves of the Americans. With this goal in mind, the American military authorities on Koje Island again started forcible screening in April. The American robbers fabricated so-called petitions and forced our captured personnel to affix their fingerprints in blood. Those who refused were maltreated and were subjected to third-degree questioning. When we two refused, we were interrogated and tortured.

It is difficult to imagine the sufferings we have endured.

All captured personnel of the Korean and Chinese people's forces are anxious to return to their own countries. We believe that the day will come soon.

The American robbers' scheme to turn our captured personnel into their slaves, and Syngman Rhee and Chiang Kai-shek's cannon fodder will never be released. The American robbers must bear responsibility for their crimes on Koje Island.

We who have returned to our free motherland will resolutely defend our beloved motherland and strive for unconditional victory.

Therefore, I naturally asked the Secretary of Defense on April 30, 1957, furnishing him a photostatic copy of said article dated June 27, 1952, to give me the answer in connection therewith. Here, therefore, is my communication to the Secretary of Defense, dated April 30, 1957, and here is his answer to my inquiry dated May 17, 1957:

APRIL 30, 1957.

Hon. CHARLES E. WILSON,
Secretary of Defense,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Enclosed is photostat of page 2 of Vilnis Weekly Review for

Friday, June 27, 1952, published at Chicago, Ill., on that date. This exhibit was introduced before my subcommittee in public session of the House Un-American Activities Committee on March 27. It is a reproduction of the English language portion of a Lithuanian newspaper published in Chicago.

I will thank you to give to me such appropriate comment as you may have in the premises relating to the alleged facts set forth in this dastardly article.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., May 17, 1957.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: Reference is made to your letter of April 30, 1957, to the Secretary of Defense forwarding a photostatic copy of a page of the *Vilnius Weekly Review* for Friday, June 27, 1952. Additional reference is made to a letter addressed to you on May 8, 1957, from Capt. Carlton R. Adams, Director of Legislative Liaison, informing you that your request for comments on the *Vilnius Weekly Review* article had been forwarded to this office.

This office is unfamiliar with the publication. It is noted, however, that the source of the story entitled "Escaped Korean POW's Expose United States Crimes" is Hsinhua. Hsinhua is the official news agency of the Chinese Communist regime in Peiping, and as such, it is completely controlled by the regime (as are all media of information in Communist China). It is the main source of Chinese Communist propaganda in the press and publications field.

During the period in question (June 1952), the Chinese Communists were suffering a severe propaganda loss to the U. N. command and especially to the United States in Korea, because at that time some 33,000 former North Korean and Chinese Communist soldiers were adamantly refusing repatriation to their homelands. The Korean truce negotiations were under way and the Communist side was stalling over the issue of nonforcible repatriation of prisoners of war. As you know, in the Orient face is a most important psychological asset. In the summer of 1952 the Chinese Communists were losing face over the PW issue and the exposure before the world of the true feelings of these former Communist soldiers with regard to the North Korean and Chinese Communist "paradise" was most intolerable in the eyes of the Communist regime.

The article from the *Vilnius Weekly Review* is only one of a variety of methods by which the Communists attempted to take the pressure of world opinion off their own difficulties and contradictions by ascribing to the U. N. command the very crimes of which the Communists themselves had been guilty.

The whole issue of U. N. treatment of Communist POW's has been thoroughly investigated through the mechanism of the International Committee of the Red Cross which made thorough and periodic inspections of U. N. command PW compounds throughout the Korean War. Except for the most minor and relatively insignificant deficiencies, the inspection teams of the International Committee of the Red Cross gave the U. N. command a completely clean bill of health on the handling of Communist POW's. The mere fact that 33,000 of these POW's refused to return to North Korea or to Communist China is in itself most eloquent testimony to the manner in

which the U. N. command took care of their welfare, and treated them in all respects in strict accordance with the Geneva Convention on POW's.

Because the article is based on completely distorted facts and outright fabrications, it is impractical to attempt to analyze each particular statement. It is assumed that the three soldiers who are described in the article were simply ordered to sign their names to the so-called letters which were prepared by a Communist propagandist within the context of the campaign to discredit the U. N. command and the United States.

I am at a loss to understand why a weekly publication, which depends upon American freedom of the press for its existence, would publish such obvious Communist propaganda, but as you know it is beyond the purview and authority of the Department of Defense to look into such matters.

I trust that these general remarks and comments on the article will serve your purpose.

