the basis of what is right. Last June the Diet was considering ratification of our reparations agreement with the Philippines but this was endangered by our party's opposition to the Government and the many conflicts in the Diet. I decided to take full responsibility as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee to fight for ratification, and 3 hours before the Diet session ended the reparations agreement was ratified."

Daw Nyein Tha, distinguished educator from Burma, said: "MRA has the secret of turning enemies into friends." She quoted Dr. Buchman: " 'The best defense of your country is the respect and gratitude of your neighbors.' "

Mr. Kichizaemon Sumitomo, head of the Japanese industrial family which before the war employed 500,000 men, said: "I realize that as a capitalist I was also responsible for what happened in the Philippines by providing the material strength for the Japanese militarists. But apology is not enough. We in management must work on a basis of what is right. It is not enough to rely on good will between individuals. We responsible leaders of our nations must commit ourselves to living a moral ideology."

After an apology by Renzo Yanagisawa, chairman of 250,000 Japanese shipyard workers, for what Japan did to the Philippines during the war, Donato Alarcon, vice president of the Philippine Transport Workers Union, said: "At this assembly we are developing the moral ideology where our mistakes of the past can be corrected and Japan and the Philippines can learn to live as members of one family."

Willard Johnson, president of the student body of 12,000 at the University of California at Los Angeles, and Jerry Nelson, another student leader from the same university, told of the unity MRA had brought to their campus. "We were the bitterest political enemies on the campus," said Nelson. "What we had been doing was divisive and selfish. MRA united us. America needs this ideology. It is the only hope of our country." Johnson said: "We Negroes have often attempted to answer racial prejudice with an equal amount of prejudice against the whites. Our real battle is against prejudice and not against the people involved in it. The ideology of moral rearmament can answer racial prejudice because it challenges both black and white to change and build a new world."

WORLD DICTATORSHIP, WORLD DESTRUCTION, OR WORLD RENAISSANCE

Dr. Douglas Cornell of Washington, executive officer of the National Academy of Sciences, said: "MRA is the ideology of freedom needed in the atomic age. I have worked 10 years in the development of weapons and have some knowledge of such facts as the marriage of atomic warheads with guided missiles. The new factor is that the next war would mean total destruction. Consciously or unconsciously everyone of us chooses one of three alternatives—world dictatorship, world destruction, or world renaissance. MRA offers every man the chance to play his full part in the creation of this renaissance."

Dante Calma of the office of the President of the Philippines, said: "As yet it is only in Communist countries that ideology is placed before self-interest. I fear for the future of my country and my children if there is not a change. Moral Re-Armament has proved a turning point in my life and for the first time I have become part of my Catholic faith. The future of this country as well as of Asia is being shaped here at this assembly. We Filipinos must make Moral Re-Armament top priority."

Dean Vincente G. Sinco, dean of the College of Law, University of the Philippines, and chairman of the import-export committee, told the assembly: "I have been overwhelmed by the decisions which men and women have made at this Assembly to take this ideology to Asia and the world. The spirit of greed, falsehood, impurity, and selfishness exists even where there is no communism. With MRA these forces will not become dominant in our nation. Only in this way will we have peace and unity."

Rajaram Shastri, Member of Parliament of India and General Secretary, 1954–55, of the All-India Hind Mazdoor Sabha, central organization of the Socialist trade unions of India with 500,000 members, declared:

"As a Marxist I spent 26 years of my life organizing the Indian working class on a basis of hatred and bitterness. When I saw the division around me I traveled for an answer to Soviet Russia, Red China, and several countries of Europe, but everywhere I found people suffering from the same disease—materialism.

"When I met Moral Re-Armament I realized that for 26 years I had been pointing out the mistakes of others instead of seeing where I need to change myself first. MRA turned a torchlight inward. Through absolute moral standards and the guidance of God lies the way to bring peace and happiness to individuals, families, nations, and the world."

Cornelio Balmaceda, general manager of the Philippine Chamber of Commerce and former Minister of Commerce, who had earlier attended the World Training Center for Moral Re-Armament at Caux, Switzerland, while a delegate to the ECOSOC Conference in Geneva, said: "Ideological controversy plagued the meetings in Geneva. At Caux I saw Communists changing and the force of an idea to unite the world. Most solutions center around material rearmament. MRA is an armament that does not cost nations billions to insure defense. While the masses of Asia are being serenaded by communism, the coming of Moral Re-Armament is very significant and timely."

TRUE BASIS FOR EAST-WEST UNITY

In a cable to Mr. SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, on the occasion of a private showing for Members of both Houses of the United States Congress of the all-African film, Freedom, delegates at the Asian Assembly said:

"The Asian nations gathered at Baguio in the Philippines respond to your initiative in the presentation of the film, Freedom, to the United States Congress. The Asian premiere of Freedom was seen here this week by delegates from 24 nations attending the Asian Assembly for Moral Re-Armament. This overwhelming film is providential for our nations at this critical time and must reach the millions of Asia now.

"The ideology depicted in the film, Freedom, is the ideology Asia wants. It is the only true basis on which East and West can unite. Where diplomacy has failed to answer our greatest need, Moral Re-Armament is succeeding. It is breaking down barriers of hate and bitterness and creating trust and unity. It is opening up avenues to reparations and concrete accords.

"We are grateful for the three American brothers, the Colwells, who responded to the late President Magsaysay's call that they come to Baguio. They have played a vital part in operating the spirit in which unity is being forged between our nations."

The cable was signed by: Senator Roseller T. Lim, the Philippines; General Ho Ying-chin, chairman, Military Strategy Advisory Board, Formosa; Niro Hoshijima, senior member, Japanese Diet; Senator Shidzue Kato, member, Foreign Relations Committee, Japan; Yoon Sung Soon, chairman, Foreign Relations Committee, Korean National Assembly; R. P. Sunarto, director, Radio Indonesia; Devar Surya Sena, Radio Ceylon; Dato Mahmoud Bin Mat, former speaker, Legislative Council, Malaya; Maung Maung Khin, editor, New Light of Burma; Rajaram Shastri, Member of Parliament, India.

A special showing for members of Congress of the Philippines was held on April 13 and attended by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Senate majority leader, chairman of the three Senate committees, and other Congressional leaders. The morning session of the Senate was delayed for an hour to enable members to attend.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 16, 1957

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

Eternal Father, strong to save, all that we think or plan or do this sacred week has upon it the shadow of a rugged cross. With a surety that pure reason cannot follow, because it passeth understanding, we are conscious that in the face of man's best man, love's best love, as He moves with unshrinking, steady pace to the cross-crowned hill outside the city's walls, is the confirmation of our highest aspirations, the rebuke to our failure to be true to our best, the shining goal of a self uncowed by the threats of foes or compromised by the seduction of friends:

We take, O cross, thy shadow
For our abiding place,
We ask no other sunshine
Than the sunshine of His face;
Content to let the world go by,
To know no gain or loss,
Our sinful selves our only shame,
Our glory all the cross.

In His name, who for the joy that was set before Him endured the cross and despised the shame. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 15, 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. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 58. An act for the relief of Duk Chang Cho;

S. 87. An act for the relief of Pavel Blaho;

S. 91. An act for the relief of Victor Charles Hunt;

S. 127. An act for the relief of Anna Maria Cosentino and Francesca Maria Cosentino;

S. 158. An act for the relief of Hewey Malachi Mackey;

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

S. 288. An act for the relief of Esther Guagliardo;

S. 363. An act for the relief of Nelson Shu-Yung Chuang;

S. 424. An act for the relief of Herbert James Bramley;

S. 649. An act for the relief of Yee Chung Fong Ming and Yee Chung Nom Ming;

S. 753. An act for the relief of Georgiana Ching Hsien (Liang) New; and

S. 812. An act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to price support for extra long staple cotton.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions of the Senate:

S. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens;

S. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent resolution withdrawing suspension of deportation of Carlis Stender;

S. Con. Res. 17. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation in the case of certain aliens; and

S. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution withdrawing suspension of deportation of Ashun Yung.

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

H. R. 1045. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended;

H. R. 1983. An act to provide for the conveyance of the reversionary interest of the United States in certain lands to the Clint Independent School District and the Fabens Independent School District in the State of Texas, or to either of them, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3367. An act to amend section 1867 of title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the use of certified mail in summoning jurors;

H. R. 3368. An act to amend section 1870 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the district courts to allow additional peremptory challenges in civil cases to multiple plaintiffs as well as multiple defendants;

H. R. 4144. An act to provide that the commanding general of the militia of the District of Columbia shall hold the rank of brigadier general or major general;

H. R. 5832. An act to increase the retired annuities of the civilian members of the teaching staffs of the United States Naval Academy and the United States Naval Postgraduate School; and

H. R. 6870. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 1045. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 1983. An act to provide for the conveyance of the reversionary interest of the United States in certain lands to the Clint Independent School District and the Fabens Independent School District in the State of Texas, or to either of them, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H. R. 3367. An act to amend section 1867 of title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the use of certified mail in summoning jurors; and

H. R. 3368. An act to amend section 1870 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the district courts to allow additional peremptory challenges in civil cases to multiple plaintiffs as well as multiple defendants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4144. An act to provide that the commanding general of the militia of the District of Columbia shall hold the rank of brigadier general or major general; and

H. R. 5832. An act to increase the retired annuities of the civilian members of the teaching staffs of the United States Naval Academy and the United States Naval Postgraduate School; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 6870. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SECOND URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS, 1957—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 234)

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I report House bill 6870, making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6870) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, House bill 6870 has been reported to the Senate without change, insofar as the action taken by the House of Representatives on the appropriations for the executive branch is concerned. All the departments and agencies affected by the bill have been consulted, and they are fairly well satisfied with the amounts of appropriations voted by the House of Representatives.

The only amendments which have been made by the Senate committee in the bill provide for certain contingent expenses of the Senate; and the action of the Senate Appropriations Committee in that connection corresponds in principle with the action taken by the House in making available the amount of $290,000 "for 'Special and select committees.'"

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendments will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was on page 5, beginning in line 10, after the heading "Legislative Branch," to insert "Senate."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 5, after line 10, to insert:

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Office of the Vice President: For an additional amount for clerical assistance to the Vice President, $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 13, to insert:

Administrative and clerical assistants to Senators: For an additional amount for administrative and clerical assistants for Senators, to provide additional clerical assistants for each Senator from the States of Louisiana and Ohio so that the allowance for each Senator from the State of Louisiana will be equal to that allowed Senators from States having a population of over 3 million, the population of said State having exceeded 3 million inhabitants, and so that the allowance for each Senator from the State of Ohio will be equal to that allowed Senators from States having a population of over 9 million, the population of said State having exceeded 9 million inhabitants, $8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 6, to insert:

Administrative and clerical assistants to Senators: For an additional amount for administrative and clerical assistants for Senators, to provide additional clerical assistants for each Senator from the State of Texas so that the allowance for each Senator from said State will be equal to that allowed Senators from States having a population of over 9 million, the population of said State having exceeded 9 million inhabitants, $2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 8, to insert:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

Inquiries and investigations: For an additional amount for expenses of inquiries and investigations, fiscal year 1956, $25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 12, to insert:

Inquiries and investigations: For an additional amount for expenses of inquiries and investigations, $820,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 14, to insert:

Automobile for the President pro tempore: For an additional amount for purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of an automobile for the President pro tempore of the Senate, $2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 18, to insert:

Automobiles for the majority and minority leaders: For an additional amount for purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of 2 automobiles, 1 for the majority leader of the Senate, and 1 for the minority leader of the Senate, $4,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 23, to insert:

Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration: For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration, $5,000, to remain available during the existence of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 6870) was passed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which

the Senate just passed the second urgent deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GOLDWATER subsequently said: Mr. President, I was absent from the floor, on committee business, when the appropriation bill including the deficiency item for the Post Office Department passed the Senate. I had certainly expected that the bill would receive far more attention than that which was accorded to it this afternoon. I was very hopeful that we would have an opportunity to have a yea-and-nay vote taken on the question of the passage of the measure. If such a vote had been taken, I would have voted against the bill.

I think the statement made on yesterday by the Postmaster General—namely, that $1 million was saved by closing the post offices last Saturday—indicates to the American people that $52 million might be knocked from the budget this year by continuing to close the post offices on Saturday. The country is working on a 5-day week basis. I do not know why it is necessary for mail to be delivered on Saturday. In fact, last Saturday at home was a joy: I did not have to read any local newspapers; I received no bills; I received no letters from anyone telling me what an unusual person I am—in either direction. [Laughter.]

I think the country might welcome a respite from the free mailings which are so numerous, both those from the Congress and those emanating from private sources through the allowances of the law and the regulations of the Post Office Department.

I certainly would have hoped this body would have given more attention than it did to an item of approximately $41 million.

However, inasmuch as the bill has now been passed, and inasmuch as I—because of my absence on committee business—did not have an opportunity to vote on the question of the passage of the bill, I ask unanimous consent that the few words I have had to say on the bill be printed in the RECORD in connection with the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Am I to understand that the distinguished Senator from Arizona, who is one of the Nation's most outstanding advocates of economy, is not in favor of the position taken by the Postmaster General, Mr. Arthur Summerfield, in respect to this particular matter?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not know what his final position is; he has taken several. However, when the Postmaster General said he could save money by not delivering mail on Saturday, I was in complete agreement with him. After the Postmaster General stated that $1 million could be saved by not delivering mail on one Saturday, I do not know what happened to change his mind and to cause him to conclude that it would be necessary that the mail be delivered on Saturday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me say that I was disturbed that, under coercion, the House caved in and voted to give the Postmaster General the amount of money he requested, because certainly he must have been in violation of some law, if the General Accounting Office was correct in its statement that the action of the Postmaster General was in violation of the law. He did not notify the Congress of the fact that he would be faced with a deficit. He notified Congress only at the last minute, and he used coercion and threats; and he seemed to get away with it. I am delighted that the distinguished Senator from Arizona is not in accord with the attitude of the present Postmaster General.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, if what the distinguished Senator from Montana says is true—and I have no reason to doubt its truthfulness—I certainly shall have reason to take issue with the Postmaster General.

I say to the Senator from Montana and to all other Senators that all of us are violating a law—one of the immutable laws of economics, namely, that one cannot spend what he does not have. However, today the Government is spending $286 billion of the money of our grandchildren and our great-grandchildren and our great-great-grandchildren, as well as the money of the grandchildren's mothers. I say it is time we put a stop to it, even in the case of those who like to be bothered by having mail delivered on Saturday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to join the Senator from Arizona; and I wish to state that I hope the agencies downtown will take heed of what the Senator from Arizona has said.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I still have hope.

REQUESTED AUTHORIZATION FOR OUT-OF-TOWN HEARINGS BY JUVENILE DELINQUENCY SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee be permitted to hold out-of-town hearings during the sessions of the Senate on May 7, 8, and 9, 1957.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I must object to the request that the Senate authorize the subcommittee to hold out-of-town hearings. It is a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee. We have had difficulty in getting the committee to have a quorum present and to take action on the proposed civil-rights legislation, which now has been pending before that committee for some time.

In view of the fact that the Senate is about to take a recess for the Easter period, unless the subcommittee's out-of-town meetings could be held during that recess week, I must object to out-of-town meetings by any subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, until the full committee has at least acted on the proposed civil-rights legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, since the Senate is meeting today following an adjournment, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour, for the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, that during the month of March there were no significant developments relating to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico for the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO INTERCHANGE JURISDICTION OF MILITARY AND NATIONAL FOREST LANDS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, and Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a notice of intention of the Department of the Army and the Department of Agriculture to interchange jurisdiction of military and national forest lands (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CONTRACTS

A letter from the Director of Research and Development, Department of the Army, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on research and development contracts, for the period July 1, 1956, through December 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON SAN ANGELO PROJECT, TEXAS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and findings on the San Angelo project, Texas (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SUPPLEMENT TO CONTRACT WITH PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC CO. FOR CERTAIN SERVICES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed contract entitled "Supplement to Contract With Pacific Gas & Electric Co. for Transmission and Exchange Service," dated March 1, 1957, amended March 4, 1957 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DEVELOPMENT AND MODERNIZATION OF NATIONAL SYSTEM OF AIR NAVIGATION

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation

to provide for the development and modernization of the national system of navigation and traffic control facilities to serve present and future needs of civil and military aviation, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MADAME HENRIETTE BUAILLON AND STANLEY JAMES CARPENTER

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Madame Henriette Buaillon and Stanley James Carpenter (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CARE AND TREATMENT OF INDIANS

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, reporting, pursuant to law, on the care and treatment of Indians, subsequent to June 30, 1957 (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 VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relating to the appropriation of funds for the construction of a fish-producing and rearing station in Sycamore Canyon, north of Cottonwood, Ariz., and in the area of Bullhead City, Ariz.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. GOLDWATER on April 15, 1957, p. 5644, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Finance:

"The increased importation of numerous products that come into competition with the output of factories, farms, and mines of Pennsylvania, replacing the products of Pennsylvania's industries, is a constant menace to the State's continuing economic stability.

"The lower wages paid abroad make it impossible for many of our smaller and medium-sized producers to compete with imports without resorting to ruinous price cutting, which in turn would result either in financial losses or heavy pressure for wage reductions and outright unemployment.

"Our national obligations have reached such extreme proportions that the national income must be maintained at its present unprecedented high level, or close thereto lest we become insolvent.

"Unemployment caused by the imports of residual oil, which represented 3.43 times the average of 45 million barrels imported in 1946, to approximately 154 million barrels in 1956, or the yearly equivalent of 36,640,000 tons of coal; and unemployment caused by imports of crude oil; various types of glass, steel, aluminum, brass, and zinc products; pottery and chinaware; granite, tiles, cement, hardboard, plywood, hardware, plumbing, flat glass and other building supplies; lace, carpets, and all kinds of woolen, cotton, and synthetic fiber manufactured goods; leather and fabric gloves; bicycles; hydraulic turbines; machine tools and other machinery; heavy electrical equipment and other electrical industry products and electronics; watches, clocks, and parts; optical industry products; cutlery; scientific apparatus; pencils and pens; pins, clips, and fasteners; soft fiber; insulation board and manufactured cork products; chemicals; toys; mushrooms; farm, dairy and dried milk products; wallpaper; hats and millinery; printing industry products; ladies' hand bags and leather goods; nails, wire, screws, bolts and nuts, and many other commodities; will render the upholding of the economy at its high levels most uncertain and difficult unless all import trade is placed on a fair competitive basis and the potential injury therefrom thus eliminated.

"Agricultural products, such as wheat, wheat flour, cotton, butter, cheese, and peanuts enjoy the protection of import quotas.

"A maximum of satisfactory trade results from a prosperous domestic economy freed from the threat of a breakdown resulting from unfair import competition: Therefore be it.

"*Resolved* (*the house of representatives concurring*), That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize the Congress of the United States to provide adequate safeguards in tariff and trade legislation, including import quotas and an effective prohibition against dumping of imports in the United States; against the destruction or lowering of our American standard of living, the labor standard of our workmen, and the stability of our economy by unfair import competition, and that the existing trade-agreements legislation be amended accordingly; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each Senator and Representative from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States.

"I certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution introduced by Senators Paul L. Wagner, Ernest F. Walker, Arthur E. Kromer, William Z. Scott, Charles R. Mallery, J. Irving Whalley, Harold E. Flack, and John T. Van Sant, and adopted by the Senate of Pennsylvania the 19th day of March 1957, and concurred in by the House of Representatives the 27th day of March 1957.

"A. H. LETZLER,
"Secretary, Senate of Pennsylvania."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"A resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to resist the efforts of proponents of centralization of government to invade the field of education and usurp or encroach upon the right and duty of the people in the local communities to provide for and supervise the education of their children

"Whereas the matter of education of the children of this State is now, and always has been of utmost concern to our citizens, both individually and collectively, and they have never hesitated to provide funds through taxation and otherwise in sufficient amount, both locally and statewide, to meet their obligation to provide proper educational facilities; and

"Whereas the differential that existed between construction and/or staffing of education facilities and student population arose through no fault or lack of interest of the people but was caused by wartime stresses and conditions when all peacetime construction and career planning, of necessity, was deferred in order that a maximum war effort could be put forth; and

"Whereas through thoughtful planning and economical and efficient use of available financial resources this State, and the local communities therein, have at this time, for all practical purposes, achieved an equalization between school facilities and school population without sacrificing quality of school plants or personnel, and, further, the office of superintendent of public instruction of this State, in cooperation with local school authorities has instituted an education-planning program so as to provide properly for the future population growth; and

"Whereas in recent years, through the efforts of certain national groups there has developed a strong movement to have the Federal Government step into or invade the education field on the pretext that the State and local authorities are unable to cope with the school problem, whereas the real reason therefor is to remove the whole field of education from the supervision, operation and control of the people of the local communities; and

"Whereas any such movement is objectionable upon several grounds among which are:

"(a) Any Federal program must be regulated which, in turn, calls for creation, establishment and staffing of various boards and bureaus with the usual waste, inefficiency, and consequent dissipation of badly needed tax money, attendant thereon;

"(b) Apart from financial or economic consideration is the even greater danger that such movement could and, eventually, would remove from the observation and control of the people of local communities the teaching methods, philosophy, source material and like matters, thus paving the way for subtle insinuation of the teachings of subversive ideologies into school curricula, and resulting in the possible warping, twisting and poisoning of the impressionable minds of children against our democratic principles and processes; and

"Whereas since the very inception of this program of unwarranted attempted usurpation of these inalienable rights and duties of the people, the State of South Dakota has fought it militantly and unyieldingly, as a result of which the aforesaid national groups have intentionally, knowingly, and unconscionably issued reports containing absolutely false misstatements and discolorations of fact and truth concerning this State's educational facilities and program in an insidious attempt to discredit, embarrass and belittle it and its citizens before the Congress of the United States and the people of this country; and

"Whereas such action upon the part of said national groups strengthens and confirms our suspicions that the tears they shed for the educational welfare of the children of this State and Nation are, truly, 'crocodile' in nature and serve but to camouflage the ulterior socialistic motives they so poorly conceal; and

"Whereas the aforesaid distortions and untruths by said groups concerning the situation in the State of South Dakota lead but to the conclusion that statements concerning the educational facilities and programs in other States are equally erroneous and fallacious; and

"Whereas this State, and the citizens hereof, are now, always have been and always shall be unequivocally, incontrovertibly and unalterably opposed to any Federal invasion, encroachment or infringement of the fundamental right, obligation and duty of the people and their local governmental authority to provide, supervise and control the education of the children of this State or the educational processes concomitant thereon: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota,

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to reject any and all efforts to obtain the passage of legislation by the terms of which, money would be appropriated and made available to the States, through grants-in-aid or otherwise for school building or other purposes, which either indirectly or directly would infringe upon the rights, duties and obligations of local and State governments or authorities to provide, supervise and control the education of the children of this country or the accompanying educational processes.

"SEC. 2. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the following:

"1. The Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President.

"2. Marion B. Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"3. All representatives in the United States Senate and House of Representatives.

"4. The governors of all other States of these United States.

"5. The commissioner on interstate cooperation in each of the other 47 States.

"L. R. HOUCK, *President.*
"NIELS P. JENSEN, *Secretary.*"

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress to appropriate funds for the purpose of increasing the span of the Fore River Bridge in the city of Quincy

"Whereas navigation on Fore River in the city of Quincy and the town of Weymouth has increased both in the number and the size of vessels which must pass over these waters due to the shipyards and other defense and industrial plants which are located in the area; and

"Whereas the present span of the Fore River Bridge over said river is becoming inadequate to allow the free passage of shipping due to said increase in both the number and size of vessels which must pass thereunder; and

"Whereas it is important to both the national defense and the civilian economy and convenience that free and unimpeded access to the shipyards and industrial plants in said area be available for both naval and civilian ships: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives hereby requests the Congress of the United States to enact legislation and appropriate funds authorizing the widening of the span of the Fore River Bridge in the city of Quincy and the town of Weymouth; and be it further

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

"House of representatives, adopted, April 3, 1957.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk.*

"A true copy, attest:

"EDWARD J. CRONIN,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

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

"A joint resolution memorializing Congress regarding the diversion of water from the Great Lakes

"Whereas the city of Chicago and its suburbs attempted, prior to 1900, to dispose of their sewage by digging the Chicago Sanitary Canal across the Continental Divide and diverting water from Lake Michigan to discharge the sewage into the Mississippi watershed; and

"Whereas the United States Supreme Court restrained this diversion in 1930 and required the area to develop other means of sewage disposal, but since then a veritable parade of other reasons for directing water from the Great Lakes have been proposed, including the desire to reduce the salty content of the lower Mississippi by diverting water from Lake Michigan; and

"Whereas the program of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin is rapidly shaping up into a plan which will enhance the economic life of that area; and

"Whereas the persistent efforts of the advocates of diversion to make inroads into the Great Lakes water supply are disrupting and in fact nullifying any long-range plan for the development of the waterways of the Great Lakes; and

"Whereas the United States Supreme Court has provided an equitable plan for the allocation of the waters of the Great Lakes which is subject to modification whenever the advocates of diversion can provide the necessary data to cause the Court to modify its order of 1930 and 1956: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That Congress be and it hereby is petitioned to refrain from disrupting the longstanding order of the Supreme Court because—

"1. The authorization of increased diversions of waters from the Great Lakes must of necessity affect the development of lake ports and lake shipping adversely;

"2. The issue which involves engineering decisions and international considerations should be made by means of the judicial process; and

"3. The valuable resources contained in the waters of the Great Lakes ought not to be disposed of without the consent of the States abutting thereon; and be it further

"Resolved, That five copies of this resolution be submitted to the Secretary of the United States Senate, Clerk of the House of Representatives, and each Member of the Wisconsin delegation in the Congress of the United States, and to appropriate authorities in Minnesota, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, Ontario, and Quebec.

"W. P. KNOWLES,
"President of the Senate.
"LAWRENCE R. LARSEN.
"Chief Clerk of the Senate.
"ROBERT G. MAROTZ,
"Speaker of the Assembly.
"ARTHUR L. MAY,
"Chief Clerk of the Assembly."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 18

"To the President of the United States, Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, and the Delegate to Congress from Alaska:

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

"Whereas the development of the oil and gas resources of the Territory of Alaska is of vital importance to the development and economy of the Territory and to the national defense of the United States and its Territories and possessions; and

"Whereas most of the known geologic areas favorable to the development of oil and gas reserves in Alaska lie beneath or are bordered by shorelands, tide and submerged lands, and inland waters; and

"Whereas such Alaska lands are now held in trust for the future State of Alaska and under present law and the territorial status of the Territory of Alaska there is no means by which such shorelands, tidal and submerged lands, may be leased for oil and gas drilling and development; and

"Whereas representatives of the oil industry have urged that these underwater lands be made available for leasing so that the further search for oil and gas deposits, and their development, if found, can freely follow the indicated and demonstrated geology and will not be impeded by the arbitrary boundaries between dry land and underwater lands; and

"Whereas it is common knowledge that the existence and extent of oil and gas deposits cannot be positively determined except by the actual drilling of wells; and

"Whereas it is the sense of your memorialist that everything possible should be done to encourage and extend to further areas the search for and development of oil and gas deposits within the Territory and in its tidal and coastal waters; and

"Whereas the 23d session of the Alaska Legislature has passed enabling legislation establishing policies for the administration of any lands acquired by Alaska and has created a department of lands capable of such administration: Now, therefore,

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully requests and petitions Congress that Alaska be granted title to its shorelands, tide and submerged lands, and its inland waters, for administration thereunder; or in lieu thereof said lands be removed from their present status and be made available to the Department of the Interior for administration in behalf of the Territory of Alaska.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house March 5, 1957.

"RICHARD J. GREUEL,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"DOLORES D. GOAD,
"Chief Clerk of the House.

"Passed by the senate March 7, 1957.

"VICTOR C. RIVERS,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"KATHARINE T. ALEXANDER,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 19

"Whereas many veterans have been unable to take advantage of the loan provisions under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; and

"Whereas the need for Federal aid to veterans for business and home loans seems likely to continue for the next 3 years; and

"Whereas it appears that the existing tight conditions for private financing will also continue making it difficult for many veterans to obtain loans from private lending organizations: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 29th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to enact legislation to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to extend the date of expiration for the making of loans thereunder from June 30, 1958 to June 30, 1960; and be it further

"Resolved, That a certified copy of this concurrent resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; and to the Delegate to the Congress from Hawaii."

The petition of Mrs. Frederick Edwards, of Downingtown, Pa., praying for the prompt enactment of legislation to provide emergency appropriations for money to send May checks to the needy blind; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 23

"Whereas it has been proposed that the United States Fish and Wildlife Service establish a migratory waterfowl refuge and recreational area on the Missouri River in and adjacent to Harrison County, Iowa, in what is known as the Bertrand-Harrison Bend in connection with a project of bank stabilization being constructed by the United States Army Corps of Engineers; and

"Whereas such an area would greatly enhance the recreational facilities of Iowa; and

"Whereas outdoor recreation tends to lessen juvenile delinquency by providing a wholesome and healthy outlet for youthful

energy as well as fulfilling a basic need for the people of Iowa in general; and

"Whereas the United States Army Corps of Engineers has made a study of the proposal and finds that the necessary alterations in its plans can be carried out at no additional cost: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Iowa commends the Federal agencies involved for their forethought and efforts in the interests of outdoor recreation and urges their continued cooperation in advancing this project to a successful completion; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate send copies of this resolution to the United States Senators and Representatives from Iowa, the United States Senators and Representatives from Nebraska, to Brig. Gen. J. L. Person, United States Army Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works, and to Mr. Ross Leffler, Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

"SENATE CONSERVATION COMMITTEE.
"ALBERT WEISS, *Chairman.*

"We, William H. Nicholas, Lieutenant Governor of Iowa; Richard W. Berglund, secretary of the senate; W. L. Mooty, speaker of the house of representatives; and William R. Kendrick, acting chief clerk of the house of representatives, hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution was adopted by the senate and house of the 57th General Assembly of Iowa.

"RICHARD W. BERGLUND,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"WILLIAM R. KENDRICK,
"Acting Chief Clerk of the House.
"WILLIAM H. NICHOLAS,
"Lieutenant Governor of Iowa.
"W. L. MOOTY,
"Speaker of the House."

By Mr. KERR:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 15

"Resolution relating to the coal industry; requesting the Congress of the United States of America to take appropriate action to provide for a comprehensive research program on the problems of the coal industry and to develop water transportation facilities in Oklahoma to assist said industry; requesting the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Treasury to provide accelerated tax writeoffs for businesses desiring to develop and expand the coal industry and related industries; and directing that duly authenticated copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Treasury, and to all members of the Oklahoma congressional delegation

"Whereas the coal industry at the time of statehood was the second largest industry in Oklahoma; and

"Whereas Oklahoma continues to have large coal reserves; and

"Whereas the coal industry has declined in recent years, resulting in a large amount of unemployment in the coal-producing areas of Oklahoma, the largest amount of unemployment since prior to World War II; and

"Whereas the coal industry operates on a small profit margin; and

"Whereas only a limited amount of money is available from the industry for needed research in such fields as improved coal production techniques, expansion of markets, new coal products and byproducts and other related subjects; and

"Whereas lack of adequate water transportation in Oklahoma is a deterrent to expansion and promotion of the coal industry; and

"Whereas the lack of accelerated Federal tax writeoffs for the coal industry is also a deterring factor in the further expansion of the Oklahoma coal industry; and

"Whereas a subcommittee of the Congress is currently studying problems of the coal industry: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 26th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

"That the Congress of the United States of America is hereby requested to provide appropriations and to take such other appropriate action as may be necessary to provide for a comprehensive research program relating to the coal industry to provide expanded markets, new production techniques, new uses for coal, and related matters;

"That the Congress of the United States of America is also requested to provide more adequate water transportation, especially in the development of the Arkansas River Basin;

"That the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Treasury are hereby requested to provide accelerated tax writeoffs for businesses desiring to develop and expand the coal industry and related industries, particularly to alleviate present and future distressed areas of unemployment in the coal-producing areas of the country; be it further

"Resolved, That a duly authenticated copy of this resolution be transmitted to the following: 1. Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; 2. George M. Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury; 3. All members of the Oklahoma congressional delegation.

"Adopted by the senate the 21st day of March 1957.

"BOYD COWDEN,
"Acting President of the Senate.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 3d day of April 1957.

"B. E. HARKEY,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

JOINT RESOLUTION OF TENNESSEE LEGISLATURE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, Senate Joint Resolution 73 of the 1957 session of the Legislature of Tennessee relative to the development of a navigable waterway connecting the Tombigbee and Tennessee Rivers by constructing a canal in the State of Mississippi. This project is vitally important to the State of Tennessee and I urge this body to give it serious consideration.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 73

A 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 Mackey's 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.

LAND PROCUREMENT PRACTICES BY CORPS OF ARMY ENGINEERS IN TUTTLE CREEK DAM AREA, KANSAS—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution approved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas on April 3 memorializing the Congress to direct special attention to the land procurement practices of the Corps of Army Engineers in the Tuttle Creek Dam area in northeastern Kansas.

The Tuttle Creek Dam is one of the large reservoir projects in the Missouri River Basin and encompasses some 3,000 acres of land, which is not only highly productive, but is the home of some of the finest people who live in my State.

In this area they have built thriving communities which include homes, schools, churches, and business sections. They are now being forced to leave these areas as a result of a project which is being constructed as a part of a water conservation and flood control program for the protection of thousands of people below the reservoir.

It is only natural that the construction of this project creates some real problems for the citizens affected, and I urge that every effort be made on the part of the Federal agencies and the Congress itself to see that these people are not only fully compensated for their removal from this area against their own will and desires, but are given additional substantial sums of money in order that they may relocate in other areas of their choosing.

The American Legion posts of that area have adopted resolutions urging that every consideration be given these people and I ask unanimous consent that

these resolutions be made a part of this statement.

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

House Resolution 41

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States and the appropriations committees thereof, to direct special attention to the land procurement practices of the Corps of Army Engineers in the Tuttle Creek Dam area of northeastern Kansas

Whereas the Tuttle Creek Dam on the Big Blue River in northeastern Kansas is in the process of construction by the Corps of Army Engineers; and

Whereas this $90 million project encompasses 53,000 acres of land in a highly developed and productive agricultural area, resulting in the removal of 2 third class cities and 4 towns and the dislocation of nearly 600 farm homes, 19 cemeteries, scores of schools and churches, and involves relocation of parts of 2 railroads, 1 Federal highway, 6 State highways and hundreds of miles of county and township roads; and

Whereas congressional appropriations for this project, as a part of the Kansas River Basin flood-control plan were finally made after 15 years of serious questioning as to the advisability and economic feasibility of this project by presidential and State commissions and engineering studies, organizations and legislative bodies of the State of Kansas; and

Whereas violent objection to this project by the several thousand residents of the Tuttle Creek area drew congressional and nationwide attention to this project; and

Whereas the people of said Tuttle Creek area repeatedly through the years voiced their objections to this project in personal and delegation appearances before the congressional appropriations committees of both the House and Senate; and

Whereas assurances were repeatedly given to the people to be displaced by said Tuttle Creek Dam, both by these congressional committees and the personnel of the Corps of Army Engineers that, in the event of construction of this project, every effort would be made to see that the people in the affected area would not have inflicted on them undue economic hardship and loss as a result of such project and so far as possible they would be left in as favorable economic position following displacement as they were before being forced to move; and

Whereas appraisals and purchase of land and residential properties in said Tuttle Creek area are in the process of being made by the land procurement office of the Corps of Army Engineers; and

Whereas appraisement of property in the cities and towns in the Tuttle Creek area are being made on the basis of value in present location with no consideration given to replacement cost in kind in another location; and

Whereas the high percent of refusals to accept the offered price by those whose properties are appraised and the ever increasing number of condemnation actions being filed against residents of the Tuttle Creek area indicates dissatisfaction with the procedures and treatment being accorded the people of this area in matters of appraisals: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, That we respectively urge, request, and petition the Congress of the United States to make such inquiry into the land procurement procedures of the Corps of Engineers, issue such directives and take such action as may be necessary to insure the fulfillment of the intent of the congressional appropriations committees as expressed to the people of the Tuttle Creek area and as assured these people by the Corps of Army Engineers; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house of representatives be directed to send a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, each Member of the Congress of the United States, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget of the United States, and to the Chief of the United States Corps of Army Engineers.

I hereby certify that the above resolution originated in the house, and was adopted by that body April 3, 1957.

JESS TAYLOR,
Speaker of the House.
A. E. ANDERSON,
Chief Clerk of the House.

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the house of representatives identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.)

Whereas the construction of Tuttle Creek Dam on the Big Blue River is proceeding on schedule and the Army engineers are accelerating their program of land acquisition in the reservoir area, which includes some 55,000 acres and several towns and villages; and

Whereas many of the homes in this area are owned by veterans and veterans' widows who will be forced to relocate; and

Whereas many of the appraisals on these homes appear to be unreasonably low and take no consideration of replacement values, thereby working a distinct injustice on said veterans and widows of veterans; and

Whereas many inconsistencies have developed in prices offered by the Army engineers for properties of like value and in appraisals made by different personnel; and

Whereas appraisals made by competent disinterested appraisers have shown that appraisals made by the Army engineers are running from $550 to $9,300 lower than the true value of said homes: Therefore be it

Resolved by Cleburne American Legion, Post No. 390, George Bedford Post No. 169, Blue Rapids, and Drumm-Frank Post No. 219, Irving, of the Kansas Department of the American Legion, That we respectfully urge, request, and petition the Corps of Army Engineers, the Members of Congress who represent this affected area, and the Kansas department and the national headquarters of the American Legion that they take whatever action is necessary and do everything possible to the end that fair and reasonable prices be paid for the homes of veterans and others who live in these small communities in the Tuttle Creek area and are being forced to give up their homes.

Adopted by Cleburne American Legion Post No. 390 February 13, 1957.

DONALD VATHAUER,
Commander.
ROBERT HOLT, *Adjutant.*

Adopted by Drumm-Frank Post No. 219, Irving, February 20, 1957.

WILLIAM LAMB,
Commander.
MAURICE BOYD,
Adjutant.

Adopted by George W. Wood Post No. 91, Washington, Kans., March 26, 1957.

IVAN WARDER.
EDWIN G. BRYCHTA.
DONALD VATHAUER.
ROBERT HOLT.
WILLIAM LAMB.
MAURICE BOYD.

Adopted by George Bedford Post No. 169, Blue Rapids, February 18, 1957.

IVAN WARDERS,
Commander.
EDWIN BRYCHTA,
Adjutant.

Adopted by S. M. N. & R. (Marysville) Post No. 163 on March 20, 1957.

———— ————,
Commander.
———— ————,
Adjutant.

Adopted by Levick-Barrett Post No. 282, Wetmore, Kans., March 19, 1957.

Adopted by Davis-Gibson Post No. 387, Winchester, Kans., March 9, 1957.

Adopted by Palmer Post No. 383, Palmer, Kans., March 12, 1957.

Adopted by Summerfield Post No. 362, Summerfield, Kans., March 12, 1957.

Adopted by Brown-Woodward Post No. 391, Richland, Kans., March 14, 1957.

PROPOSED SELF-HELP MEAT PROMOTION PROGRAM—LETTERS AND RESOLUTION

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Missouri Livestock Association transmitting a copy of a resolution adopted by its board of directors relative to S. 646, which proposes a self-help meat promotion program. I would also like to include a letter I have received on this subject from C. W. Sheppard, president of the Missouri Livestock Association. I believe the views of this representative group of livestock producers should be given careful consideration by the Senate.

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

MISSOURI LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION,
Columbia, Mo., February 23, 1957.

The Honorable THOMAS C. HENNINGS,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: There is before the Senate a bill, S. 646, that has to do with amending the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921 by inserting a new section to be designated as section 318.

Attached you will find a copy of the resolution adopted by the directors of the Missouri Livestock Association relative to this amendment.

This resolution was read and discussed in eight district meetings held in the State in January and February of this year. Missouri livestock producers attending these meetings voted their approval of the board's action.

We will appreciate hearing from you as to your views on this bill.

Very truly yours,

E. S. MATTESON,
Secretary-Treasurer, Missouri Livestock Association.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE MISSOURI LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION

The board of directors of the Missouri Livestock Association has given careful consideration to the proposal that Federal legislation be enacted requiring that all marketing agencies deduct stated amounts from proceeds on all livestock sold, such money to be used in the creation of a fund to be used in the promotion and advertising of meat and meat products and in research having to do with the production and marketing of meat and meat products.

The board of directors is highly in favor of any practical method or program which will be effective in increasing the consumption of meat and in encouraging research in the production and marketing of meat and meat products provided such methods will not duplicate present ones or detract from promotional and advertising programs now being carried out. However, the board is doubtful about the advisability of the enactment of the proposed legislation at this time for the following reasons:

(1) We are reluctant to ask the Government for further Federal legislation if the objectives desired can be attained in any other manner.

(2) We do not feel that effective and efficient methods of spending the additional funds to be raised by the proposed check-off have been sufficiently well developed to avoid duplication of effort and waste of money.

(3) We are concerned about the possibility of encouraging competition between the different segments of the livestock industry. It would be unfortunate, indeed, if any program is launched which would result in pitting against each other the cattle producer, the hog producer, and the sheep and lamb producer in the market places. This situation is highly undesirable for many obvious reasons.

(4) The National Live Stock and Meat Board is now doing a splendid job on an effective and economical basis. We feel that the possibility of expanding the funds and program of this board should be studied thoroughly before resort is had to Federal legislation and the creating of another agency to do a job now being done by the National Live Stock and Meat Board and by many other agencies in the livestock and meat industry, i. e., packers, retailers, etc.

(5) We need further information about the possibilities of actually increasing meat consumption by the expenditure of enormous funds in doubling or trebling the advertising campaign.

(6) We are convinced that much more can and should be done in the field of research and marketing and in the improvement of the types of hogs, cattle, and sheep which will better meet consumer demands. We have serious doubts that by merely expanding our advertising campaign we can best meet the marketing problems confronting livestock producers.

For these reasons we feel that final action on the proposed Federal legislation should be deferred pending more careful study of the entire program in general and the accumulation of more information about practical means of collecting the proposed check-off and the use of funds to be derived from that source.

MISSOURI LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION,
Warrensburg, Mo., March 27, 1957.

Hon. THOMAS C. HENNINGS,
United States Senator from Missouri,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have received a copy of your letter to Mr. E. S. Matteson, secretary of the Missouri Livestock Association, in response to his letter to you setting forth the position of our association with respect to the proposed nationwide check-off program for livestock.

I want to thank you for your letter and for your request to have the contents of the letter entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Our board of directors made careful study of this proposed program, and while we are in agreement upon the objectives of the program, we cannot go along with the suggested plans for meeting those objectives.

Our members at our last annual meeting requested the board to make this study and report our conclusions. We reported to the members at a series of district meetings held last spring covering the entire State. The members at all eight meetings agreed with the board of directors that we should not support this legislation. They recommended that more money be given to the National Livestock and Meat Board.

The National Cattle and Swine Councils seem to be carried away with the possibilities of this national producer meat promotion agency. Our board members think it would be nearly impossible to coordinate the promotional activities of the proposed national agency, and as the law provides, not more than three State agencies in each State. That would be a lot of organizations and jobs for somebody.

We question the wisdom of setting up a new and inexperienced promotional setup, when we have now in operation an experienced, efficient, and economical agency on the job in the capacity of the National Livestock and Meat Board. This board gets a tremendous amount of free publicity by having the various news agencies run their educational material. If the producer agency is authorized by Congress and they begin buying publicity, we stand a chance of losing this free publicity.

Farmers are a bit touchy about any sort of deductions. They would be very unhappy if any money deducted from their sales of livestock went to pay fat salaries for any top-heavy administrative agency.

The members of the Missouri Livestock Association will greatly appreciate your cooperation in supporting our views with respect to Senate bill 646.

Sincerely,

C. W. SHEPPARD,
President, Missouri Livestock Association.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

S. 147. A bill for the relief of Guido William Grambergs (Rept. No. 236);

S. 239. A bill for the relief of Maria Parisi (Rept. No. 237);

S. 256. A bill for the relief of Aristea Vitogianes (Rept. No. 238);

S. 470. A bill for the relief of Livio Senni (Rept. No. 239);

S. 616. A bill for the relief of Blanca G. Hidalgo (Rept. No. 240);

S. 629. A bill for the relief of John Eicherl (Rept. No. 242);

S. 650. A bill for the relief of Isabella Abrahams (Rept. No. 243); and

S. 710. A bill for the relief of Sui-an Fung and Shu-nung Wu Fung (Rept. No. 244).

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

S. 308. A bill for the relief of Maria Caccomo (Rept. No. 245);

S. 622. A bill for the relief of Georgina Mercedes Llera (Rept. No. 241);

S. 623. A bill for the relief of Donini Maurizio Donato (Rept. No. 246); and

S. 641. A bill for the relief of Elvira A. Belford (Rept. No. 247).

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

S. 776. A bill for the relief of Shigeko Kimura (Rept. No. 248):

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution to designate the third Friday of May of each year as National Defense Transportation Day (Rept. No. 235).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 1886. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point Harkjoon Paik, a citizen and subject of the Republic of Korea; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 1887. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 1888. A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, to provide a certain number of visas for persons of ethnic Armenian origin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 1889. A bill to provide in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for a loan service of captioned films for the deaf; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 1890. A bill to establish a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1891. A bill for the relief of Piet W. Van Aalst; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1892. A bill for the relief of Cacilie Emilie Eichmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. LANGER):

S. 1893. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Finnell (nee Pitsch); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEUBERGER (by request):

S. 1894. A bill to amend the law with respect to the recoupment of funds expended in cooperation with the school board of Klamath County, Oreg., because of the attendance of Indian children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

S. 1895. 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 Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 1896. A bill for the relief of Maria West; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 1897. A bill to provide the United States with a gold standard and redeemable currency, and to correct other defects in the monetary system of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1898. A bill to amend section 203 of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1899. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by establishing quantitative restrictions on the importation of iron and steel wood screws; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 1900. A bill to regulate the interstate distribution and sale of hazardous articles in packages suitable for or intended for

household use; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. GORE:

S. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the proposed United States Veterans' Administration Hospital at Nashville, Tenn., as the J. Percy Priest Veterans' Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR STUDY OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. KEFAUVER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 126), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 173, agreed to on March 20, 1956, as amended, be amended by striking out in section 4, lines 21 and 22, "Expenses of the committee, under this resolution which shall not exceed $80,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Expenses of the committee, under this resolution which shall not exceed $82,500."