Sincerely yours,

G. B. ERSKINE,
General, USMC (Retired), Assistant
to the Secretary of Defense (Spe-
cial Operations).

In producing this traitorous article from a foreign-language newspaper, printed at Chicago on June 27, 1952, and which paper is still printed there, was the subcommittee interfering with the freedom of the press? In asking you this question I call your attention especially to paragraph 7 of my preliminary statement beginning as follows:

The primary purpose of our inquiry today and tomorrow here in the Chicago area is the extent to which the press is Communist-dominated so far as foreign-language papers are concerned or the subversive conspiracy is implemented thereby.

And for your information I am pleased to present the following text of one of the pamphlets widely distributed in Chicago at the time prior to the subcommittee hearings beginning March 26, 1957:

YOUR RIGHT TO READ NEWSPAPERS, TO BUY BOOKS, TO SEE FILMS, IS CHALLENGED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

On Tuesday, March 26, and Thursday, March 28, several of your fellow citizens have been summoned to appear for inquisition before the House Un-American Activities Committee (the Walter committee) at the Federal Courthouse in Chicago. Their crime: They publish newspapers, sell books, or exhibit films that the bigots on the Walter committee don't like.

"The most un-American activity in the United States is the conduct of the Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities. It is so viciously flagrant a violation of every element of common decency associated with human liberty that it is a foul mockery on all that Jefferson and Lincoln made articulate in their dreams of a cleaner, finer order on earth." — From an editorial in the *Detroit Free Press*, sister paper of the *Chicago Daily News*.

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." (First amendment, Constitution of the United States, Dec. 15, 1791.)

Some of the people summoned by the Walter committee are editors of foreign-language

newspapers published in Chicago. Apparently in the eyes of the Walter committee anyone who speaks or writes in a foreign language is suspect. This is in line with the objectives of the Walter-McCarran Immigration Act, of which Congressman WALTER is coauthor.

The Constitution forbids Congress to restrict freedom of expression, so it cannot legislate in this field. Therefore, the purpose of the inquisition is to create hysteria and block the growing opposition to the Walter-McCarran Act.

The specific objective of the forthcoming inquiry is to destroy the foreign-language newspapers because of their influence in arousing opposition to the Walter-McCarran Act. Freedom of speech is of special importance to these people because they speak in a different language. If the foreign-language press is deprived of its rights, will other newspapers be secure?

The Walter committee seeks to accomplish its purpose by having paid informers attack those with whom it disagrees. These informers label as subversive and un-American those who sell books not approved by Secretary of State Dulles, or who show Russian films, or who oppose repressive legislation.

We agree with the following message sent to a meeting of the American Booksellers Association by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in April 1942, when the Nazis were burning books with which they disagreed:

"We know that books burn—yet we have the greater knowledge that books cannot be killed by fire.

"People die, but books never die. No man and no force can abolish memory."

Among those summoned to appear before the Walter committee on March 26 and 28 are:

EDITORS

Mrs. Alice Yonik: Editor in chief of *Vilnius* (meaning Surge). *Vilnius* has been published for Lithuanian readers in Chicago since 1920 and has been a daily newspaper since 1926. Mrs. Yonik has been with the newspaper since 1932. She is a native of Chicago and is active in the Lithuanian Women's Cultural Club.

Leon Pruseika: Associate editor of *Vilnius*. Jacob Paulukas: Manager of *Vilnius*.

Vincent Andrusis: Columnist and former editor of *Vilnius*. Member for 27 years of the Association of Lithuanian Workers. Active in Lithuanian Literary Society. He is very ill with a heart ailment.

Mrs. Nellie De Schaaf: Housewife. Editor of *Vilnius*' English section from 1950 to 1952.

Anthony Minerich: Business manager and former editor of the Croatian weekly, *Narodni Glasnik* (meaning People's Voice). Formerly active in United Mine Workers of America. Now active in Croatian Fraternal Union.

John Zuskar: Business manager of the Slovak weekly newspaper, *Ludowy Noviny* (meaning People's News). Secretary of the Slovak Circle. Member for 45 years of the National Slovak Society.

FILM EXHIBITORS

John Rossen: Theater manager. Veteran of World War II. Executive director of the Chicago Council of America-Soviet Friendship.

LeRoy Wolins: Veteran of the Korean campaign. Graduate of the University of Chicago. Director of the Film Forum of Chicago, which has been showing Russian films. Editor of *Friendship*. Administrative secretary, Chicago Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

BOOKSELLER

Otto Wangerin: Operator of Modern Bookstore. Active for 40 years in labor and progressive movement.