AMENDMENT OF REFUGEE RELIEF ACT, RELATING TO NUMBER OF VISAS FOR PERSONS OF ETHNIC ARMENIAN ORIGIN

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, to provide 20,000 visas for persons of ethnic Armenian origin. The bill which I am today introducing is very similar to S. 2248 of the first session of the 84th Congress. Hearings were held on this bill in January of last year, and much favorable testimony was developed, although, because of the press of other business, no final action was taken on the bill.

There are many people of Armenian extraction living in our country. They have made many splendid contributions to our Nation and to our culture. To permit them now to be reunited with their families abroad, who have heretofore been denied admission into the United States, would be truly consistent with the provisions of the Refugee Relief Act. As was stated last year in the committee hearings, such an amendment as this would rectify a previous omission in the immigration laws which has prevented these very deserving people from seeking refuge in this great land of ours.

To admit the 20,000 refugees of Armenian origin as provided by the amendment to the act which I am introducing would signal unmistakably to the remainder of the world that our Nation will not forget persecuted peoples wherever they may be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1888) to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, to provide a certain number of visas for persons of ethnic Armenian origin, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LOAN SERVICE OF CAPTIONED FILMS FOR THE DEAF

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a loan service of captioned films for the deaf and the severely hard-of-hearing.

This measure, if enacted, will bring to approximately 200,000 deaf persons and to about 400,000 severely hard-of-hearing persons better understanding and appreciation of those films which play such an important part in the general and cultural advancement of hearing persons.

Through the more than 1,000 organizations of and for the deaf and the severely hard-of-hearing in 429 communities in 46 States and the District of Columbia, this bill will provide enriched educational and cultural experiences through which these people can be brought into better touch with the realities of their environment. It will also provide a wholesome and rewarding experience which these people may share together.

Under the program established by the bill, State schools for the deaf and other agencies in this field, to be designated by the Secretary, will serve as local or regional receiving and distribution centers for the films. All films made available under the program will be for nonprofit purposes in accordance with regulations to be promulgated by the Secretary of the Department.

In carrying out the provisions of the proposed act, the Secretary shall have the authority to acquire films, or rights thereto, by purchase, lease, or gift. The Secretary will further provide for the captioning of films and for their distribution.

The Secretary will also make use, consistent with the purposes of the bill, of films made available to the Library of Congress under the copyright laws, and will also utilize the facilities of other governmental agencies.

Mr. President, this proposed legislation will also establish in the Department an Advisory Council on Captioned Films consisting of 12 members to be appointed by the Secretary. At least 3 of the members shall be deaf persons and 3 more shall be representatives of the general public. The membership shall also include persons selected from the leading organizations of the deaf or those groups working with the deaf, including professional workers. The Secretary, or a member of the Department so designated by him, shall act as Chairman of the Council.

It shall be the duty of the Council to advise the Secretary on the establishment of broad criteria for the selection of films to be captioned, and to recommend films which it believes would make the greatest contribution to the general, cultural, or recreational advancement of deaf or severely hard-of-hearing persons.

The bill also provides for compensation for the members of the Council while engaged in its work, and provides traveling or other necessary expenses incurred while so engaged. The bill also authorizes sums necessary to carry out its provisions to be appropriated.

Mr. President, in introducing this measure, which is similar in intent, but differs in operational process, a measure I proposed last year, and in which I was joined by 40 Members of this body as cosponsors, I would like to make this final observation.

In years past, films were one of the great sources of information and recreation for the deaf and severely hard of hearing. The advent of sound film deprived these people of this valuable resource and, up until now, they have had nothing satisfactory to take its place.

It is also true that the great number of educational and technical films now in existence are of little use to the deaf, particularly to the deaf child, because nearly all of these films are carried by narration. I want to particularly stress the opportunities for increased educational benefits inherent in the program proposed.

This program would provide great advantages, not only from the educational and informative subject matter of the films themselves, but in recreational therapy and in the opportunity for great increase in general understanding. Our deaf and hard of hearing are deprived of the many advantages available to hearing persons through radio, television, and motion pictures. This program would compensate in considerable measure for this lack. It will also provide opportunities to which I believe these afflicted persons are entitled.

A pilot program of this sort has been pioneered by Captioned Films for the Deaf, Inc., and the enthusiastic reception and demonstrated value of these films circulated among schools for the deaf is impressive evidence of the worth of this proposal.

My visits to the American School for the Deaf in my own home community of West Hartford, Conn., and my continuing research and investigation in this matter have convinced me of the necessity of this project in behalf of the young and old deaf and severely hard of hearing.

I believe it is proper and fitting to undertake such a program of incalculable educational and other benefits to provide for these handicapped citizens.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1889) to provide in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for a loan service of captioned films for the deaf, introduced by Mr. PURTELL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PROPOSED COMMISSION AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RULES OF JUDICIAL PROCEDURE

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanation I have prepared concerning the measure, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill

and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1890) to establish a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, introduced by Mr. WATKINS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RULES OF JUDICIAL PROCEDURE

SEC. 1. There is hereby established a Commission to be known as the Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, hereinafter referred to as the "Commission."

PURPOSE OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 2. The Commission shall investigate and study existing practices of judicial assistance and cooperation between the United States and foreign countries with a view to achieving improvements. To the end that procedures necessary or incidental to the conduct and settlement of litigation in State and Federal courts and quasi-judicial agencies which involve the performance of acts in foreign territory, such as the service of judicial documents, the obtaining of evidence, and the proof of foreign law, may be more readily ascertainable, efficient, economical, and expeditious, and that the procedures of our State and Federal tribunals for the rendering of assistance to foreign courts and quasi-judicial agencies be similarly improved, the Commission shall—

(a) draft for the assistance of the Secretary of State international agreements to be negotiated by him;

(b) draft and recommend to the President any necessary legislation;

(c) recommend to the President such other action as may appear advisable to improve and codify international practice in civil, criminal, and administrative proceedings; and

(d) perform such other related duties as the President may assign.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall consist of 7 members. The President shall appoint 3 public members, the Secretary of State shall appoint 2 representatives of the Department of State, and the Attorney General shall appoint 2 representatives of the Department of Justice. The Commission shall elect a chairman from among its members.

(b) Vacancies in membership of the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of original designation.

(c) Five members shall constitute a quorum.

(d) Members of the Commission who are appointed by the Secretary of State and the Attorney General shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the Government.

(e) The public members of the Commission shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel subsistence, and other expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

(f) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission shall not be considered to be service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

THE DIRECTOR AND STAFF

SEC. 4. (a) The Director of the Commission shall be appointed by the Commission without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, and his compensation shall be fixed by the Commission without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The Director shall serve as the Commission's reporter, and, subject to the direction of the Commission, shall supervise the activities of persons employed under the Commission, the preparation of reports, and shall perform other duties assigned him within the scope of the functions of the Commission.

(c) Within the limit of funds appropriated for such purpose, individuals may be employed by the Commission for service with the Commission staff without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, and services may be procured as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946, as amended (5 U. S. C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not in excess of $50 per diem.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby established a committee of 15 members to be known as the Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure (hereinafter referred to as the "Advisory Committee"), to advise and consult with the Commission. The Advisory Committee shall be appointed by the Commission from among lawyers, judges, and other persons competent to provide advice for the Commission.

(b) Members of the Advisory Committee shall not be deemed to be officers or employees of the United States by virtue of such service and shall receive no compensation. Members of the Advisory Committee who are not otherwise officers or employees of the United States shall be entitled to travel and subsistence expenses as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (5 U. S. C. 73b–2), for persons serving without compensation, in accordance with the provisions of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended (5 U. S. C. 835–842).

GOVERNMENT AGENCY COOPERATION

SEC. 6. The Commission is authorized to request from any department, agency, or independent instrumentality of the Government any information it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this act; and each such department, agency, and instrumentality is authorized to cooperate with the Commission and, to the extent permitted by law, to furnish such information to the Commission, upon request made by the chairman or other member designated to act as chairman.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 7. (a) For administrative purposes only, the Commission and the Advisory Committee shall be attached to the Department of Justice.

(b) The Commission shall render to the President annual reports for transmission to the Congress.

The Commission shall submit its final report and the Commission and the Advisory Committee shall terminate and wind up their affairs prior to December 31, 1959.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The explanation presented by Mr. WATKINS is as follows:

EXPLANATION

The purpose of the attached bill for the establishment of a Commission and an Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure is to create an agency to study existing practice of international judicial assistance and to make such recommendations as are considered desirable for the improvement of international practice and procedure in civil, criminal, admiralty, and quasi-judicial matters.

The end of hostilities in 1945 brought to our Federal and State courts an unprecedented flood of litigation with international ramifications—cases in which judicial documents must be served abroad, records or witnesses examined within the territory of a foreign state, or in which proof must be offered of the law prevailing in a foreign jurisdiction. These cases pose problems of procedure which are often baffling and sometimes insoluble. They emphasize the need in the international field of the same expert study and codification which have brought about historical reforms of Federal procedure over the last few years. The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure became effective in 1938. The Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure became law in 1945, and the Administrative Procedure Act became law in 1946. It is appropriate that the benefit of simplified and codified procedure should now be extended to our international practice.

Except for some consular treaties which permit the taking of depositions abroad of American citizens in certain categories of cases, extraterritorial procedure now depends largely upon usage and custom. It is difficult for the practicing lawyer to ascertain what steps should and can be taken in a given instance. The provisions of the Federal Rules of Civil and Criminal Procedure and of the State practice acts for the taking of evidence abroad are often frustrated by prohibitions and limitations put upon the use of such procedures by foreign governments. For reasons which are not entirely understood by the American bar, many countries either forbid entirely or limit the taking of depositions within their territories. Even where our practice with respect to the taking of depositions is permitted or tolerated, there is no provision in civil-law jurisdictions for obtaining the testimony of an unwilling witness.

When witnesses refuse to testify, or if they are found in a country where our practice with respect to the taking of depositions is forbidden, recourse must be had to letters rogatory. Borrowed from the civil law, a letter rogatory is, in our practice, a request by a domestic court to a court of a foreign country to take evidence. It is executed according to the law of, and in the language of, the foreign country. Procedure in civil-law jurisdictions is so different from ours that American lawyers avoid using letters rogatory wherever possible. As now issued, transmitted and executed, they are inefficient, time consuming, and costly. Moreover, the courts of some countries, such as the Netherlands and Germany, are unable to issue compulsory process even to aid in the execution of a letter rogatory issuing from an American court because the United States has not entered into procedural treaties or other arrangements with their governments. Courts of limited and specialized jurisdiction and administrative tribunals which cannot promise reciprocity, a time-honored condition of letters rogatory, are without certain means of obtaining testimony abroad from unwilling witnesses found in civil-law countries.

It appears that the provisions of the Federal Judicial Code and of the practice acts of the States for the personal service of judicial documents abroad cannot be utilized in many countries. Inability to serve judicial documents and to take depositions abroad may seriously impede the prosecution of crimes against our internal security. More than in the case of ordinary crime, prosecutions for security violations may require the service of documents and the procuring of evidence abroad. Prosecutions could be impeded or frustrated by any of the following:

1. Lack of agreements with foreign countries for service, under sections 1783 and 1784 of the Judicial Code, of subpenas and orders

to show cause upon witnesses found in their territory.

2. Prohibitions by certain foreign countries of interviews with or interrogations of prospective witnesses.

3. Prohibitions and limitations by many countries on the taking of depositions under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 15.

4. Lack of means in all civil-law countries to compel unwilling witnesses to testify in deposition proceedings and in some civil-law countries to compel unwilling witnesses to testify in the execution of letters rogatory from American courts.

5. Difficulty or impossibility of proving foreign public records under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 27 and section 1741 of the Judicial Code.

6. Difficulty or impossibility of proving foreign records under sections 3491–3494 of the Criminal Code.

Foreign courts are said to find equally unsatisfactory the judicial assistance which American courts render them. Neither the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure nor the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure contains any provision relating to assistance to foreign courts. Section 1782 of the Federal Judicial Code relating to the taking of depositions to be used in foreign judicial proceedings is ill-adapted to the execution of letters rogatory from courts of the civil-law countries. Neither State nor Federal practice makes any adequate provision for the service of judicial documents on behalf of foreign courts.

Practice can be simplified, expedited, and rendered more certain and less expensive by treaty or other arrangement. Much of Latin-America and Europe is covered by a network of procedural treaties. Great Britain has entered into a number of such agreements. This demonstrates that the common-law and the civil-law systems can be coordinated procedurally. An excellent start in drafting has already been made by the Harvard Research in International Law which in 1939 published a Draft Convention on Judicial Assistance. The Inter-American Juridical Committee of the Organization of American States in September 1952 rendered a report on judicial assistance in civil matters. Considerable improvement in practice can probably be effected by informal agreement, or the development of greater uniformity of law in the various countries.

Responsibility for reform must be assumed by the Federal Government because there is little or nothing the individual States can do to improve their international juridical relations.

Reform of international procedure has been urged by many interested organizations. In 1950, the American Bar Association recommended the establishment of a governmental agency for that purpose. Again, in 1953, the association adopted a resolution favoring the establishment of a commission and advisory committee to draft international rules of practice. Joining the American Bar Association with resolutions urging reform of international practice are the American Society of International Law, the American Foreign Law Association, the Consular Law Society, the Maritime Law Association, the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, and the Pennsylvania State Bar Association. In the international field, the International Bar Association and the Inter-American Bar Association have recommended the negotiation of procedural treaties.

The proposed legislation would combine the techniques of democratic draftsmanship by the joint effort of the bench, bar, and law faculties that proved successful in recent Federal procedural reforms, with certain of the techniques of interdepartmental cooperation utilized in the drafting of treaties for the alleviation of international double taxation.

Effective and uniform reform of international procedures can be brought about only by general international agreement. Any such agreement would set up rules of practice which, in litigation in the Federal courts, would supplement the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. The organization contemplated by the proposed legislation has therefore been modeled upon the two Supreme Court advisory committees, which, in turn, were established upon the precedent of the American Law Institute.

The requested legislation will not of itself effect any particular reform or change of procedure; it will merely create an agency for the study of existing problems of international judicial assistance. The proposed commission and advisory committee will be authorized to explore, report upon, and make recommendations for the improvement of all aspects of international judicial or quasi-judicial practice and procedure. The commission will itself determine, within broad limits of the subject of judicial assistance, the precise scope and content of its program; and its recommendations, accompanied by draft treaties or other proposed procedures, model conventions, or draft statutes, will be forwarded to the President for appropriate action.

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], I introduce, for appropriate reference, 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. I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table until the close of business on Thursday next, in order that other Senators, if they so desire, may have the opportunity to become cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the table, as requested by the Senator from Alabama.

The bill (S. 1895) 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, introduced by Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

QUANTITATIVE RESTRICTIONS ON IMPORTATION OF IRON AND STEEL WOOD SCREWS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by establishing quantitative restrictions on the importation of iron and steel wood screws.

I should like to observe that the heavy importations of iron and steel wood screws have reached such a point that the American industry is jeopardized and action is called for. The bill I am introducing deals with this matter, and proposes a quota for our own industry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1899) to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by establishing quantitative restrictions on the importation of iron and steel wood screws, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

REGULATIONS OF INTERSTATE DISTRIBUTION AND SALE OF CERTAIN HAZARDOUS ARTICLES

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to regulate the interstate distribution and sale of hazardous articles in packages suitable for or intended for household use.

There is increasing concern on the part of the public, members of the medical profession and responsible manufacturers because of the many substances in household use which are potentially hazardous to life and health. There have been distressing cases of death or injury of young children resulting from misuse of such products.

The proposed Federal Hazardous Articles Act is intended to protect the public by requiring manufacturers to label such articles so as to clearly identify the hazard and the precautionary measures which should be taken to protect life and health. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1900) to regulate the interstate distribution and sale of hazardous articles in packages suitable for or intended for household use, introduced by Mr. BUSH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

CHAPTER I—SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "Federal Hazardous Articles Act."

CHAPTER II—DEFINITIONS

SEC. 201. For the purposes of this act—

(a) The term "Territory" means any Territory or possession of the United States, including the District of Columbia and excluding the Canal Zone.

(b) The term "interstate commerce" means (1) commerce between any State or Territory and any place outside thereof, and (2) commerce within the District of Columbia or within any other Territory not organized with a legislative body.

(c) The term "Department" means the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(d) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(e) The term "person" includes individual, partnership, corporation, and association.

(f) The term "hazardous article" means any article or mixture of articles which is (i) toxic, (ii) corrosive, (iii) an irritant, (iv) flammable, (v) radioactive, or which (vi) generates pressure through decomposition, heat or other means, and which, when used and handled in any customary manner

or in a manner reasonably to be anticipated, is likely to cause substantial bodily injury or illness to man.

(g) The term "toxic" shall apply to any article which has the inherent capacity to produce bodily injury to man through ingestion, inhalation or absorption through the skin.

(h) The term "poison" means any toxic article which falls within any of the following categories: (i) produces death within 48 hours in half or more than half of a group of 10 or more laboratory white rats weighing between 200 and 300 grams, at a single dose of 50 milligrams or less per kilogram of body weight, when orally administered; or (ii) produces death within 48 hours in half or more than half of a group of 10 or more laboratory white rats weighing between 200 and 300 grams, when inhaled continuously for a period of 1 hour or less at an atmospheric concentration of 2 milligrams or less per liter of gas, vapor, mist or dust, if such concentration is likely to be encountered by man when the article is used in any reasonably foreseeable manner; or (iii) produces death within 48 hours in half or more than half of a group of 10 or more rabbits tested in a dosage of 200 milligrams or less per kilogram of body weight, when administered by continuous contact with the bare skin for 24 hours or less.

If available data on human experience with any article in the above-named dosages or concentrations indicate results different from those obtained on animals, the human data shall take precedence.

(i) The term "corrosive" is limited to any article which, when placed in contact with living tissues, will cause significant destruction of tissue by chemical action.

(j) The term "irritant" means any article which is not corrosive within the meaning of subsection (i) of this section, but which, when placed in contact with normal living tissue, will induce a severe local tissue reaction.

(k) The term "flammable" means, in the case of any article other than the contents of self-pressurized containers, an article which has a flashpoint of 80° or less, as determined by the Tagliabue open cup tester, and, in the case of the contents of self-pressurized containers, any article determined by the Secretary, after investigations, to be flammable and is so designated in regulations issued by him.

(l) The term "radioactive" means any article which, as a result of disintegration of unstable atomic nuclei, emits energy.

(m) The term "label" means a display of written, printed, or graphic matter upon the immediate container of any article; and a requirement made by or under authority of this act that any word, statement, or other information appear on the label shall not be considered to be complied with unless such word, statement, or other information also appears on the outside container or wrapper, if any there be, of the retail package of such article, or is easily legible through the outside container or wrapper.

(n) The term "immediate container" does not include package liners.

(o) (1) Except as is otherwise provided by paragraph (2), the term "misbranded package" means any retail package of a hazardous article, intended or suitable for household use, which fails to bear a label (A) which conspicuously displays (i) the name and place of business of the manufacturer, packer, or distributor, (ii) the common or usual name, or the chemical name (if there be no common or usual name), or the recognized generic name (not trade name only) of the hazardous article or of each component which contributes substantially to the hazardous quality thereof, (iii) a single word such as "danger," "warning," or "caution," (iv) when necessary for the protection of the life or health of man, an affirmative statement of the principal hazard or hazards of the article, such as "flammable," "vapor harmful," "causes burns," "absorbed through skin," or similar words descriptive of the hazard or hazards involved, (v) precautionary measures describing the action to be followed or avoided in order to protect the life and health of man, (vi) in case of an article which is hazardous through contact or exposure, such instructions for first-aid treatment as may be necessary for the protection of the life or health of man, (vii) the word "poison" in the case of any article which is defined as poisonous by subsection (h) of section 201 of this act, (viii) instructions for handling and storage of such article, if special care in handling or storage thereof is necessary for the protection of the life or health of man, and (ix) the statement "keep out of reach of children," or its practical equivalent, if the hazardous article is packed in a container holding not more than one United States gallon of a liquid, or not more than 10 pounds of a solid, and if the hazardous article is intended for other than laboratory or industrial use; and (2) on which there appears with such conspicuousness (as compared with other words, statements, designs, or devices, in the label) and in such terms as to render likely to be read and understood by the ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase and use all words, statements, and information required to appear thereon by subparagraph (A).

(2) (A) If the Secretary finds that, because of the size of the package involved or because of the minor hazard presented by the article contained therein, full compliance with the labeling requirements contained in paragraph (1) would constitute an unreasonable burden upon the manufacturer, packer, or retailer of any hazardous article, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations exempting such articles from such requirements to such extent as he determines to be consistent with adequate protection of life or health of the public.

(B) The provisions of paragraph (1) shall not apply to packages of articles which are subject to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, to packages of economic poisons which are subject to the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, or to packages of substances intended for use in agricultural, horticultural, or related operations.

CHAPTER III—PROHIBITED ACTS AND PENALTIES

Prohibited acts

SEC. 301. The following acts and the causing thereof are hereby prohibited:

(a) The introduction or delivery for introduction into interstate commerce of any misbranded package of a hazardous article.

(b) The alteration, multilation, destruction, obliteration, or removal of the whole or any part of the label of, or the doing of any other act with respect to a hazardous article, if such act is done while the article is in interstate commerce or while the article is held for sale (whether or not the first sale) after shipment in interstate commerce and which results in the hazardous article being in a misbranded package.

(c) The manufacture within any Territory of any misbranded package of a hazardous article.

(d) The receipt in interstate commerce of any misbranded package of a hazardous article and the delivery or proffered delivery thereof for pay or otherwise.

(e) The giving of a guaranty or undertaking referred to in section 302 (b) (2) which guaranty or undertaking is false, except by a person who relied upon a guaranty or undertaking to the same effect signed by, and containing the name and address of, the person residing in the United States from whom he received in good faith the article.

(f) The refusal to permit entry or inspection as authorized by section 402 (b).

Penalties

SEC. 302. (a) Any person who violates any of the provisions of section 301 shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall on conviction thereof be subject to a fine of not more than $500, but if the violation results from willful disregard of the provisions of this act, the penalty shall be imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or a fine of not more than $3,000, or both such imprisonment and fine.

(b) No person shall be subject to the penalties of subsection (a) of this section, (1) for having violated section 301 (d) of this act, if delivery or proffered delivery of the hazardous article was made in good faith, unless he refuses to furnish, on request of an officer or employee duly designated by the Secretary, the name and address of the person from whom he purchased or received such article, and copies of all documents, if any there be, pertaining to the delivery of the article to him; or (2) for having violated section 301 (a), if he establishes a guaranty or undertaking signed by, and containing the name and address of, the person residing in the United States from whom he received in good faith the article, to the effect that the article is not in misbranded packages within the meaning of that term in this act; or (3) for having violated section 301 (a) in respect of any article shipped or delivered for shipment for export to any foreign country, in a package marked for export and branded in accordance with the specifications of the foreign purchaser and in accordance with the laws of the foreign country.

Seizure

SEC. 303. (a) Any hazardous article that is in a misbranded package when introduced into or while in interstate commerce or while held for sale (whether or not the first sale) after shipment in interstate commerce, shall be liable to be proceeded against while in interstate commerce, or at any time thereafter, on libel of information and condemned in any District Court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which the article is found: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to an article intended for export to any foreign country if it (1) is in a package branded in accordance with the specifications of the foreign purchases; (2) is in accordance with the laws of the foreign country, and (3) is labeled on the outside of the shipping package to show that it is intended for export.

(b) The article shall be liable to seizure by process pursuant to the libel, and the procedure in cases under this section shall conform, as nearly as may be, to the procedure in admiralty; except that on demand of either party any issue of fact joined in any such case shall be tried by jury. When libel for condemnation proceedings under this section, involving the same claimant and the same issues of misbranding, are pending in two or more jurisdictions, such pending proceedings, upon application of the claimant seasonably made to the court of one such jurisdiction, shall be consolidated for trial by order of such court, and tried in (1) any district selected by the claimant where one of such proceedings is pending; or (2) a district agreed upon by stipulation between the parties. If no order for consolidation is so made within a reasonable time, the claimant may apply to the court of one such jurisdiction, and such court (after giving the United States attorney for such district reasonable notice and opportunity to be heard) shall by order, unless good cause to the contrary is shown, specify a district of reasonable proximity to the claimant's principal place of business, in which all such pending proceedings shall be consolidated for trial and tried. Such order of consolidation shall not apply so as to require the removal of any case the date for trial of which has been fixed. The court

granting such order shall give prompt notification thereof to the other courts having jurisdiction of the cases covered thereby.

(c) Any article condemned under this section shall, after entry of the decree, be disposed of by destruction or sale as the court may, in accordance with the provisions of this section, direct and the proceeds thereof, if sold, less the legal costs and charges, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States; but such article shall not be sold under such decree contrary to the provisions of this act or the laws of the jurisdiction in which sold: *Provided*, That after entry of the decree and upon the payment of the costs of such proceedings and the execution of a good and sufficient bond conditioned that such article shall not be sold or disposed of contrary to the provisions of this act or the laws of any State or Territory in which sold, the court may by order direct that such article be delivered to the owner thereof to be destroyed or brought into compliance with the provisions of this act under the supervision of an officer or employee duly designated by the Secretary, and the expenses of such supervision shall be paid by the person obtaining release of the article under bond.

(d) When a decree of condemnation is entered against the article, court costs and fees, and storage and other proper expenses, shall be awarded against the person, if any, intervening as claimant of the article.

(e) In the case of removal for trial of any case as provided by subsection (b)—

(1) The clerk of the court from which removal is made shall promptly transmit to the court in which the case is to be tried all records in the case necessary in order that such court may exercise jurisdiction.

(2) The court to which such case was removed shall have the powers and be subject to the duties, for purposes of such case, which the court from which removal was made would have had, or to which such court would have been subject, if such case had not been removed.

Hearing before report of criminal violation

SEC. 304. Before any violation of this act is reported by the Secretary to any United States attorney for institution of a criminal proceeding, the person against whom such proceeding is contemplated shall be given appropriate notice and an opportunity to present his views, either orally or in writing, with regard to such contemplated proceeding.

CHAPTER IV—GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Regulations and hearings

SEC. 401. (a) The authority to promulgate regulations for the efficient enforcement of this act, except as otherwise provided in this section, is hereby vested in the Secretary.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall jointly prescribe regulations for the efficient enforcement of the provisions of section 501, except as otherwise provided therein. Such regulations shall be promulgated in such manner and take effect at such time, after due notice, as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall determine.

Examinations and investigations

SEC. 402. (a) The Secretary is authorized to conduct examinations, inspections, and investigations for the purposes of this act through officers and employees of the Department or through any health officer or employee of any State, Territory, or political subdivision thereof, duly commissioned by the Secretary as an officer of the Department.

(b) For purposes of enforcement of this act, officers or employees duly designated by the Secretary, upon presenting appropriate credentials and a written notice to the owner, operator, or agent in charge, are authorized (1) to enter, at reasonable times, any factory, warehouse, or establishment in which hazardous articles are held for introduction into interstate commerce or are held after such introduction, or to enter any vehicle being used to transport or hold such hazardous articles in interstate commerce; and (2) to inspect and sample, at reasonable times and within reasonable limits and in a reasonable manner, finished articles in retail packages and labeling thereon in such factory, warehouse, establishment, or vehicle. A separate notice shall be given for each such inspection, but a notice shall not be required for each entry made during the period covered by the inspection. Each such inspection shall be commenced and completed with reasonable promptness.

Records of interstate shipment

SEC. 403. For the purpose of enforcing the provisions of this act, carriers engaged in interstate commerce, and persons receiving hazardous articles in interstate commerce or holding such articles so received, shall, upon the request of an officer or employee duly designated by the Secretary, permit such officer or employee, at reasonable times, to have access to and to copy all records showing the movement in interstate commerce of any such article, or the holding thereof during or after such movement, and the quantity, shipper, and consignee thereof; and it shall be unlawful for any such carrier or person to fail to permit such access to and copying of any such record so requested when such request is accompanied by a statement in writing specifying the nature or kind of article to which such request relates: *Provided*, That evidence obtained under this section shall not be used in a criminal prosecution of the person from whom obtained.

Publicity

SEC. 404. (a) The Secretary shall cause to be published from time to time reports summarizing all judgments, decrees, and court orders which have been rendered under this act, including the nature of the charge and the disposition thereof.

(b) The Secretary may also cause to be disseminated information regarding articles which, in the opinion of the Secretary, involve imminent danger to health. Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the Secretary from collecting, reporting, and illustrating the results of the investigations of the Department.

CHAPTER V—IMPORTS

SEC. 501. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury shall deliver to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, upon his request, samples of hazardous articles which are being imported or offered for import into the United States, giving notice thereof to the owner or consignee, who may appear before the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and have the right to introduce testimony. If it appears from the examination of such samples or otherwise that such article is in misbranded packages then such article shall be refused admission, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause the destruction of any such article refused admission unless such article is exported, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, within 90 days of the date of notice of such refusal or within such additional time as may be permitted pursuant to such regulations.

(b) Pending decision as to the admission of an article being imported or offered for import, the Secretary of the Treasury may authorize delivery of such article to the owner or consignee upon the execution by him of a good and sufficient bond providing for the payment of such liquidated damages in the event of default as may be required pursuant to regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury. If it appears to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that the article can, by relabeling or other action, be brought into compliance with the act, final determination as to admission of such article may be deferred and, upon filing of timely written application by the owner or consignee and the execution by him of a bond as provided in the preceding provisions of this subsection, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may, in accordance with regulations, authorize the applicant to perform such relabeling or other action specified in such authorization (including destruction or export of rejected articles or portions thereof, as may be specified in the Secretary's authorization). All such relabeling or other action pursuant to such authorization shall in accordance with regulations be under the supervision of an officer or employee of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare designated by the Secretary, or an officer or employee of the Department of the Treasury designated by the Secretary of the Treasury.

(c) All expenses (including travel, per diem or subsistence, and salaries of officers or employees of the United States) in connection with the destruction provided for in subsection (a) of this section and the supervision of the relabeling or other action authorized under the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, the amount of such expenses to be determined in accordance with regulations, and all expenses in connection with the storage, cartage, or labor with respect to any article refused admission under subsection (a) of this section, shall be paid by the owner or consignee and, in default of such payment, shall constitute a lien against any future importations made by such owner or consignee.

CHAPTER VI—MISCELLANEOUS

Separability clause

SEC. 601. If any provision of this act is declared unconstitutional, or the applicability thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the constitutionality of the remainder of the act and the applicability thereof to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Time taking effect

SEC. 602. This act shall take effect upon its passage, but no penalty or condemnation shall be enforced for any violation of the act occurring prior to the sixth month after the month in which this act is enacted.

Application to existing law

SEC. 603. Nothing in this act shall be construed to modify or affect the provisions of title 18, United States Code, chapter 39 or any regulations promulgated thereunder (relating to the transportation of dangerous articles and explosives by surface carriers); or of title 18, United States Code, sections 1715–1716 or any regulations promulgated thereunder (relating to mailing of dangerous articles); or of title 49, United States Code, section 622 (h) or any regulations promulgated under section 551 of such title (relating to transportation of dangerous articles and explosives in aircraft); or of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended; or of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act of June 25, 1947.

Repeal of Federal Caustic Poison Act

SEC. 604. The Federal Caustic Poison Act, approved March 4, 1927, as amended, is hereby repealed as of the first day of the sixth calendar month after the month in which this act is enacted: *Provided*, That, with respect to violations, liabilities incurred, or appeals taken prior to said date, all provisions of the Federal Caustic Poison Act, as amended, shall be deemed to remain in full force for the purpose of sustaining any proper suit, action, or other proceeding with respect to any such violations, liabilities, and appeals.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT OF 1953—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] be added as cosponsors on subsequent printings of the bill (S. 1789) to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 (title II of Public Law 163, 83d Cong., as amended), introduced by me, for myself and other Senators, on April 4, 1957.

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

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA — ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of April 10 and April 12, 1957,

The names of Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. POTTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. IVES, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. KEFAUVER were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1846) to provide for the District of Columbia an appointed governor and lieutenant governor, and an elected legislative assembly and nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BEALL, for himself and Mr. JAVITS, on April 10, 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. KNOWLAND:

Address delivered by him before 66th Continental Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution, Constitution Hall, Washington, D. C., April 15, 1957.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

Address delivered by Senator RUSSELL on April 15, 1957, before the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution, on the subject The Landmarks We Defend.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

Genesis of the Amen Corner and addresses delivered by him and by Senator SCHOEPPEL, at the Amen Corner dinner on April 6, 1957.

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF A NOMINATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that the Senate received today the nomination of Roy Richard Rubottom, Jr., of Texas, a Foreign Service officer of class 1 to be an Assistant Secretary of State, vice Henry F. Holland, resigned.

Notice is given that the nomination will be eligible for consideration by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, for action on the nominations on the Executive Calendar under the heading "New Reports."

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair) 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. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Gerald A. Drew, of California, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Haiti;

Donald Vaughn Lowe, of New Jersey, to be the representative on the Transport and Communications Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations; and

Robert B. Memminger, of South Carolina, and sundry other persons, for appointment and promotion in the foreign and diplomatic service.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Frederick J. Lawton, of the District of Columbia, to be Civil Service Commissioner;

Christopher H. Phillips, of Massachusetts, to be Civil Service Commissioner; and

Harris Ellsworth, of Oregon, to be Civil Service Commissioner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar, under the heading "New Reports," will be stated.

THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the Coast and Geodetic Survey nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc, and, without objection, they are confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William B. Franke, of New York, to be Under Secretary of the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

IN THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the Army nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc, and, without objection, they are confirmed.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Caleb R. Layton III, of Delaware, to be a United States district judge for the district of Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. 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.

PANAMA CANAL

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, pertinent excerpts from communications received by me concerning proposed legislation affecting the Panama Canal and the question of interoceanic canals generally, with a preliminary statement by myself.

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

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT BY SENATOR MARTIN OF IOWA

In a statement to the Senate on June 4, 1956, I quoted a memorandum to the Congress on the Panama Canal problem with excerpts of letters from a number of eminent engineers and others with Panama Canal construction and subsequent broad experience. Since then I have received additional communications on various aspects of the canal question from persons in many parts of the Nation. Among them are some whose records include both canal engineering and thermonuclear warfare.

The key issue in this correspondence centers on the old question of type of canal for the major increase of interoceanic transit facilities: whether to improve the existing high-level-lake and lock shipway by adapting it to the principles of the terminal lake-third locks conception or to construct a new Panama Canal at sea level that would still require tidal locks. This important matter was last considered by the Congress and the President in 1906, after years of explorations and studies culminating in a great Congressional debate known as the battle of the levels, with decision for the high-level plan under which the Panama Canal was constructed.

Now, more than 50 years afterward, this much discussed problem of the type of canal, once described by former Governor J. J. Morrow as a hardy perennial, is posed again in a far more complicated setting. It is one that has been featured by animated injections of so-called security and national defense angles occasioned by the advent in 1945 of the atomic bomb.

By way of explanation, it should be remarked that this development in weapon design led to authorization in late 1945 for an inquiry by the Governor of the Panama Canal conducted in 1946–47 under Public Law 280, 79th Congress—an act originally drafted in the Canal Zone by those who later supervised its execution. That study was not an independent investigation but one preconceived and administratively directed toward securing adoption of a sea-level project at Panama. (See Hon. Willis W. Bradley, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 21, 1948, vol. 94, pt. 10, p. A2449). Submitted in 1947, its recommendations failed to receive Presidential approval and were not accepted by the Congress.

As expressed in my statement to the Senate on January 17, 1957, the advocates of the sea-level proposal in their public statements have not been fully candid with the Congress and the country. Their mode of treatment was recently illustrated in an unofficial report on the Panama Canal prepared by a special committee of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, entitled "The Sea-Level Project and National Security," which generally followed the recommendations of the 1947 report (H. Doc. No. 446, 84th Cong.).

Despite the large volume of informed discussions of the canal problem, much of which has been published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, this rivers and harbors congress report dismissed all consideration of all high-level lake and lock plans on the alleged basis that "none of these can afford the necessary security," and failed to mention the well-known terminal lake-third locks program (see Gov. Glen E. Edgerton's preliminary report, January 17, 1944, in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 8, p. 10756). Though stressing the vulnerability of locks and dams in the present canal, it failed to consider the danger of closure of any type of canal by nuclear attack on the slide area of Gaillard Cut, which sector is considered by independent atomic warfare and canal engineers as constituting a comparable hazard (see E. S. Randolph in United States Naval Institute Proceedings, April 1956, p. 395). It is obvious, because the bottom of the channel in the mountainous section of the sea-level project would be lowered more than 100 feet below its present height of 40 feet above sea level, that this project would offer a far greater hazard with respect to such closure than the existing canal.

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress, it should be recorded, is a registered lobby organization (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 3, 1957, p. 120). Its primary purposes are to obtain from the Congress authorizations and appropriations for river and harbor projects of the United States.

Notwithstanding the nature and purpose of this organization, its report on "The Sea-Level Project and National Security" was published as a Government document at the request of its president, who is also a Member of Congress. Never before, so far as I have been able to learn, has any unofficial organization obtained publication of any report as a Government document. Certainly the National Rivers and Harbors Congress has not been in a position to make an adequate or authoritative study of Panama Canal problems.

Thus, it must appear that the indicated report can serve no purpose except that of propaganda. In this, the Rivers and Harbors Congress has been surprisingly successful in creating the erroneous impression that its report on the Panama Canal is an official one by a regularly appointed Congressional committee, which it is not. Such publication is certainly contrary to long-established practice of the Congress with respect to public documents. It is unfortunate that the rivers and harbors organization permitted itself to be used in a role of this character.

Over a period of years, in close association with former Representative Willis W. Bradley, an experienced naval officer and ordnance engineer, and other distinguished Members of Congress, I have observed that advocates of the sea-level project, in their discussions of the means to increase Panama Canal capacity, have consistently ignored three vastly important factors that must be considered. These are:

(1) A new treaty with Panama that the sea-level project would require, with its inevitable huge indemnity and greatly increased annuities;

(2) The well-established marine operational shortcomings of the present waterway and a reasoned plan for their solution; and

(3) The effect of costs for increased capacity on tolls that must be imposed on shipping using the canal, especially that of its greatest customer—the American merchant marine.

The failure to meet these and all other vital questions bearing on the expansion of trans-Isthmian transit facilities certainly gives color and credence to the charge that sea-level advocates have been evasive and unfair in their views and recommendations and, in effect, have considered the Congress and the public at large altogether stupid or indifferent (see hearings on Panama Canal and Canal Zone Government before House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, March 29–31, 1955). The only fair inference to be derived from these failures of sea-level advocates to present and discuss all such greatly important matters is that they have been lacking either in candor, good faith, or in adequate grasp of all the problems involved.

Any informed or thoughtful person must know that the indicated factors must be faced and dealt with in a sufficient and realistic manner. Thus far, this has not been done and, apparently, can be achieved only by means of an independent commission created by Congressional authority.

In contrast with the actions of advocates of the sea-level project, the supporters of the terminal lake-third locks proposal, who include many persons of distinction, have endeavored to consider fully these three factors, as well as the many others that apply, and to present them forthrightly in their discussions and views. The lake-lock plan, it is important to note, does not require a new treaty with the Republic of Panama. Moreover, its cost would be only a fraction of the vast expenditure for any sea-level undertaking.

Though these facts are obvious and have been published many times in professional papers and the annals of the Congress, the official recommendation in 1947 by the Governor of the Panama Canal of only the sea-level project for major canal construction, which, as previously stated, failed to receive Presidential approval or Congressional acceptance, has served to exclude from proper consideration what many independent experts consider the best solution when evaluated from all angles. (See memorandum to the Congress on the Panama Canal Problem, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 7, p. 9406.)

In this connection the attention of the Congress, which is the highest and final authority on Isthmian Canal policy matters, is invited to the salutary results produced by the recent independent inquiry into an official recommendation to abandon the Panama Railroad. Undertaken under direction of the House, this investigation thwarted an effort by the Panama Canal Company to liquidate this vital trans-Isthmian rail link (H. Rept. 2974, 84th Cong.) and reversed the decision of the routine administrators. The results supply eloquent evidence of the even greater necessity for independent inquiry for the tremendously more important canal policy question of the type of the future canal.

More factors, however, are involved in the canal situation than the inherent problems of the waterway. There are at this time in the United States and elsewhere advocates who are vociferously clamoring for the internationalization of the Panama Canal. They do this regardless of the facts that the Canal Zone was acquired in perpetuity; that the Panama Canal was constructed by the United States with the taxpayers' money; and that it has been successfully and impartially operated since completion, all under terms provided by treaty.

The question thus arises, "Should the taxpayer be further burdened by the huge cost of a sea-level undertaking estimated up to $10 billions, and after its completion allow it to pass from exclusive American control with complete loss of the huge sums supplied by the United States for its construction?" An independent commission would certainly consider such angles and make some recommendations in the premises.

Fortunately the paramount features in the legislative history and problems of the Panama Canal have been extensively documented in available form. The attention of the Congress is invited to the comprehensive bibliography prepared by Representative CLARK W. THOMPSON, of Texas, and published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 23, 1955, volume 101, part 3, page 3610; also to subsequent statements in the RECORD by other distinguished Members of Congress.

From these it is clear that the interoceanic canals problem is anything but a routine matter to be handled by routine officials. Instead, it is one of prime importance that must be decided on its merits and at the highest plane of statesmanship.

To these ends, Representatives CLARK W. THOMPSON, DANIEL J. FLOOD, and FRANCIS E. DORN, all effective students of canal problems, and myself, have just introduced identical measures to create an independent Interoceanic Canals Commission: H. R. 3258, H. R. 4774, H. R. 6008, and S. 611, 85th Congress.

This body should be composed of the best qualified men in the country—men who cannot be improperly dominated—and, without further delay, put to work on the canal problem, which has become increasingly a topic of public discussion since the Suez crisis. For this step, we cannot afford to wait until some grave crisis overtakes the Panama Canal with attendant necessity for quick solution, which might precipitate and bring about ill considered action and unfortunate decisions.

The present Panama Canal situation and the imperative necessity for prompt constructive legislation is keenly appreciated by those with whom I have been in consultation. Because of their high stature, some of their expressions should be of the greatest interest and value not only to the Congress and Executive but also to the Nation at large, particularly agencies that use the canal or would otherwise be affected by tolls.

JUNE 28, 1956.

DEAR SENATOR MARTIN: I was much interested in your letter of June 12 in regard to the Panama Canal, and the influence which vulnerability to atomic bombing might have on consideration of this matter.

Now I am not an expert on atomic bombing, or on atomic energy matters generally. I know that the newspapers sometimes indicate that I am, but as a matter of fact I have never been what is ordinarily known as an atomic scientist. Neither have I delved closely into this matter since the war, for I have not been at any time a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, or even on one of its advisory bodies. My connection with the subject during the war was more that of an administrator than of a scientist or engineer. So I have only the layman's point of view, and of course the point of view of a

man who has been an engineer all of his life and who is always interested in engineering matters.

With this background, so that you will not place undue weight upon what I have to say, I have a feeling that vulnerability to atomic bombing should not be a controlling factor in decisions on this Panama Canal question. This is for the reason that I believe that any type of canal whatever could be put out of operation for a rather long period by bombing, if the enemy was able to place bombs on its target, and if the enemy considered it a matter to be of sufficient importance to make the necessary sacrifices for this purpose, and to employ bombs of a magnitude adequate for the job. In fact I believe that if we get into a war in which atomic bombs are used generally, which of course I very much hope can be avoided, I doubt whether the continued operation of the Panama Canal would have any really decisive influence on the outcome.

Cordially yours,

VANNEVAR BUSH,
Former Chairman, Research and Development Board, National Military Establishment.

DECEMBER 21, 1956.

DEAR SENATOR MARTIN: I am in receipt of your letter of December 11, 1956, with particular reference to the effect that atomic and thermonuclear weapons would have on the Panama Canal.

I am sending you herewith a memorandum which I wrote on October 1, 1956, which gives briefly my views concerning the vulnerability of either a sea-level or a lock canal to an attack by atomic or thermonuclear weapons. You may use that memorandum in any way you choose.

With kindest wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

T. F. FARRELL,
Major General, AUS, Retired, Former Deputy Commander, Atomic Bomb Project.

OCTOBER 1, 1956.

ISTHMIAN CANAL POLICY AND ATOMIC WAR

The debate between advocates of a sea-level canal at Panama and those favoring an improved lock canal still goes on. In order to provide for the increasing needs of interoceanic commerce, an early decision should be made and work gotten underway.

One strong argument of the sea-level advocates is its alleged greater security against atomic-weapon attack. What little merit there may have been to that argument with respect to the earliest atomic weapons is lost when one considers the superatomic weapons and their successors, the thermonuclear (hydrogen) weapons.

The earlier atomic bombs produced effects equivalent to 20,000 tons of TNT (20 kiloton weapons). Later atomic bombs are many times as powerful and hydrogen bombs are rated in millions of tons (megatons) of TNT equivalent. In a few short years, the power of the bombs has gone up by a factor of 1,000.

The radioactive fallout from the superweapons now can cover a vast area with its killing deposits. Chairman Strauss of the Atomic Energy Commission reporting on the thermonuclear device tested at Bikini on March 1, 1954, states that:

"There was sufficient radioactivity in a downwind belt about 140 miles in length and of varying width up to 20 miles to have seriously threatened the lives of nearly all persons in the area who took no protective measures.

"About 7,000 square miles of territory downwind from the point of burst was so contaminated that survival might have depended upon prompt evacuation of the area or upon taking shelter and other protective measures."

The early 20-kiloton bombs, by blast and heat, would destroy or damage severely all buildings within a radius of more than a mile from the point of explosion. Lesser damage would extend further out.

In a megaton bomb, with the energy yield increased by a factor of 1,000, the distance for similar damage increases approximately by a multiple which is the cube root of 1000 or 10. Thus, the circle over 2 miles in diameter of almost total destruction for a 20-kiloton bomb would become a circle of similar destruction more than 20 miles in diameter for a 20-megaton hydrogen bomb. Something less than total destruction would extend many miles beyond that area. The intensity of the blast and heat for a large area directly below the explosion would be so enormous that buildings, power, communications, shipping, vegetation, and life, itself, would be totally destroyed. Great fire storms would sweep out in all directions. As Milton wrote in Paradise Lost, there would be "whirlwinds of tempestuous fire."

A megaton hydrogen bomb exploded over the center of activities at each end of the canal would destroy life and things completely. Another megaton bomb exploded in the deep Gaillard cut could be expected to start slides so overwhelming that years of massive effort would be needed to clear them away. It would be a long, long time before a working canal could be restored. The deadly radioactive fallout would snuff out the lives of those it could reach. The few living who were spared because they were hidden out would flee in panic from the awful place. The canal, its people, and all its vast wherewithal would be dead and done for.

Two puny, old-fashioned atomic bombs blasted and burned the heart out of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and left them gasping for life. The awful memory of those shattered cities makes one pray to be spared seeing what bombs thousands of times more powerful would do to living communities.

Since death, destruction, and waste would be so total at either a sea-level or a lock canal, there is little to be gained by making detailed comparisons. All is all.

The interruption must last for years in either case. The losses would be complete in all supporting facilities of power, water supply, communication, transportation, shops, housing, supply installations, maintenance plants, and floating equipment. The operating personnel and all those on whom they depend for normal living would be wiped out. The residual effects of radiation could prevent working in hot areas for a long time. The canal would be so blocked by slides that it would take years to dig out. The deeper cut of the sea-level canal could be a much tougher job to open than that of the lock canal.

To sum up: If war with atomic and hydrogen weapons should come to the Panama Canal—be it a sea-level or a lock canal—the canal would die in blast and fire and radiation. It could stay dead a long, long time. Perhaps it would not be rebuilt. It could be abandoned to the voracious jungle, and become buried ruins to be dug up and studied by archeologists of future generations. Perhaps instead, a better and wiser world will find a way to avoid the uttermost folly of atomic war.

THOMAS F. FARRELL,
Major General, AUS, Retired.

NOVEMBER 21, 1956.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Reference is made to your letter of November 13 on the subject of an independent commission to be created to study the Panama Canal situation.

I have been working with a number of the engineers who were engaged in the initial design and construction of the canal for many months in an attempt to create an atmosphere based on sound judgment and it is highly necessary that a competent and independent commission be created to study the various plans that have been suggested for increasing the capacity of the Panama Canal and including the proposed sea-level canal.

It is my considered opinion that a sea-level canal, while perhaps possible, is highly impractical. I am also convinced that the hydrogen bomb is an absolute weapon which, if properly used, would put either the lock or sea-level canal out of commission for many months or possibly years.

I endorse wholeheartedly the stand taken by Messrs. W. R. McCann, Richard H. Whitehead, E. Sidney Randolph and others in reference to the necessity of a competent and disinterested commission to study the problems that are presented in any consideration of increasing the capacity of the canal.

The Sunday New York Times of November 11 quotes figures of the income of the Panama Canal from 1952 to 1956. In the year 1956 the income, before payments to the United States Treasury, was $23,278,426. Interest was paid to the United States Treasury at the rate of 2.48 percent based on the canal cost of $342,465,445, and after the payment of the interest and the annuity to Panama of $430,000, which has since been increased by the late treaty with Panama to over $1,125,000, the net income was $4,179,464.

House Document 446 of the 84th Congress, 2d session, is a report by the Special Committee on the Panama Canal of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress regarding the Panama Canal—the sea-level project and national security, which endorses everything certain Army engineers propose and has a statement that the policy of the committee has been to seek information from every available informed source both lay and official. To my certain knowledge they have not communicated with any of the engineers who participated in the design and construction of the Panama Canal.

They estimate the cost of the sea level canal project, which they endorse, at $4,879,000,000. Now, if we add this sum to the present capital investment of the canal and apply the present rate of interest, the additional interest amounts to $120 million annually or more than five times the present income of the canal from all sources. Note this is an additional charge and based on the same operating costs. The canal's net income of $4,179,464 would show an annual operating deficit of about $117 million. I have serious doubts as to whether the tolls from the sea level canal can ever approach this annual charge.

Returning to the question of security: The hydrogen bombs with megaton effect indicates there is no such thing as security. The security of the canal must be obtained through diplomatic agreements or similar means rather than by the expenditure of huge sums to obtain so-called security. Security is a myth that has been exploded by the hydrogen bomb.

There are a very few of the engineers who went to the canal in 1904 and served throughout its design and construction still living and in actual engineering practice and it does appear to me * * * that their experience and knowledge of the situation should be taken into account either by the Army engineers, the Congress or a commission, if one is ever appointed, to study these problems.

* * * * *

We believe it to be in the interests of the American public that the grave questions involved merit a complete study of all of these questions, including that of the sea-level project, by a commission to be appointed without further delay, and that the competent engineers who were engaged in the design and construction of the lock canal be given an opportunity to express their views and opinions based on their complete and accurate knowledge of all of

the facts. If this matter is delayed unduly there will be very few of them left to testify and to us time is extremely important.

I trust that you and other Members of the Congress will be successful in the next Congress in obtaining the approval to the appointment of such a commission. You have labored long and diligently on this very serious matter and we are all hopeful that you will be successful in this Congress.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Very truly yours,

HARTLEY ROWE,
Former Member, General Advisory Committee, Atomic Energy Commission.

JUNE 21, 1956.

MY DEAR SENATOR:

* * * * *

As your letter states, I have had long experience with the Panama Canal project. I first went to the isthmus a few months after Colonel Goethals took over in 1907. I had two tours of duty under him, starting as a young surveyor just out of West Point. I had occasion to review the French plans and to inspect the remaining evidences of their efforts in the field. Actually, until we really got fully started, we used a lot of French abandoned equipment and facilities.

After many later visits to the isthmus, to keep up with developments, I was recalled to active duty and served for over 6 years under two governors, in many capacities during World War II, including engineer of maintenance (now lieutenant governor), and finally assistant to the Governor.

In the short time since I have returned to the United States I have been going through a mass of accumulated second-class mail including many marked copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for which I thank you. I was especially impressed by your remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 102, part 7, page 9406.

While I naturally have a lot of ideas accumulated over nearly 50 years, I am not committed to any one solution, and I could not discuss them in a short letter. That is the function of the proposed Interoceanic Canals Commission as contemplated by your and Mr. THOMPSON'S bills now before Congress. I am strongly for an independent commission to overhaul the whole situation as of today. The last report was a departmental report in 1947 which has not been printed and upon which Congress has taken no action. In the succeeeding 10 years, there have been terrifying advances in the nuclear situation.

Cordially,

JAS. G. STEESE,
Former Engineer of Maintenance, Panama Canal.

MAY 28, 1956.

DEAR SENATOR MARTIN:

* * * * *

When the Isthmian Canal was first proposed, I realized that fundamentally the problems involved were in large part geological. Accordingly, I undertook them and have lost no opportunity since to inform myself on the matter and have visited the Canal Zone several times and kept in touch with developments.

Admiral Walker, Chairman of the first Canal Commission and also of the two successive Commissions, was a close friend of mine and he urged me to accept the position of geologist for the Canal Commission. * * * Agreeable to Admiral Walker's request however, I examined the drill cores obtained in the course of the drilling to determine the best foundations and therefore most desirable location for the Gatun Dam. * * *

As between the preferable location for a canal across the isthmus whether in Nicaragua or Panama, much geological work has been carried out. The then Chief Geologist of the United States Geological Survey, C. W. Hayes, went over the ground of both sites thoroughly. He concluded that the northern site across Nicaragua was not only considerably longer but would traverse a region subject to considerable violent volcanic outburst, one of the mountain ranges which the canal would pass through is made up of a chain of volcanic cones. The unpredictable nature of this volcanism made the Nicaragua site impractical and most undesirable as compared with the Panama site which was not threatened by such volcanism. * * *

As between a sea-level project and a lock project, I believe the sea-level would not only prove vastly more expensive but would also, in case of war and bombing, prove much less defensible.

All in all, the so-called terminal lake plan, which has been carefully worked out by qualified engineers who have worked on the zone, impresses me as the most desirable plan for expanding the facilities of the Panama Canal. Further, it is estimated that the cost of accomplishing the expansion according to this plan would be under $600 million as compared with the estimated cost of the sea-level plan of $2,500,000,000. After careful consideration of the various factors involved I am satisfied that the terminal lake plan is the most feasible and most economic and most satisfactory method for expanding the capacity of the canal.

Most sincerely,

JOHN M. BOUTWELL,
Consulting Geologist, Formerly With Isthmian Canal Commission.

JUNE 1, 1956.

DEAR SENATOR MARTIN: Thanks for sending me the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 26, 1956, containing your remarks on the Isthmian Canal policy. This brought to my mind the studies made in the Navy Department in 1946–47 on modernization of the Panama Canal.

Secretary Forrestal, after his trip to the Canal Zone in January of 1946, authorized the studies in the Navy Department as a means of acquainting the Governor of the Panama Canal Zone with the naval problems involved.

Supervision of this work devolved on me as Assistant Chief of Overseas Bases. We concentrated our efforts on ways of improving the canal as it existed so as to increase the efficiency of ship handling through the canal.

It was soon apparent from reports of the Governor's board of consultants and from visitors from the canal organization to Washington that the Governor was using the authority of Public Law 280, 79th Congress, to overstress the security and national-defense angles to bolster an argument for a new canal at Panama at sea level.

Inadequate consideration was given to the simple and obvious solution of improving the existing canal by means of a high-level terminal lake on the Pacific side of the canal to balance the similar lake (Gatun) on the Atlantic side.

Voluminous propagada in the lay and technical press supporting the sea-level concept appeared at this time. The origin of such articles was obvious—dredging and earthmoving interests.

The Navy Department supplied the canal authorities with naval views, which included the answers to questions of relative vulnerability, then termed "security," of the two types of canals.

Atomic experts in the Navy Department held that either a sea-level or a lock canal would be vulnerable to superbombs. Therefore the type of canal is irrelevant. As all this information was classified at the time, it was never given to the public nor to Congress so far as I know.

It all looks so simple to me, I wonder that there is any problem at all. The problem would be solved if some authoritative person or body such as your and Representative CLARK W. THOMPSON'S Interoceanic Canals Commission—provided for in S. 766 and H. R. 3335, 84th Congress—would announce, "We are going to improve the present canal according to the authorized third-locks plan adapted to the terminal lake project. After this there would be no further changes in lock dimensions." * * *

Because of your position as a congressional leader on interoceanic canals, economic, and defense policy questions, you may have the great opportunity of pioneering the decision in what may lead to the final settlement of the canal question. May I add that I know of no greater service to the welfare of these United States and the world at large than the successful culmination of the prolonged efforts of yourself and Representative THOMPSON to effect a wise Panama Canal policy.

Sincerely yours,

H. H. LITTLE,
Captain, United States Navy (retired), Former Assistant Chief of Overseas Bases, Office of Naval Operations.

JANUARY 8, 1957.

DEAR SENATOR MARTIN:

* * * * *

My father was one of the two civilian division engineers on the construction of the Panama Canal under General Goethals, and was responsible for the design of the Gatun Dam, and subsequently was in charge of all of the hydrology of the canal. I was brought up there as a young man, and have naturally retained my interests in developments, since I have continued in my father's field of hydraulic and sanitary engineering.

As a member for many years of the United States Beach Erosion Board, which functions under the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, I have had occasion to concern myself with many hydraulic problems involving waterways and I have followed closely the various recommendations which have been made with respect to the Panama Canal problem. * * *

From the studies and reports which I have made, and from my own personal familiarity with the canal both during its construction and from a visit years later, I am of the opinion that the situation has become so involved in controversies not fully supported by adequate investigation, that an Interoceanic Canal Commission should be authorized by the Congress with a directive to study the entire canal situation. * * *

I remember well the Board of Consulting Engineers to the Panama Canal during its construction, several of whose members I knew very well, including John R. Freeman and Frederick P. Stearns. Prior to that time there had been also an Interoceanic Canal Commission I believe, also made up of distinguished engineers and others.

I hope very much that the efforts which you apparently have in mind to stimulate the authorization of an independent Interoceanic Canal Commission will be successful * * *.

Cordially yours,

THORNDIKE SAVILLE,
Dean, College of Engineering, New York University.

DECEMBER 30, 1956.

DEAR SENATOR MARTIN: This responds to your request of December 27 for comment on some aspects of the Panama Canal problem.

1. Comment below is based on the premise and hope that the canal as an institution will be forever preserved and protected as an American bulwark against encroachment and violation by any agency whatsoever. Existent misguided sentiment would give to the United Nations administrative control.

Nothing could be more inimical to the sovereign integrity of our country. Frustration and confusion must inevitably ensue when 80 nations are given any license to meddle in our internal affairs.

2. Assuming that we shall retain undivided control, we should proceed in orderly fashion to improve and increase capacity of existing facilities. This suggests an early consideration of, and approval by, the Congress of the so-called terminal lake plan which entails a new dam at Miraflores which would raise Miraflores Lake to plus 85 feet, enabling vessels to proceed safely at summit level with minimum transit time from Miraflores to Gatun.

3. This plan cancels out Pedro Miguel dam and locks. It requires new dams and locks at Miraflores. Properly designed this concept will permit passage of *Roosevelt* or any ships now contemplated, without restrictions inevitably to be imposed by any sea-level chimera. The terminal lake plan, with all its appurtenances, might cost one and one-half billions and require, say, 7 years to complete, including a new set of larger bypassing locks east of Gatun. This obviously is the preferable solution, economically, strategically, and navigationally.

4. Certain officers of the Corps of Engineers have long advocated a completely new so-called sea-level canal, paralleling the existing route. This advocacy was suddenly born after a nuclear bomb fell on Hiroshima, on the theory that a nuclear bomb, by destroying the locks, would destroy the canal. These advocates forebore mentioning that well-placed TNT bombs, used long before Hiroshima, could accomplish the same purpose. It is simply not true that a sea-level canal is not susceptible to destruction, or long interruption of transit. Diversion of rivers whose rainy season flow is now dispersed into Gatun Lake, and which could not be permitted to flow into a sea-level canal, is imperative * * *. Dikes to contain this diversion through miles of swamps would be peculiarly susceptible of destruction by light bombs.

5. To honestly summarize for your purposes, no canal of whatsoever type of construction may be deemed invulnerable to intelligently organized attack. In actuality, the tidal locks at Balboa, absolutely essential to functioning of a sea-level canal, are as liable as are the navigational locks.

6. Earth and rock slides have plagued this canal since 1906. Obviously, the deeper the excavation the greater is the certainty of slides. What will happen when the proposed sea-level canal bottom is carried 100 feet deeper than it now is? The new channel is to have its bottom at minus 60. This is one of the gravest of the considerations confronting the sea-level plan. * * *

My devotion to and affection for this Nation impels me to suggest that a cost of seven or eight billions and 10 or 12 years for a sea-level canal hardly provides that immunity from trouble we have a right to expect * * *.

In short, no type of canal is immune to enemy destruction. A canal with summit level at 85 or 90 is immeasurably to the Navy's advantage, as opposed to a sea-level canal just as susceptible to closure.

The Congress must eventually decide on this matter. * * * You and your colleagues have a most perplexing problem. You have my most sympathetic best wishes.

WM. G. B. THOMPSON,
Consulting Engineer, Formerly With Isthmian Canal Commission.

SEPTEMBER 27, 1956.

DEAR SENATOR MARTIN: This is an unavoidably delayed reply to your letter of September 4 requesting my views with respect to the proposed conversion of the existing lock canal at Panama to sea level, as recommended by the Governor of the Panama Canal in an extensive and voluminous report dated November 1, 1947.

That report, comprising a text and plates supplemented by eight separate volumes identified as annexes, and embracing 21 additional volumes classified as appendixes, was transmitted to the Congress by the President, December 1, 1947, without comment or recommendation.

During succeeding years no definitive decision was taken by the Congress. The great problems of engineering, future capacity to meet maritime growth, enormous estimated costs, questions of national defense and security, and increasing political complexities inherent in our relations with the Republic of Panama, all combined to present a most controversial national and international problem. I understand the report has not been printed or released to the public.

Public Law 280, 79th Congress, approved December 28, 1945, under which the investigation and subject report was authorized, was initiated to deal with the phases of methods and costs to increase the capacity of the canal, which within itself encompasses broad and most complicated matters of the engineering field.

In the act, however, as finally worded, there were included the words "* * * increasing the capacity and security of the Panama Canal," and further the words "* * * to meet future needs of interoceanic commerce and national defense," and again the words "* * * international commerce or national defense." With this very involved mingling of two great objects the question arises, which was intended to be of paramount importance? If the answer is of equal importance, what qualified line officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Departments were assigned for duty with respect to national defense and security in the preparation of the subject report?

A careful reading of the various studies leading to the recommendation for a sea-level canal discloses that national defense and security seemed to be paramount. As early as February 1947, while the subject report was in process, a superintendent of dredging on a Panama Canal in a paper before the American Society of Civil Engineers, recommended a sea-level canal. He stressed security and national defense as more important than maximum capacity and further stated a sea-level canal would be "relatively invulnerable."

Shortly after the report reached the Congress, but not available in text to the public, the various authors presented to the American Society of Civil Engineers a series of papers summarizing the major elements of the report. These were a part of the official proceedings of the society but were made the subject of a separate publication by the society carrying the title "Panama Canal—The Sea Level Project—A Symposium." Thus began what many thought was an attempt to mold public opinion and the technical world in favor of the sea-level recommendation in advance of action by committees of the Congress. To some nonmembers of the society and to the public, this special publication seems to imply in some degree the formal stamp of approval of the American Society of Civil Engineers, comprising many thousands of experienced engineers of the country.

Thus began the flow of many public articles, not only in the technical press, but in newspaper and popular magazines supporting the sea-level project. All through many such articles appeared the indicated necessity of taking the canal to sea level in the interest of security and national defense as of paramount importance irrespective of cost, and the lesser importance of future capacity enlargement.

It occurs to me that if my views, which you have asked for, may receive more than cursory attention, I should state briefly the background from which they arise. I need not refer to my nearly 13 years of engineering, design, and construction experience during the building of the canal.

Early in 1948 a typewritten copy of the Governor's report, and all its annexes and appendixes, with the exception of annex 8, entitled "Security (Secret), and Appendix 6, Volume 1 (Confidential) and Volume 2 (Secret)" came into my possession. Prior to this I received a copy of the Sultan report on the Nicaragua Canal. I also had some knowledge of the Edgerton report of 1944 and recently had the opportunity to read an extensive summary.

Between 1948 and 1953 I studied all these reports in great detail; reread many of the annual reports of the chief engineer during the period of original construction; conferred with many old engineering associates. In particular, I conferred with two of the leading engineers in the development of the atomic bomb and also with that employee of the Atomic Energy Commission who was delegated to help in the preparation of the security annex and appendix (marked secret). * * * Further, for a period of 12 years prior to 1945, I was in charge of the operations of a commercial corporation which, in addition to its other activities, operated a fleet of company-owned and chartered vessels, engaged in intercoastal commerce between North Atlantic and North Pacific ports and to the Far East via the Panama Canal.

I am quite familiar with the bills introduced concurrently in the House of Representatives and the Senate (84th Cong.) by Representative CLARK W. THOMPSON and yourself respectively, designed to establish a special agency to be called the Interoceanic Canals Commission. These bills failed of action as did similar bills introduced in previous sessions of the Congress.

I understand there may be opposition to a new commission as proposed, and that opposition, if it exists, is based on the premise that all phases and alternatives of the canal problems have been exhaustively covered and no useful purpose would be served in further studies by a new group.

In conclusion, my studies have led me to the following specific views:

1. As opposed to modernization, the recommended conversion to sea level of the lock canal at Panama is not warranted from the following standpoints:

(a) National defense and security;

(b) Comparative navigability;

(c) Increased capacity;

(d) Relative impracticability of conversion, within the limits of the present canal, concurrently proceeding with the daily transiting of ocean vessels;

(e) Unprecedented practical problems of engineering and construction methods;

(f) Unprecedented design and building of outsize dredging and excavation equipment;

(g) Unpredictable action of the complex and loaded unstable base formations when the existing counterbalancing head of 87 feet of water is removed;

(h) The basic requirement for areas of new territory outside the present Canal Zone, thereby causing another revision of the controlling treaty with the Republic of Panama, with all the international problems and hazards to the United States inevitably involved; and finally

(i) The impossibility of reasonably projecting in advance the ultimate cost in billions of dollars of a sea level canal at Panama. If finally completed there would have been created, in my opinion, the Straits of Panama, that cauvinistic dream of Bunau-Varilla.

2. Establish an Interoceanic Canals Commission as proposed broadly in S. 766 and H. R. 3335 and introduced in the 1st Session of the 84th Congress, but more or less limited in functional scope. * * *

* * * * *

4. The vast physical data available for Panama, and also the comparable physical data for Nicaragua accumulated over the years up to and through the Sultan studies, may be considered an adequate basis for definitive analysis and recommendations by the proposed new Commission, without additional field work.

* * * * *

With regards and cordial best wishes, I am,
Yours sincerely,

GEO. M. WELLS,
Consulting Engineer, formerly with Isthmian Canal Commission.

FEBRUARY 2, 1957.

DEAR SENATOR MARTIN: In reply to your letter of December 27, 1956, with reference to our Isthmian Canal policy, I wish to comment as follows:

The major questions of policy involved in this discussion I believe can be outlined as:

(a) The relative practicability from the engineering standpoint of the proposed sea-level canal and the proposed locks-lake plan.

(b) The relative cost of the two plans above mentioned.

(c) The relative navigability of the canal under the two plans.

(d) The relative toll charges under these plans for ships utilizing the canal.

(e) The relative defensibility of the canal in case of war under these plans.

(f) The proper course of action by the Congress of the United States in the consideration and determination of a wisely reasoned Isthmian Canal policy.

A. ENGINEERING PRACTICABILITY

The question of engineering practicability would hardly be a serious one if the terrain and geologic features of the Panama Isthmian route were the same as the Suez Canal route. The essential points of difference lie in the fact that the isthmian route necessarily involves a passage through the Continental Divide and the difficulties and uncertainties created by the instability of the geologic strata extending for some miles in the vicinity of the divide.

This instability is evidenced by the numerous slides that occurred not only during the initial construction period (approximately 1904–15), and increasing in number and volume as the excavation of the cut through the divide deepened, but also during the operating period from 1915 to date.

The annual report of the Board of Directors of the Panama Canal Company for 1956 contains the following passage:

"During 1955 Contractors Hill, overlooking the canal at the Continental Divide, started to move toward the channel, and the threat of a serious blockage of the canal required immediate correction. The project, involving an expenditure in excess of $4 million, was completed without any delay to transiting ships. Currently, Gold Hill, adjacent to Contractors Hill, is under continual observation because of signs of instability and may require attention."

The fissure in the strata at Contractors Hill that marked the threatened slide in 1955 referred to in the above quotation was first observed on the surface of the ground several hundred feet from the canal bank, and was found to extend to a depth several hundred feet below the bottom of the proposed sea-level canal.

The instability of the geologic strata evidenced by the slides during the construction period and at intervals during the operating period up to the 1955 Contractors Hill occurrence, and the presently threatened Gold Hill slide, was created by the excavation of the present canal channel through the divide, and the slides due to the instability thus created increased in number and volume as the cut was deepened. The proposed sea-level project involved the deepening of this cut by over 100 feet below the present canal bottom.

In my opinion it is impossible to estimate the amount of material that will have to be removed to effect this deepening, the cost of such removal, or the permanence of the canal channel if and when such deepening is effected.

No such hazards and uncertainties created by strata instability occur in the proposed locks-lake plan.

B. COST

The only estimate of cost of the sea-level canal that the writer has seen is $2.483 billions, contained, I believe in the original Mehaffey report made in 1947. Construction costs have greatly increased since that date, and for that reason alone this estimate would have to be greatly increased, the most recent published estimate being $4.8 billions.

In view of the hazards and uncertainties which have been discussed under A above, the writer believes that it is inherently impossible to make any reliable estimate of cost for the sea-level project.

The estimates for the proposed locks-lake project, under $800 million, made at a later date, may still be too low, but reasonably reliable estimates of cost are not inherently negated.

C. NAVIGABILITY

It is the writer's opinion that the sea-level canal would involve greater navigational difficulties and hazards and less adequate and flexible facilities for ships, especially vessels of the United States Navy that may find it necessary or desirable to stopover in the canal than in the case of the locks-lake canal with its Gatun Lake and the proposed Miraflores Lake. This question was discussed in a symposium conducted by the American Society of Civil Engineers several years ago, together with all other features of the two types of canal. The writer read the discussions and arguments presented by advocates of both types of canal at the time it appeared in the proceedings of the society * * *.

In any case, it would appear that the question of relative navigability of the two proposed plans should be thoroughly investigated by the Congress through the testimony of officers of the United States Navy and qualified representatives of commercial shipping organizations.

D. TOLLS

The annual report of Board of Directors of the Panama Canal Company for 1956 states that the maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal is governed by the act of September 26, 1950, 64 Statutes 1036 (Public Law 841 of the 81st Cong.). The report further states that:

"The (Panama Canal) Company is required to be self-supporting, to reimburse the United States Treasury annually for the net cost of operation of the Canal Zone Government and the basic annuity payment to the Republic of Panama, and to pay interest to the Treasury on the net investment of the United States Government in the corporation (Panama Canal Company)."

For the fiscal year 1956, approximately 78.6 percent of the total revenue of the Panama Canal was derived from tolls. The net investment in the canal at the end of fiscal year 1956 was $408,505,000. The interest rate the Canal Company has to pay to the Treasury of the United States has been established at 2.485 percent for the fiscal year 1957. The receipts from tolls from commercial vessels and credits from United States Government vessels for fiscal year 1956 were $34,450,951.

The amount paid by the Canal Company to the United States Treasury for fiscal year 1956 was $22.3 million of which approximately $10,131,000 was for interest.

If the net investment for a sea-level canal were only $5 billion, the interest at the 1957 fiscal year rate would amount to $124 million. In the writer's opinion, for reasons discussed above, the cost would be far greater than $5 billion, and the interest charges proportionately increased.

Commercial users of the canal have for some time been urging a reduction in the present toll charges. It would appear to be obvious that the increased capital charges of a sea-level canal could not possibly be met by an increase in tolls or in any other revenues of the canal, since the tolls constitute so large a percentage of the total revenue. The 1956 report of the Panama Canal Company, previously mentioned, says on page 9:

"Thus the canal enterprise operates entirely from earnings, requiring no contribution from the American taxpayer."

This condition could not possibly exist with the proposed sea-level canal.

E. DEFENSIBILITY

In all of the discussions of the sea-level versus locks-lake plan that the writer has seen, the proponents of the sea-level plan base their main argument on the claim that the sea-level canal would be less vulnerable to bombing attack in time of war than the locks-lake type.

In the writer's opinion this argument is completely fallacious. The writer believes that in any war in which an enemy of the United States has at its command atomic bombs of either the fission (original atomic bomb) or fusion (thermonuclear or hydrogen bomb) type, and considers the canal a military objective of sufficient importance to warrant its attack, either type of canal is sufficiently vulnerable to be effectively put out of commission for the duration of such war.

There are only two possible ways of preventing such an outcome—first, by an international agreement preventing war, or, second, by an air defense of the canal area that would preclude the proximity of enemy bombers. The writer doubts the practicability of arriving at or enforcing any international agreement that envisions wars of global extent between great powers, but effectively bans the use of atomic bombs in such wars.

Any war in which atomic bombs are used, by either or both belligerents, is certain to be a short one—measured by weeks or months rather than by years.

The possible damage to the canal in the event of such war must not be envisioned as occurring only to the canal channel or structures proper, nor as the dropping of a single bomb. The attack, if made, would involve the effects of numerous, perhaps a dozen or more bombs, directed at the canal proper, and at shops, powerplants, storehouses and centers of population in and adjacent to the Canal Zone.

The hydrogen bomb we dropped at Bikini created a crater approximately a mile in diameter and of a depth far greater than the bottom of the proposed sea-level canal. What would such a bomb do if dropped in the unstable strata section referred to in "A" above? What would such bombs do to the population of Panama and Colon, and of the various towns in the Canal Zone housing employees of the canal? What would happen to their sources of electric light and power and water, and to their food supplies?

It would appear to be obvious that in the case of such an eventuality the canal itself would be blocked, its navigational service, supply and repair activities paralyzed, and there would be neither personnel, equipment, nor material or supplies available for the restoration of essential canal operations, within the possible duration of such a war.

If such an attack on the canal were, as would probably be the case, accompanied by simultaneous attacks on our major productive centers and seaports in the United States, on cities such as Boston, New York,

Philadelphia, Washington, Pittsburgh, Detroit, Chicago, Kansas City, St. Louis, New Orleans, San Francisco, etc., etc., the restoration of Panama Canal navigation would be rendered still more impossible.

The opinion of members and experts of the Atomic Energy Commission and of scientists who have been engaged in our atomic energy developments on this question should be sought by Congress.

F. ACTION BY CONGRESS

In the light of the foregoing discussion, and of the serious objections to the sea-level plan by numerous and eminent engineers, including almost every engineer and executive still living who was engaged in a responsible position during the design and construction of the present canal, the least the Congress could do is to enact legislation such as that contemplated in H. R. 3258 and S. 611. Those bills do not attempt to decide the issue, but to ensure to the Congress the unbiased opinion of highly competent Army, Navy and civilian experts, to the end that whatever policy the Congress may choose to adopt, it will, to use your own expression, at least be a wisely reasoned one.

Sincerely yours,

W. H. ROSE,
Brigadier General, Honorary Retired List, United States Army, Former Civil Assistant to Chief of Engineers, 1941–46.

APRIL 15, 1957.

MY DEAR SENATOR MARTIN: I have your letter of the 9th inst. You have done me the honor to ask my views with respect to the future of the Panama Canal.

In response—and for whatever they may be worth—I herewith submit certain comments.

1. In the world at large there is being pushed the proposal for the internationalization of the Panama Canal. The communistic governments and international communism have been, and are, strongly in favor of such internationalization; and, emboldened by the marvelous success in helping to bring about the liquidation of the power and authority of the free nations—while, at the same time, retaining and increasing their unprecedented and ever-growing dominion over tremendous areas and vast populations of the world—they are pressing for the surrender, in one or another way, by the United States, of all its authority and control of the Panama Canal. There is also non-Communistic sentiment in free countries—including some in our own—for such internationalization. There is growing insistence that the United States step out of the picture, notwithstanding the fact that throughout its connection with the Panama Canal enterprise it has scrupulously observed the treaty agreements involved, and since the completion of the great waterway it has, in compliance with existing treaties, operated the canal under terms of equality for all the nations and without any discrimination in behalf of its own shipping.

Then there is a fast growing sentiment in Panama for the nationalization of the canal by that country, the recently developed Suez Canal status being urged as a precedent—though, in fact, the two situations appear to be quite dissimilar.

In no plan calling for the relinquishment of the rights of the United States in and about the maintenance and operation of the Canal has there been any suggestion—so far as I am advised—for the reimbursement to our Nation of the vast net outlay incurred by it—at the expense of its taxpayers—in the construction and protection of the canal.

The questions are so grave that it is of the utmost importance—for the benefit of all concerned—that the position of our own Government in the premises be, at the earliest possible moment, fully and formally stated.

To this end, I am sure that it would be most helpful if the Congress should adopt an appropriate resolution or declaration recording its views and judgment touching these questions. As to Panama, it is to be hoped that the spirit of friendship and good will, so long existing between the two countries, may continue and that all substantial questions of variance may be solved in the spirit of amity and affectionate esteem which has generally characterized the dealings between the two countries since Panama became an independent nation.

The United States would certainly never have undertaken the construction, maintenance, and operation of the Panama Canal—all at tremendous cost and much sacrifice—except for the treaty arrangements involved; and no nation but the United States could have performed the tremendous task required. I believe it is best for ourselves, for our friends in Panama, and for the entire world that the United States continue its authority and control over the operation of the canal in strict accord with its treaty obligations and, except for which obligations, its work in the building of the canal would never have been undertaken. Should it ever come to pass that the authority of the United States for the maintenance and operation of the canal shall cease, it must likewise be absolved from any further responsibility in that connection. Certainly it cannot afford to have responsibility without authority.

2. Assuming that the United States will continue in the control and operation of the Panama Canal, the question of its increased capacity is becoming more and more urgent because of growing shipping requirements. While I do not speak as a civil engineer, my service on the Isthmian Canal Commission and as head of the civil administration of the Canal Zone during several years of the construction period, as well as my continued study of the problems of the canal ever since, have caused me to favor what is called the terminal lake-third locks project. I think such plan would be greatly superior and more satisfactory than that involved in the sea-level design. The former would require no new treaty arrangements; but new treaty arrangements, it appears, would be required in the sea-level plan; and these would certainly bring increased demands by Panama as to indemnity and annuities, together with other complications. Moreover, the funds required for any major development of the canal would be exacted from our own taxpayers—just as was the case in the original construction—and the terminal lake-third locks project would entail far less expenditure than that which would be necessary in constructing a sea-level design: not more, perhaps, than 1 billion in the former, and between 5 and 10 billion in the latter. With the staggering public debt of the United States already approaching the unprecedented $300 billion mark, other things being equal, it is certainly the part of wisdom to choose the lower cost. It would be criminal stupidity for the United States to spend a vast sum for major improvements of the existing canal—all at the expense of our taxpayers—only to surrender the finished work to some other power or authority.

3. My judgment is that for navigational purposes the present canal is best adapted for efficient results; it has proven successful for the entire period that it has been in service; and with the removal of the Pedro Miguel locks and the grouping of the three Pacific locks in the manner of those at Gatun, the canal would be navigationally improved, certain navigational dangers eliminated, greater anchorage provided for ships on the Pacific side, and other benefits secured.

4. As to the sea-level design, it appears that the basic and most important argument that was formally submitted some years ago in its behalf was that the canal would provide greater security—that it to say, greater security from nuclear attack. It seems to me that whatever force there may have been in this contention at that time, since then the tremendous increase achieved in the destructive force of nuclear bombs has wholly destroyed any idea that any form of canal could escape obliteration under modern nuclear attack. Not only this, but there is every reason to believe that there will be further and greater destructive agencies of nuclear character developed in the years to come; and that it is altogether futile to expect or hope that the Panama Canal can be protected against these forces in any way except that which the United States through two World Wars and the Korean conflict has, with great skill and never-failing watchfulness, provided. Should the internationalization of the Panama Canal, or its nationalization by any other country, ever take place, such status of the canal would never be respected by the Communistic countries if and when it appeared to be to their interest to act in an adverse manner.

5. As to the engineering problems which would be involved in the two designs for increased capacity of the Panama Canal, it is significant that all surviving engineers—practically without exception—of the construction days who had substantial experience in the building of the canal oppose the sea-level design and strongly favor the terminal lake-third locks project.

As I understand the plan for the sea-level design, it would have as a feature the deepening of Gaillard (Culebra) Cut by something like 100 feet. Having for some years, during the construction period, observed the tremendous slides occurring in that region, I cannot escape the belief that if an attempt should be made thus to deepen the Cut, these slides would recur in far greater volume and more devastating effect than obtained during the construction period. In consequence, there is presented an unknown, but certainly vastly sinister, factor of tremendous importance. In case of nuclear attack, the great Cut would certainly be as vulnerable as would be the existing locks; and if through such attack the Cut should be filled with obstruction, it would require as much time and effort to clear it as would be required in the construction of the locks. Moreover, in this connection a sea-level design would require tidal locks and a great dike system to confine the Chagres River—and these features would be likewise vulnerable to such attack. In the event of the indicated destruction in the case of war, it is highly improbable that the restoration could be made until the conflict ceased. Hence, it is difficult to believe that under the improvements involved in nuclear development, the question of relative security in different types of the canal would have intrinsic bearing; and the major questions remain, namely, navigational facility, cost, and freedom from new treaty requirements; and as to these certainly the terminal lake-third locks plan is to be preferred.

6. It is my judgment that the best and wisest manner of dealing with these canal problems is the creation of an Interoceanic Canals Commission, as proposed in identical (nonpartisan) bills introduced in the present session of Congress—in the Senate by yourself and in the House by Representatives THOMPSON, of Texas; FLOOD, of Pennsylvania; and DORN, of New York. Such a body, properly constituted and vested with the fullest measure of independence, could make the required up-to-date studies and present to the President and to the Congress wise and adequate recommendations—not only as regards the Panama Canal, but, as well, concerning the entire subject of interoceanic canals. This proposed legislation, I believe, should receive prompt con-

sideration and approval. The time undoubtedly has come for action.

Sincerely yours,

MAURICE H. THATCHER,
Former and Only Surviving Member of Isthmian Canal Commission and Head of Department of Civil Administration of the Canal Zone, 1910–13.

AMERICA'S MAIL SERVICE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Nation wants a solution to the mail problem.

Probably millions of words have already been written and spoken about the serious problem caused by the drastic curtailment of mail service, as ordered by Postmaster General Summerfield.

There are all sorts of explanations of why it happened, how it happened, who is to blame, and so forth.

So far as I am concerned, the really important thing is to act constructively so as to make sure that this postal snafu does not occur again.

The American people are entitled to adequate, efficient mail service.

At the same time, there is no question but that the enormous postal deficit problem must be met.

I send to the desk a brief statement which I have prepared. It outlines some of the many factors, as I see them, in this situation.

Appended are excerpts from letters and telegrams from a good many of the messages which have come to me from mail users back home.

I ask unanimous consent that this statement and appended materials be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

In all the maze of charges and countercharges, certain facts emerge:

THIRD-CLASS USERS DEPEND ON MAIL CRUCIALLY

1. The first fact is that America's business economy depends very heavily upon the mails.

This is especially true of third-class mail. Yet it is this mail in which the Postmaster General has threatened a paralyzing embargo.

I need hardly point out that there is a tremendous variety of American business—from the corner grocery store to multimillion-dollar mail order businesses, whose life and death, businesswise, depends upon prompt and efficient delivery of direct mail.

There are a vast number of printing establishments, including some of the smallest letterpress and offset shops whose "bread and butter" is this third class printing.

Thus, to embargo such mail would, in my judgment, constitute a direct threat to the very existence of these enterprises. Such a threat cannot be justified.

FORTY MILLION HOUSEHOLDS NEED MAIL

2. There is, however, a larger interest. It is the interest of 40 million householders. There is not a single household in America which does not rely upon the mail—first, second, third, or fourth class—for some purpose or another.

And the fact of the matter is that, already, mail service to our 40 million and more households is recognized as inadequate.

I think that one of the best descriptions of this situation—at least so far as we of Wisconsin are concerned—was contained in an editorial in the Friday, April 12 Milwaukee Journal.

MILWAUKEE JOURNAL DESCRIBES POOR MAIL SERVICE

It described the amazing slowness and irregularity of mail service.

Here are some excerpts from that editorial:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal of April 12, 1957]

"RAISE POSTAL RATES AND KEEP SERVICE FROM GETTING WORSE

"In 1836, when Belmont was the territorial capital of Wisconsin, the hamlet of eight buildings enjoyed daily mail service via stagecoach.

"This week a letter mailed in Madison at 5 p. m. Tuesday reached the Journal office Thursday noon—43 hours after it started its 77-mile trip from the capital to the State's biggest city.

"It is service like this that makes so ironic Postmaster General Summerfield's determination to curtail the service further in his row with Congress. The truth is that the service is incredibly bad now. And although Summerfield insists that he has made 'more than 1,000 improvements' since he took office in 1953, what counts with the average householder and businessman is when he gets his mail and how often.

"No change has been made in the 1950 cutback from twice a day to only once a day home delivery, and the single round of the letter carrier may reach your residence at any hour. Post office clerks no longer try to trace address changes through city directories and phone books. A letter posted in Milwaukee today may or may not reach its destination in Wauwatosa tomorrow. (Consider the difference in London; there an invitation to tea dropped in the collection box in the morning will reach a guest in ample time for him to keep the appointment.)

"A paradox of the service is that the more distant the point to which a letter is dispatched the less relative time it takes in transit. Milwaukee has overnight air mail service to Washington, and recently the Journal received dispatches of a roving correspondent from India, Burma, and Singapore in 4 or 5 days and communications from South Africa in 5 or 6."

THE POST OFFICE'S HUGE PROBLEM

3. Let it, however, be pointed out in all frankness that there is a third factor, and that is:

That in 1955 some 54 billion pieces of mail were handled—more than all the mail in the rest of the world. As pointed out in the Milwaukee Journal editorial, the load still further increased last year.

The Post Office has made a great many improvements in its service, but obviously not enough improvements.

All the while, let it be stated in all fairness and frankness that postal expenses have risen. I refer to the costs of postal employees' salaries (but postal unions urgently feel "not high enough") plus the rising cost of operating machinery, the cost of materials, etc.

STAGGERING POSTAL RED-INK TOTALS

4. And so a fourth factor is the staggering Post Office deficit. Since World War II American taxpayers have had to make up deficits in the mail that have totaled almost $5½ billion.

The three-quarter-billion-dollar deficit in prospect cannot be ignored. Somehow that deficit must be reduced. Somehow a reasonable compromise must be found.

But the deficit must be reduced in a way which will not destroy businesses which depend upon the mail.

DON'T KILL BUSINESS GOOSE THAT LAYS GOLDEN EGG

We cannot and must not kill the goose that lays the golden egg.

If a mail-order business or a printshop thrives, it pays taxes to Uncle Sam and it pays mail costs to Uncle Sam.

But if the business is knocked out by destroying its mail service, then Uncle Sam gets no taxes from that business; the enterprises' employees are thrown out of work.

And the postal service loses that much of a customer.

Wisconsin, I may say, is one of the great printing States—one of the great graphic arts States of this Nation. The printing industry can hardly be ignored in its vital needs.

IS POST OFFICE'S COST ACCOUNTING SOUND?

5. Another key aspect of the situation is: Just what are the actual costs of the various classes of mail? How much of a deficit really occurs in each category?

Experts differ.

Many experts say, however, that the Post Office's accounting system is wrong; that it does not allocate costs efficiently and accurately.

GIVE A BREAK TO THE MAILMAN

6. Still another factor to which I have already referred is that the postal unions feel that postal salaries are again under the levels that they should be.

There is a considerable employee turnover in the Post Office Department because of a feeling that salaries are unfair and inadequate.

This factor—the factor of employee morale—too, must be considered.

In all the welter of criticisms which have been flung about there are very few, if any, Americans who dispute the fact that the employees of the Post Office Department are trying to do an honest, conscientious job.

The faithful American mailman is certainly not the one to be criticized. He is carrying an enormous burden on his back, literally and figuratively.

These, then, are some of the factors which bear upon consideration.

POST OFFICE COMMITTEE HEARINGS SUGGESTED

I am not personally a member of the Senate Post Office Committee. So I cannot assert that I have any prepackaged solutions to this situation.

I do know that it is absolutely indispensable that Congress promptly authorize the supplemental funds, as the House has now done.

Comprehensive hearings should likewise be held on the overall postal situation.

There should be no recriminations on a personal basis. Rather, there should be an effective effort to find the answers in a constructive, nonpartisan fashion, once and for all.

To the extent that the post office can be further modernized, it certainly should be.

It should be streamlined for the sort of high-speed, high-accuracy operations which will give the American people the best possible service at the lowest possible cost.

REPRESENTATIVE MESSAGES FROM GRASSROOTS

There follow now excerpts from a flood of letters and telegrams to me.

In respect of the confidence in which private individuals wrote, I have omitted their names.

Where individuals wrote however, on a public basis on behalf of their organizations, I have included their names.

"EVANSVILLE, WIS.

"Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
"Washington, D. C.:

"The Wisconsin Advertising Publishers Association joins with other publishers and direct-mail advertisers in protesting the proposed embargo on third-class mail; such a ban would necessitate suspension of the service we offer businessmen and residents of communities where our shopping guides are the only media reaching every urban and rural home. Merchants depending on our

publications to reach their customers would suffer loss of revenue. Shopping guides are published in over 60 Wisconsin communities and in hundreds of communities throughout the United States. All would feel serious effects of a third-class mail embargo.

"Mrs. ROSE P. EHLE,
"For Wisconsin Advertising Publishers Association."

"MILWAUKEE, WIS.

"Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
"Senate Office Building,
"Washington, D. C.:

"In connection with Postmaster General order No. 56314, the Wisconsin Manufacturers Association, a traffic committee of 62 industrial manufacturers in Wisconsin and Illinois request that you take immediate action to retain third-class mail services which the order requests to be discontinued April 29, 1957.

"CUTLER HAMMER, INC.,
"M. I. ADAMS,
"Traffic Manager, chairman, Express Mail and Parcel Post Committee WMA."

KAUKAUNA, WIS., *April 8, 1957.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In reading the newspapers, following television and radio, regarding the question of the curtailment of mail delivery to the American people, the question of dollars seems to be more important and out of proportion to the damages that could be done if Congress does not give relief to one of the greater branches of governmental services which are given to the people and which is a great factor in our economy and is part of our everyday life.

I hope that Congress will realize the fact that the great increase in population also has meant such an increase in mail delivery and which will continue. Congress will have to make a decision as to whether they want to give the American people the kind of service which they are asking for. We all realize that the postal employees of today are underpaid in any comparative study in what involves hard work, public relations, and presenting themselves as one of the finest of the Government workers.

In the beginning of this great service, in the days of the Pony Express, the longer the horse carried the mail, the more oats and feed were given him to carry on this American institution, so I hope Congress will follow the voice of the pioneers in regard to mail delivery and give the Postal Department a small piece off of one of the foreign-relief bills to maintain the proposed mail service in the United States. I trust that they will also see fit to realize that the postal employees are a very important part of every community and every city and the services rendered by them, to the public, are reflection of clear thinking in Washington.

I hope that you see fit to use your influence and that the Postal Department's request is granted so that there will be no interference of the orderly running of the Postal Department in the United States.

Respectfully yours,

JOSEPH F. BAYORGEON,
Mayor.

MEDFORD, WIS., *April 8, 1957.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: You are aware I believe that we have in the Medford, Wis., community a group of organized rural people affiliated with the National Farmers Union.

We are of course interested in efficient Government in connection with necessary services to the citizens of the United States.

We are aware of the terrific tax burden the American taxpayers are compelled to shoulder and the constantly increasing national debt due in part, we must admit, to the services we Americans demand.

In spite of these facts, however, we feel that expansion of our economy would suffer severely if postal services were to be curtailed, a service which we feel is so all inclusive and so uniformly beneficial to every American citizen.

We hope you will be on our side and join us in protesting the threatened curtailment of postal service which we understand may include nondelivery of mail on Saturdays and discontinuance of issuing of money orders.

Yours sincerely,

CHAS. PAUR,
Deer Creek Farmers Union.

A Wisconsin daily newspaper spokesman:

"Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
"Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

"Summerfield's service curtailment threat means chaos for daily newspapers, even if temporary. Mail subscribers will not receive Friday editions until Monday. Saturday's edition probably won't get handled before Tuesday. I need not remind you the wholesale cancellations facing us, not to mention a shutting off of advertising revenue because of delay. Few of us can survive a jolt like that."

A planograph printing plant:

APRIL 8, 1957.

"Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
"United States Senate,
"Washington, D. C.:

"If third-class matter is ruled out by Post Office Department on April 29 it will put us out of business; throw 11 persons completely out of work; cut off 13 part-time employees, and destroy a $100,000 business. This would be repeated in many Wisconsin communities. We cannot even afford to suspend 1 week. Will you do utmost to help solve post-office problem."

A printing firm in Madison writes:

"APRIL 10, 1955.

"Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
"Senate Office Building,
"Washington, D. C.:

"DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We are very much disturbed by Postmaster General Summerfield's arbitrary order No. 56314 of April 5. A refusal on the part of the post office to handle third-class mail, particularly on such short notice, would wreak havoc in business. It would hit the entire graphic-arts field directly and severely.

"Direct-mail campaigns are laid out months in advance of mailing. For example, we are now working on our Christmas cheese mailers and soon will be in production on them. Normally, this work is completed early in August. Most of the accounts for which we do these jobs live entirely as mail-order houses, moving vast quantities of Wisconsin cheese throughout the country. The Postmaster's order, if put into effect, would put all of these people out of business quickly and effectively—and in turn disrupt the marketing of Wisconsin cheese.

"This brief outline of the problem indicates the widespread disorganization and hardship which the Postmaster's order would effect.

"Anything you can do to help avert the disaster which would follow the Postmaster's order will be sincerely appreciated.

"Very truly yours."

AMONSON LETTER SERVICE,
Oshkosh, Wis., April 12, 1957.

Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Representative WILLIAM VAN PELT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the employees of the firm of Amonson Letter Service, respectfully request that you do all in your power to prevent or discontinue the proposed embargo on third-class mail.

An embargo, for even a very short period of time, would work a serious hardship on every employee and if continued for even 3 months would mean eventual financial ruin for our company.

We resent the highhanded and discriminatory manner in which this embargo is to be placed and the shameful, self-serving publicity given to the matter by the press.

Third-class mail represents a major portion of our work, as it must to every direct-mail letter shop, and the loss of this business could ruin every direct-mail shop in the United States.

Again we ask you, for the sake of small business, to do all you can to stop this un-American abuse of authority and the ruination of our livelihood and jobs.

Respectfully yours,

E. B. AMONSON.
LOIS TREISE.
JANET LEMKE.
NANCY AHRENS.
H. O. AMONSON.

A small-business problem:

"Hon. Senator WILEY,
"Washington, D. C.

"DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We are publishers of a weekly shoppers' guide. * * * It serves 6,000 homes, and many persons have become dependent upon it for their daily buying.

"Continued publication * * * is seriously jeopardized by the Postmaster General's dictum to place an embargo on third-class mai matter. Needless to say complete discontinuance of third-class mail would simply put ourselves out of business, along with the hundreds of other shoppers that serve well their communities.

"We appeal to you in the interests of many persons to do everything within your power to prevent such an embargo from going into effect.

"If the needs of the Post Office Department are so great, why is it not possible to demand that second-class mailers pay their fair share of the postal rates?

"Very truly yours."

A publisher in Milwaukee:

"MILWAUKEE, WIS.

"Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
"Senate Office Building,
"Washington, D. C.:

"Milwaukee Post Office advises our publication * * * mailed under section 34.64, Postal Laws and Regulations, will not be accepted in view of Post Office Department restrictions; this means controlled circulation magazines will be put out of business; what is being done to alleviate this confiscating situation?

A Milwaukee publishing house:

"APRIL 9, 1957.

"Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
"Senate Office Building,
"Washington, D. C.

"DEAR SENATOR WILEY: As you know, hearings are being held at the present time by

both the Senate and House on proposed increases on postal rates. As a publisher of three trade publications we can be seriously affected by the extent of these increases.

"We recognize the problems with which the Post Office Department is faced. We do not oppose increases in rates for the various classes of mail, but we do oppose excessive increases which may seriously affect the entire publication industry, particularly smaller publishers such as ourselves which use the second-class privileges and who must rely on the mails entirely for their distribution.

"These smaller magazines are to the largest extent made up of trade papers. It is through these trade papers that the dissemination of information within industries is largely accomplished. The growth and progress of the smaller businesses are actively tied to the trade publications serving their respective industries. Anything that would affect the growth of small business in this country would, in our opinion, affect the entire economy.

"It was with this in mind that we are writting to you and ask that you express our position at this time to the members of both the House and Senate Post Office Committees. It would be our recommendation that an incerase in second-class rates be limited to not more than 10 percent per annum for a limit of 3 years.

"I would appreciate hearing from you as to what position you will take when and if new legislation regarding increases in the postal rates are presented to Congress.

"Sincerely yours,

"ROBERT H. APPLE."

A leading Wisconsin newspaperman:

"Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
"United States Senator,
"Washington, D. C.

"DEAR SENATOR: I am much disturbed over the threat of Postmaster General Summerfield to discontinue Saturday rural deliveries. This would mean that our farm subscribers, of which we have a large number, would not receive their Friday paper until Monday. That would be definitely bad, and would generate a squawk that will be heard all the way from here to Washington.

"In talking to the local post office officials, I gather that nothing will be saved by elimination of rural deliveries because the rural carriers would not be cut one-sixth in pay. I understand they are on an annual pay basis, and that their pay would not be affected.

"Our newspapers reach the post office by 5 o'clock each afternoon. The bags are tossed down a chute to the rural carriers' room in the basement. Each rural carrier sorts the mail on Saturday morning, and gets everything in order for the delivery trip. All other mail coming into the post office on Friday also is shot down to the rural carrier room on Friday and is sorted by the rural carriers on Saturday morning. So nothing is saved by eliminating rural service on Saturday.

"It seems to me that the Summerfield order is too far-reaching—more far-reaching than necessary to accomplish the end he says he must accomplish, namely the saving of $47 million.

"With kindest personal regards, I remain,

"Sincerely yours."

A citizen in Eau Claire:

"APRIL 13, 1957.

"Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
"Senate Office Building,
"Washington, D. C.

"DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I am writing to you concerning the request of Mr. Summerfield for sufficient money to operate the Post Office Department. I think that you should give Postmaster General Summerfield the rest of the $47 million he asked for.

"We are on a rural mail route and we get very poor service at best. Six years ago, we received our mail at 11:30 a. m. but right now, we do not get it before 2:30 p. m. If our mail service is curtailed through insufficient funds, we will probably have none at all.

"Yours very truly."

A postal union for the Lake Winnebago area:

"APRIL 11, 1957.

"Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
"Senate Building,
"Washington, D. C.

"DEAR SIR: I am writing with the hope that some quick action will be taken to appropriate more money for the Post Office Department.

"The morale in this office has dropped 100 percent. Fellows with many years of faithful service are beginning to wonder if they will still have jobs, while the younger fellows in the service will surely be put out of work. The cut in funds will create problems for the townspeople as well as the postal employees and their families.

"If the Post Office Department has ever needed help, the time is now. We hope you will do everything in your power to help appropriate more money for the Department.

"Hoping to hear from you regarding this matter, I remain."

A major publishing enterprise in Milwaukee:

"Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
"Senate Office Building,
"Washington, D. C.:

"Most urgent that you take immediate action to prevent embargo of third-class mail. Embargo would cripple our company, cause major losses, and disrupt employment of 150 people."

A publisher in Madison:

"MADISON, WIS., *April 8, 1957.*

"Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
"United States Senate,
"Washington, D. C.:

"Third-class mail is the life blood of our business. Without it our employees would be thrown out of work, and it would seriously affect our suppliers and customers. We are alarmed and appalled at Summerfield's threat to discontinue third-class service. We appeal to you to exercise your good influence to prevent this catrastrophe."

A publisher in southern Wisconsin:

"BURLINGTON, WIS., *April 8, 1957.*

"Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
"Senate Office Buiding,
"Washington, D. C.:

"The undersigned herewith vigorously protest the suspension of third-class mail privileges. It will result in our immediately being put out of business and will disrupt the entire advertising program of a substantial number of local merchants who depend on this media for communicating their wares and merchandise to the people of a large area. We have a 3-year lease on a new building, contracts with staff employees and a substantial investment in our present business. We cannot operate for a single issue without this third-class mail privilege. A number of employees will be put out of work as well. We urge your immediate attention to a reconsideration of this matter."

ADVERTISING BY ELECTRIC POWER AND LIGHT COMPANIES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, for some time now the privately owned electric power and light companies have been running an advertising campaign designed to attack TVA, Niagara, Hells Canyon, the REAs, and public power generally.

Much of this advertising is of a false and misleading nature.

It was undertaken following a survey made for the National Association of Electric Companies, which showed that TVA was very popular but socialism was not, and, therefore, the cold-blooded decision was made to link TVA with socialism, and the electric companies' advertising program was formed.

I have been in correspondence with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue concerning this advertising to determine how it is treated for tax purposes. At the conclusion of my remarks, I shall ask that the Commissioner's letter be printed in the RECORD.

However, I am glad to inform the Senate that as a result of this correspondence the Commissioner tells me that he has ordered his field forces to make a study of the advertising in question and its relationship to proposed legislation.

He states that it is the rule of the Internal Revenue Service "not to allow deductions of expenditures where the facts of the case indicate that they were incurred primarily for lobbying purposes, for the promotion or defeat of legislation, for political purposes, for the development of exploitation of propaganda (including advertising other than trade advertising) relating to any of the foregoing purposes, or for the furtherance of matters in the area of political controversy."

I submit that an impartial study of the electric companies' advertising will show that it violates all these criteria and therefore should not be deductible.

I have no present estimate on the amount of money spent, but it is considerable. I have a booklet published by the Saturday Evening Post reprinting all the advertisements which appeared in that journal alone through 1956. There are 169 of them. The advertising agency in publishing this booklet claims credit for helping shift public opinion 12 percent in the course of the campaign.

There is little doubt in my mind that these companies have been charging the public, through income tax deductions, for their own brainwashing. For the Treasury to now retrieve this money would be not only just and fair, but a great help to the small taxpayers who have been bearing the brunt of the cost of government.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter dated March 21, 1957, addressed to me by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue; also a memorandum containing a copy of Internal Revenue Ruling 54–442, together with the pertinent provisions of the Internal Revenue Code dealing with this subject matter.

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

UNITED STATES TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., March 21, 1957.

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
Chairman, Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: This is in reply to your letter of February 20, 1957,

concerning the deductibility for Federal income tax purposes of amounts expended by electric companies in connection with the "Electric Company's Advertising Program".

Photostatic copies of three advertisements which recently appeared in National magazines were submitted with your letter. These advertisements were under the sponsorship of "America's Electric Light and Power Companies" and "America's Independent Electric Light and Power Companies", which are said to include some 50 electric companies.

You inquire as to whether the costs to the individual companies for placement of these advertisements is classified as a business expense and whether there has been a ruling on this matter.

To be deductible, advertising expenses must be ordinary and necessary and bear a reasonable relationship to the business activities in which the enterprise is engaged. Whether expenditures of this nature meet the requirements of section 162 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and the regulations applicable thereto, as deductible business expenses, involves a question of fact, the determination of which is made by the field office at the time of examination of the taxpayer's income tax return. It has been the consistent practice of the Internal Revenue Service, however, not to allow deductions of expenditures where the facts of the case indicate that they were incurred primarily for lobbying purposes, for the promotion or defeat of legislation, for political purposes, for the development or exploitation of propaganda (including advertising other than trade advertising) relating to any of the foregoing purposes, or for the furtherance of matters in the area of political controversy. The basis for the nonallowance is that such expenditures do not meet the requirements of the Internal Revenue Code and regulations as ordinary and necessary and directly connected with the carrying on of the taxpayer's trade or business.

It is not clear whether the advertisements in question are sponsored by a formal organization or by individual companies. However, a copy of Revenue Ruling 54-442, which sets forth the Internal Revenue Service's position with respect to amounts paid to certain organizations, is enclosed for your information.

I have directed our field forces to make a study of the import of the magazine advertisements in question and their relationship to any proposed legislation. If it is determined that the principal purpose of the independent utility companies, who paid for the costs of the advertisements, was lobbying or attempting by propaganda or otherwise to promote or defeat legislation, the amounts of such payments would not be allowable deductions.

Very truly yours,

RUSSELL C. HARRINGTON,
Commissioner.

COPY OF REVENUE RULING 54-442, AS PUBLISHED IN CUMULATIVE BULLETIN 1954-2, PAGE 131

Regulations 118, section 39.101(7)-1: Business leagues, chambers of commerce, real-estate boards, and boards of trade.

"A corporation organized and operated primarily for the purpose of promoting a common business interest and bettering the conditions of independent business, whose activities include the furtherance of a legislative program in connection therewith, is exempt from Federal income taxation under the provisions of section 101 (7) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939."

Advice is requested whether a corporation organized and operated primarily for the purposes of promoting a common business interest and bettering the conditions of independent business, whose activities include the furtherance of a legislative program in carrying out those purposes, is exempt from Federal income taxation under the provisions of section 101 (7) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939.

Section 101 (7) of the code provides for the exemption of:

"(7) Business leagues, chambers of commerce, real estate boards, or boards of trade, not organized for profit and no part of the earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual."

There is no prohibition in the statute or regulations relating to section 101 (7) which disqualifies a corporation from exemption for legislative activities so long as such activities are only incidental and the purposes of the organization are to promote a common business interest and to improve business conditions of one or more lines of business, and it is shown by its actual activities that it is operating for those purposes.

Accordingly, it is held that a corporation organized and operated primarily for the purposes of promoting a common business interest and bettering the conditions of independent business, whose activities include the furtherance of a legislative program in connection therewith, is exempt from Federal income taxation under the provisions of section 101 (7) of the code.

However, with respect to dues, assessments or other payments, to organizations such as the foregoing, it should be noted that section 39.23 (o)-1 (f) and 39.23 (q)-1 (a) of regulations 118 provides that "sums of money expended for lobbying purposes, the promotion or defeat of legislation," etc., are not deductible from gross income. This provision is also applicable to deductions for business expenses under section 23 (a) of the code. *Textile Mills Securities Corp.* v. *Commissioner* (314 U. S. 326, Ct. D. 1532, C. B. 1941-2, 200); *Roberts Dairy Co.* v. *Commissioner* (195 F. 2d 948, cert. den. 344 U. S. 865). It accordingly follows that all payments made to such organizations are not necessarily deductible. Whether or not any portion of such payments is deductible must be determined on the facts of each case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not morning business is closed.

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

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

TRANSFER OF RIGHT-OF-WAY FOR YELLOWTAIL DAM AND RESERVOIR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has met today pursuant to an adjournment. Therefore the unfinished business will not be laid before the Senate automatically until 2 o'clock. The Senate may by motion take up any bill for consideration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the measure which was the unfinished business at the close of the session yesterday, Calendar No. 217, Senate Joint Resolution 12, relating to the Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir project, be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 12) 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD obtained the floor.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, does the Senator intend to make a statement in connection with the joint resolution?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed. However, if the Senator desires, I shall insert my statement in favor of Yellowtail Dam at this point in the RECORD, and then the Senator can answer my statement. The Senator knows pretty well what is in my statement.

Mr. WATKINS. I think I do.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MANSFIELD ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 12, YELLOWTAIL DAM AND RESERVOIR

The Senate is considering today Senate Joint Resolution 12 which will remove the one remaining obstacle to the development of one of the few remaining natural power sites in the country—Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir. The construction of this project will give a needed shot-in-the-arm to the economy of eastern Montana and northern Wyoming. It will provide power in an area with power demands exceeding production; it will bring arid lands under irrigation; and it will provide flood control and recreation, in addition to a number of other subsidiary benefits.

Briefly, the purpose of Senate Joint Resolution 12 is to provide for the transfer of right-of-way of approximately 7,000 acres of land for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir and payment of $5 million to the Crow Indian Tribe in this connection. The facts and elaborate testimony have been presented and explored by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on several occasions. They support, in my judgment, the just and fair compensation as set forth in this joint resolution. A position subscribed to by the Senate committee.

I should like to limit my discussion to the more important aspects of this legislation, so that the Senate may act expeditiously in approving Senate Joint Resolution 12.

Testimony in behalf of this joint resolution has cited two precedents for the $5 million payment—Kerr Dam in western Montana and Pelton Dam in Oregon. In both instances special values and justifiable considerations were essential factors where Indian lands for power site purposes are being leased by private utilities at rates which in a 50-year period yield proportionately more than the proposed payment in this resolution. This procedure has been subscribed to as reasonable by the Federal Power Commission, and the Department of the Interior. What we are asking in this joint resolution is equitable treatment for the Crow Indians.

The Flathead Indians at Kerr Dam are receiving an annual payment of $175,000 and the Warm Spring Indians are receiving $90,000 for their lands at the Pelton project. Over a 50-year period the Indian charges will be $7,377,000 and $3,952,000 respectively. In view of these precedents and the multi-

purpose benefits derived from a completed Yellowtail Dam, I feel that the $5 million figure is justifiable.

I point out that since a third generator has been installed at Kerr Dam, the Flathead Indians are currently negotiating for additional compensation from the utility company in view of this new power revenue.

The Yellowtail Dam settlement will be an outright purchase, allowing certain reservations for the Crow Indians as set forth in this joint resolution, as opposed to a lease at Kerr and Pelton Dams.

In a report submitted to the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on February 5, the Bureau of the Budget states that these precedents should not be considered because they are private concerns, licensed under the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Act. The utilities are private profit-making organizations and cannot be compared with the Federal Government's operations, but it is the duty of the FPC and the Interior Department to see that the interests of the Indians and the consumers of power from these projects are protected.

The Federal Power Commission is an arm of the Congress, and it is difficult to see why the recognition of power-site values at Kerr and Pelton Dam sites are not a sufficient precedent for their recognition by the Congress itself in the case of Yellowtail Dam site.

The fact that Indians constitute a special case is well established in our law. Aside from this, I feel that the $5 million payment is very reasonable when you compute the total payment over a period of time. What we are trying to do is give equitable treatment to the Crow Indians. The provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 12 gives this equitable compensation to the Crow Tribe and the completion of the Yellowtail Dam will give the consumer hydroelectric power at reasonable rates.

The Budget Bureau rejects the provision that the reduction in area of the Crow tribal lands to approximately 5 percent of the original area, is partial justification for the $5 million payment. As established, by treaty in 1851, the Crow Indian Reservation in Montana and Wyoming was composed of 38,500,000 acres of land, including valuable grazing and other agricultural lands, as well as vast timber and mineral resources. The Crow Indian Reservation now comprises 2,018,218 acres. To the contrary, this is just one more reason why we should bend over a little backwards to treat these Indians equitably. The approval of this payment should in no way be considered fulfillment of any claims on this matter now pending before the Indian Claims Commission.

The Department of the Interior report on this bill, dated April 2 states the Government's action to acquire the lands by condemnation has proceeded to the point where a judicial determination of the value of the lands would be made relatively soon. In short, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Fred G. Aandahl, stated that "it is unlikely that construction of the Yellowtail undertaking will be long delayed even if the Congress should fail to enact Senate Joint Resolution 12 or some similar measure."

As my Senate colleagues may know, Judge Charles N. Pray of the District Court of the United States ruled in favor of condemnation proceedings on January 8, 1957.

The statement of Assistant Secretary Aandahl rejects the wishes of Congress in this matter as did the President when he vetoed a similar measure in the 84th Congress.

At this point I wish to make it very clear to the Congress and the Executive that I am unalterably opposed to condemnation proceedings. I never have and I never will agree to a position of force in obtaining these lands. My support of the $5 million figure is firmly established and I shall not agree to a cent less.

The original appraisal of the actual value of these lands was set at something under $50,000 without giving consideration to power site values. The Department of Interior, under both Democratic and Republican administrations, has offered the Crow Indians $1½ million for these lands. These offers were not adequate and were rejected by the tribe. At the other extreme there have been proposals recommending $1 million a year on a lease basis for 50 years, at which time the project would revert to tribal ownership. I understand that this suggested payment has been reduced to something like $8 million for the transfer of these lands.

I think it is most interesting to note that the Interior Department's most recent report on this measure cites $2½ million as an agreeable price for these 7,000 acres. This is $1 million more than they had been willing to agree to previously. Perhaps if we wait a few years they will eventually readjust their estimates to favor a $5 million payment. But we do not have time; we need Yellowtail Dam now.

In view of the various offers proposed I feel that the $5 million settlement is just, fair, and equitable, and it is agreed to by the vast majority of those concerned.

The Crow Indian Tribe has been more than cooperative in advancing the development of this vital multipurpose project in southeastern Montana and neighboring Wyoming. On several occasions they have endorsed the $5 million settlement by tribal resolutions, the most recent being January 25, 1957.

This payment was subscribed to by Congress in the last Congress, the Governor of Montana has endorsed the settlement, the people of the Billings-Hardin area of Montana are fully behind it, and most recently the Montana Legislature passed House Joint Memorial No. 4 urging and requesting the enactment of resolutions pending before Congress setting forth a fair and just settlement.

President Eisenhower vetoed Senate Joint Resolution 135 in the last session of Congress. However, I sincerely believe that he will reconsider when he is given all of the facts and their justification.

Before concluding my statement on behalf of Senate Joint Resolution 12 I invite the Senate's attention to the excellent report on this resolution prepared by the Senate Interior Committee. This document is very comprehensive and presents all the legal and factual data supporting the $5 million payment. Also, the report points out an additional precedent for a congressional award as set forth in this joint resolution. I refer specifically to the Boysen Dam case. The additional precedent relates to the right-of-way for the small multi-purpose Boysen Dam in Wyoming. In this instance Congress authorized payment to the Arapahoe and Shoshone Indian tribes that recognized power site values. This power installation is one-eighth of that proposed of Yellowtail Dam and the amount of payment was considerably less but the principle involved is the same as that in Senate Joint Resolution 12.

The approval of Senate Joint Resolution 12 will be the green light for this multipurpose project which has been authorized for over 12 years.

Early and expeditious action on this legislation is imperative so that we can appropriate funds this session of Congress for the beginning of construction of Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir in fiscal year 1958. Any additional delay in meeting the power needs of the Northwest will be detrimental as well as disastrous to the economy of the area.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I rise to state briefly my reasons for opposition to the joint resolution, which I opposed in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and which I oppose in the Senate today.

First of all, let me explain that my opposition to this measure is on its policy precedent of a far-reaching nature, and not on its obvious objective of providing a fair settlement for the Crow Tribe of Indians in Montana. As a member of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee, I have initiated and supported many measures for relief and rehabilitation of our Indian peoples, and I most certainly feel that the Crow Indians deserve equitable treatment where their rights as individuals or as a tribe are concerned. Furthermore, I think that such an equitable settlement on all claims outside of the taking of land for the Yellowtail claim would be made eventually in the Indian Claims Commission, a body established by the Congress for orderly consideration of such claims.

If the proponents of the Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir of the Hardin unit of the Missouri Basin project wish to utilize surplus power revenues to make a large grant to these Indians in addition to just compensation, I most certainly would give it serious and fair consideration on its merits if there was nothing otherwise objectionable or illegal or precedent making involved in such an action. And I most certainly would like to see this delayed Hardin project moved along. It is a sound project and I would like to see it built.

In the bill itself, and in the report, it should be clearly indicated that it is a grant, and not in the nature of a just settlement, as provided in the Constitution, for the taking of properties for public use.

However, I object to the precedent-making action we are asked to take here today of incorporating such an outright grant in addition to just compensation for lands required for a Federal water-resource development. By approving this bill we will be saying, in effect, that the Congress approves as just and equitable compensation the payment of more than 100 times the fair market value of lands required for a reservoir project when the measure of damages, under the constitutional provision for just payment has been established under a long line of court decisions, as the fair market value of the land at the time and place of the taking.

Nothing quite as extreme as this bill proposes to do has ever been done by Congress, and it is my considered opinion that this action could affect future land acquisition for reservoir projects in all States, and possibly involving lands owned by other citizens as well as Indians.

In this connection I think we in the Congress owe a real debt to the executive department for recognizing the far-reaching legal implications of the measure we passed last year, and returning it to us by veto. As you are aware, considerable improvement has been made in the language of this resolution in committee. But lest anyone is unaware of the serious limitations of the bill we reported out and passed last year, I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point the President's veto message of June 8,

1956, with which he returned Senate Joint Resolution 135 of the 84th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair) Is there objection?

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

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO MESSAGE

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 8, 1956.*

To the United States Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, Senate Joint Resolution 135, for payment to Crow Indian Tribe for right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming.

The joint resolution would pay the Crow Indian Tribe, Montana, $5 million as just compensation for certain tribal lands required for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir. The area of the land comprises 5,677.94 acres and such additional land as the Secretary of the Interior determines to be required for the construction of minimum basic recreation facilities for the accommodation of the public, which it is understood will increase the total area to somewhat more than 6,000 acres.

In essence, this resolution culminates a decade of negotiation and disagreement between the Department of the Interior and the Crow Indians with respect to the amount of compensation to be paid to the tribe for lands required for the Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, for which the initial construction appropriation was made in the fiscal year 1956 and for which an additional $10,850,000 was included in the budget for the fiscal year 1957.

The standard of payment for land acquired by the Government is just compensation or fair market value. However, I recognize that, as a matter of policy, the Federal Government has made awards in excess of just compensation in other cases involving Indian lands. If the Congress determines that it wishes to provide for an extra payment in this case, it should not be done under the claim that it is just compensation. The amount, the method for computing it, and the equitable justification for it should be clearly established on acceptable premises. Neither the resolution nor the legislative history does this.

According to my information, the acquisition by the United States of the land contemplated will not interfere with the tribal life, except as to a small area used for grazing, and will not displace any of the members of the tribe since the area is not inhabited and consists almost wholly of inaccessible land, largely of bare, precipitous canyon walls. Thus, the only justification for an additional sum over and above just compensation arises from the value of the land as a power site. General principles of constitutional law exclude power site values in determining just compensation, as the Supreme Court recently reiterated in *United States* v. *Twin City Power Co.*, January 23, 1956.

A statutory settlement of this kind of controversy might be acceptable if soundly and equitably premised, and if it reflected a substantial measure of agreement between parties to the dispute. I regret that the extravagant nature of the award contemplated by Senate Joint Resolution 135 requires this action which may cause some additional delay in proceeding with the construction of the Yellowtail unit. It is my hope that the Congress can approve a statutory settlement which will permit expeditious action to proceed with the construction of this much-needed project.

For these reasons, I have withheld my approval from this measure.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
June 7, 1956.

Mr. WATKINS. Also, in order to show more clearly that the executive agencies do not endorse the mandatory action taken in connection with the revised version, I ask unanimous consent that the 1957 reports of the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of the Interior be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF
THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., February 5, 1957.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your letter of January 14, 1957, requesting the comments of the Bureau of the Budget with respect to Senate Joint Resolution 12, "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."

The resolution provides for payment of $5 million to the Crow Tribe for the transfer of right-of-way for the Yellowtail unit and is similar in that respect to Senate Joint Resolution 135, 84th Congress, from which the President withheld his approval for the reasons set forth in a message to the Senate dated June 7, 1956. The essence of that message is contained in the preamble to Senate Joint Resolution 12, together with a statement of various circumstances bearing on the amount of the proposed payment.

One of the points cited in the preamble is the reduction over the years in the size of the Crow Indian Reservation "without just compensation" to about 5 percent of its original area. We understand that the Indian Claims Commission is now considering on its own merits the claim of the Crow Tribe relating to this matter, and it would therefore appear to be improper to include the reduction in area of tribal lands as partial justification for the payment here in question.

The preamble also cites awards to the Flathead Indians and Warm Spring Indians in connection with power sites where special values and justifiable consideration were essential factors, and which in 50 years yield proportionately more than the proposed payment to the Crow Tribe. The comparison is not a sound one because these awards were negotiated under the Federal Power Act, which is not applicable to Government use of navigable rivers but applies only to licensees under that act.

It is noted that the Department of the Interior has instituted condemnation proceedings against the tribal lands on the Yellowtail right-of-way in the Federal courts. The committee may wish to consider deferring action on Senate Joint Resolution 12 until the courts have determined the amount of just compensation in order that the basis for any additional payment for special values may be clearly established.

On the basis of information now available and without further demonstration of the special values to the United States cited in the preamble, the Bureau of the Budget is unable to agree that payment to the Crow Indian Tribe for the right-of-way under discussion should exceed $1.5 million, the amount proposed some time ago by the Department of the Interior. Therefore, we are not in a position at this time to recommend enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 12.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT E. MERRIAM,
Assistant Director.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., March 29, 1957.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: You have requested an expression of the views of this Department on Senate Joint Resolution 12, a measure "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."

If enacted, Senate Joint Resolution 12 would provide for transfer of $5 million to the credit of the Crow Tribe and for the transfer to the United States of such right, title, and interest as the tribe may have in and to certain lands which are to be used for construction of Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, excepting therefrom certain mineral and other rights.

For the reasons hereafter stated, while the Department recommends that Senate Joint Resolution 12 be not enacted with a $5 million figure in it, it would not object to enactment if this figure were reduced to $2,500,000 or less.

When we reported to your committee on February 27, 1956, on Senate Joint Resolution 135, 84th Congress, a somewhat similar measure, we recommended that the sum to be transferred to the credit of the tribe be fixed at $1,500,000. The Congress adopted $5 million as the figure, and the President vetoed the measure (S. Doc. 128, 84th Cong.). His reasons for doing so were that the joint resolution confused the concept of "just compensation" or "fair market value," in terms of which the joint resolution was then written, by including power site value; that there was lacking, either in the joint resolution itself or in its legislative history, any equitable justification for payment of the proposed amount; and that the amount to be paid the tribe was extravagant.

Senate Joint Resolution 12 attempts to overcome the first of these objections by specifying that the sum proposed to be paid "includes both just compensation for the transfer to the United States * * * of the right, title, and interest of the Crow Tribe in and to the tribal lands described in section 2 of this resolution and a share of the special value to the United States of said lands for utilization in connection with its authorized Missouri River Basin project * * *." While this successfully separates the "just compensation" element from other factors, and thus overcomes one of the stated objections of the President, it does not touch the measurement of "special value."

Its attempt to meet the other two objections of the President is, we believe, unsuccessful. As spelled out in the preamble to the joint resolution, the specific "justifiable considerations" relied on for a $5 million payment are the reduction in the size of the Crow Reservation by acts of Congress over the last hundred-odd years and the approval in two other cases of agreements between Indian tribes and private power companies which "yield proportionately more than proposed in this resolution * * *."

It is true that the reservation as established by the Treaty of Fort Laramie, September 17, 1851, has been severely reduced since that time. The bulk of the reduction—about 77 percent of the original reservation—took place under the treaty of May 7, 1868. Another 17 percent was the consequence of agreements ratified in the acts of

April 11, 1882, March 3, 1891, and April 27, 1904. And, since the last of these acts, the tribal lands have been still further reduced by sales, by termination of restrictions on allotments, and by elimination of lands under the act of June 31, 1937. At present, the area of the reservation under the jurisdiction of the Government embraces about 1,730,000 acres, as compared with the approximately 38,530,000 acres which it had to begin with.

This Department cannot subscribe to mixing compensation for reduction of the reservation, assuming that any is due, with compensation for a proposed acquisition of lands for a Government dam, reservoir, and powerplant. The problems involved in the two should be studied and dealt with separately. In view of the numerous other reductions in the area of Indian reservations throughout the United States that have taken place over the years, the precedent-making character of this ground for the award of $5 million or any part of that amount has tremendous potentialities which cannot be overlooked and that argue against it. In addition, the Crow Tribe now has pending before the Indian Claims Commission, I am advised, a claim for the principal sum of $29,530,764 based upon the diminution of the reservation effected by the treaty of 1868. In establishing the Indian Claims Commission, the Congress provided an orderly method of handling such claims as those on which the proposed $5 million is at least partially based. We recommend, therefore, that the portion of the preamble reciting the reduction in the reservation be deleted from the resolution.

The other "justifiable consideration" mentioned in the preamble to Senate Joint Resolution 12 is the payments being made or proposed to be made to the Flathead Indians in western Montana and to the Warm Springs Indians in Oregon by licensees of the Federal Power Commission. These cases do not support a payment of $5 million to the Crow Tribe. The fact, if it be a fact, that these payments "yield proportionately more [to the tribes concerned] than proposed in this resolution" (p. 4, lines 9–10) is, of course, no measure of "the share of the special value to the United States of said lands for utilization in connection with its authorized Missouri River Basin project" (p. 5, lines 1–2).

Since, however, our comments on the Kerr and Pelton cases have been specifically requested, we submit them in the following paragraphs.

In the Kerr Dam case negotiations with the Commissioner of Indian Affairs were initiated in 1926 by the Rocky Mountain Power Co. for the construction of a hydrogenerating plant at the Newell site on the Flathead River within the Flathead Indian Reservation. The act of March 7, 1926 (45 Stat. 200, 212), among other things, authorized the Federal Power Commission, in accordance with the Federal Power Act, upon terms satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior, to issue permits or licenses for the development of power sites on the Flathead Reservation and for the use of water rights reserved or appropriated for irrigation projects on the reservation. License No. 5, dated May 23, 1930, under which the Kerr Dam was constructed, was issued to the Rocky Mountain Power Co. The license was subsequently transferred to the Montana Power Co. The license also authorized the company to regulate Flathead Lake between elevations 2,883 and 2,893 mean sea level as a storage reservoir. Approximately one-half of the shoreline of Flathead Lake is within the Indian reservation.

Two generating units, each of 56,000 kilowatts capacity, were installed. The first unit went into service in 1939, the second in 1949. Payments to the Indian tribes are stipulated in article 30 (D) of the license as amended, which provides that the annual charges may be adjusted at the end of 20 years after the beginning of operations under the license and at periods of not less than 10 years thereafter by mutual agreement between the Commissioner and the licensee with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior. A total of $2,872,379 was paid to the Indian tribes through 1954. An annual payment of $175,000 per year was stipulated for the period 1954 to 1959. In the event the annual payment of $175,000 is not readjusted, the payments to the tribes for the 50-year period of the license will total $7,247,380 and the average annual payment will be $145,000. The license also requires that certain quantities of energy be made available to the Flathead irrigation project at preferential rates. These are of benefit both to the tribe and to white irrigators.

A third unit of 56,000 kilowatts was installed and placed in operation in December of 1954 by the power company. Proper payment for this unit is a matter of controversy between the company and the tribes and is now before the United States District Court for the District of Montana.

The Pelton Dam case involves a license granted to the Portland General Electric Co. dated March 23, 1956, by the Federal Power Commission for a hydroelectric dam on the Deschutes River. This river forms a portion of the east boundary of the reservation and half of the structure will be located on the Indian reservation. The Pelton project also includes a low re-regulating dam about 2¼ miles below the Pelton Dam proper. A total installation at Pelton of approximately 108,000 kilowatts is contemplated. When the Pelton project is completed and has begun to generate electricity the company, under terms of agreement with the Indians approved by the Secretary of the Interior, will pay to the Indians the sum of $4,320 per month, or 4 cents for each kilowatt of installed capacity based on the total nameplate rating of 108,000 kilowatts. In addition, the company will pay monthly one-tenth of 1 mill per kilowatt-hour produced at Pelton. The Warm Springs Indians will thus receive annual payments ranging from $84,340 to $89,340.

In addition to the above payments the agreement provides that the Warm Springs Indians shall have a prior right to purchase up to 4,000 kilowatts of power developed at Pelton Dam and the exclusive right to install, operate, and maintain at their own expense 1 or 2 generating units at the re-regulating dam. The contract provides that the company will pay 5 cents per acre per month for any and all tribal lands used. The company is also required to construct a gated outlet below the re-regulating dam capable of releasing 10 cubic feet per second for the irrigation of Indian lands below the re-regulating dam.

The agreement between the company and the Warm Springs Tribe also covers the construction of a dam known as the Round Butte project located about 8 miles north of the Pelton Dam on the Deschutes River below the confluence of the Metolius and the Crooked Rivers. The height of the dam and the capacity of the generating plant have not yet been determined. Payment to the Indians would be essentially on the same basis as for the Pelton Dam. A license for the Round Butte project has not yet been issued to the company.

The problem of finding a solution that is fair to both sides in the present case—that is, to the Government as the developer of the Missouri River Basin project and to the Government as trustee for the Indians—is a difficult one that has faced us for well on to a decade. It is not one that—assuming, for the sake of the argument, that power site value can properly be considered legislatively where it would not be considered judicially—can be resolved by multiplying the proposed number of kilowatts of installed capacity at Yellowtail by a factor derived by dividing the 50-year payments to, say, the Warm Springs Indians by the number of kilowatts installed at their site. Nor is it one that can be arrived at by any similar process which substitutes acres taken or kilowatt-hours generated for installed capacity. For power site value, if it is to be brought into the picture, is an economic concept that must have its basis in the net earning capacity of the proposed installation.

Not only must we bear in mind that power-site value is something which is outside the constitutional phrase "just compensation" in the circumstances of the Yellowtail case, but we have also to remember that when power site value is properly open to consideration it is as a part of market value and the latter is not the value of the site to any particular taker—for example, the Government—but its value on the market. Finally, we must remember that the Yellowtail site as a power site is valueless to anyone except the Government.

The last point just made is of particular importance. Its meaning, put simply, is this: If Yellowtail were developed otherwise than as a unit of the Missouri River Basin project, it would probably have an installed capacity of 130,000 kilowatts. (Our proposed installation of 200,000 kilowatts includes 70,000 of peaking capacity.) The kilowatt-hour cost of producing and delivering energy from such a plant, estimated as shown on the attached table, would be somewhat over 14 mills. This is an uneconomically high price. If 200,000 kilowatts were installed under private development, the cost of producing and transmitting the output would be still higher; namely, about 16 mills.

It is, therefore, only a matter of academic curiosity to apply the Pelton Dam formula of 48 cents per year for each kilowatt of installed capacity and one-tenth mill for each kilowatt-hour of energy generated to the Yellowtail site and to estimate a payment to the Crow Tribe on that basis. The bare arithmetic of such a formula, however, produces an annual payment of $144,200 (the capitalized value of which is $3,710,000) in the case of a 130,000-kilowatt plant or $177,800 (the capitalized value of which is $4,575,000) in the case of a 200,000-kilowatt plant. Similar computations based on the Kerr payments cannot be made, since they are not directly related to capacity or output. In addition, as the Federal Power Commission has reported to you, "Such values of power as may have been considered in arriving at the rental for tribal lands for the Kerr project No. 5 in 1930 are of little, if any, use under present-day conditions."

Consideration has been given by this Department to a report, dated July 5, 1955, prepared by Mr. Barry Dibble and relied on by the Crow Tribe as support for the $5 million figure. The computations in the Dibble report are not related to power value of the site and do not recognize the fact that the Crow Indian Tribe is not the sole owner of all lands required for the reservoir. In fact it is not clear what relationship the amount of $5 million bears to the computations in the report. The computations are in reality a pay-out study of the Yellowtail site based on the assumption that the Bureau of Reclamation would build and operate the project in accordance with a number of assumptions and estimates of cost arrived at by Mr. Dibble. Under the conditions assumed, the report indicates that if the assumptions are correct the undertaking will pay itself out in the 59th year. The author of the report further states: "I believe that the indicated rental of $150,000 per year for the Yellowtail site and reservation lands to be used for the reservoir would be fair and reasonable compensation to the Crow Tribe for the use of

their property." After studying the report, we have reached the following conclusions:

(a) The report does not develop the Yellowtail power site value on a sound basis in accordance with well established methods.

(b) The conclusion of the report that a $5 million powersite value exists is not justified by the text and supporting data of the report and apparently was arrived at in some manner unrelated to the material and presentation which precedes it.

(c) The report takes full advantage of the Federal multipurpose development principle but fails appropriately to credit all multipurpose functions and uses and, instead, claims all the benefits of such development for the Crow tribe.

(d) The report contains basic data on costs and employs revenue estimates which influence repayment ability as developed, which in turn is the determinant of site value. Some of these estimates are inaccurate and inconsistent with assumptions made elsewhere in the report.

For the above reasons and because the report fails to recognize the factual infeasibility of private development, it is our belief that it cannot be taken as support for the claimed figure.

The approach that is reflected in the $1,500,000 which we recommended to your committee last year was based on the earning capacity of the proposed Yellowtail installation. (This estimate has been restudied in the light of cost experience since the time we last reported to your committee and the restudy concludes with substantially the same figure.) This figure was derived from and is supported by two appraisals—one made by engineers for the Bureau of Reclamation, the other by engineers for the Bureau of Indian Affairs—that took into account not only the entire estimated net earnings of the Yellowtail plant as compared with an alternative steam plant but, of course, the marketability of the power and the price at which it will be sold. It also took into account that Yellowtail dam, reservoir, and power plant are not being constructed by the Government as a commercial enterprise but that they are part of a plan which will, at Government expense, benefit a very large area and furnish protection by way of flood control both to the Indian reservation and to other lands. Finally, it took into account the fact that only a portion of the reservoir lands are in tribal ownership, the remainder being public lands, State and county lands, and allotted lands, and that the value cannot, therefore, be attributed solely to the tribal lands.

The fact that only about 20 percent of the required lands are in tribal ownership but that about one-third of the special value of the entire site to the Government for its installation was attributed to them is indicative that $1,500,000 would be not only a fair but a generous payment. This conclusion is many times reinforced when it is recognized that, exclusive of its use by the Government, the tribal lands is probably worth less than $50,000. But while we could not recommend that more than $1,500,000 be allowed to the tribe, we are not wedded to the figure as one that is inescapable and, as has been indicated above, would not object if the Congress should see fit to insert a figure of not more than $2,500,000 both as just compensation for the lands taken and as the "share of the special value to the United States of said lands" which the joint resolution speaks of. Two million five hundred thousand dollars will give to the tribe somewhat more than 50 percent of this "special value."

The above recital, I believe, is persuasive of the desirability of non-enactment of the joint resolution in its present form at this time. There is another factor in the situation which we must also point out to you. Since the last time we reported to you, the Government's action to acquire the tribal lands by condemnation has proceeded. The trial court has heard argument and has ruled in favor of the power of the Government to condemn. The case is now being prepared for trial on the issue of compensation which, under the trial court's ruling, is the only issue left to be tried. Thus there can be, relatively soon, a judicial determination of the value of the site, including a judicial determination of whether the Indians are entitled to power site value and, if so, what it is. In short, it is unlikely that construction of the Yellowtail undertaking will be long delayed even if the Congress should fail to enact S. J. Res. 12 or some similar measure.

Your attention is invited to two typographical errors. The first occurs on page 7, line 9, where "4,711.6" should be "4,771.6"; the second on page 8, line 4, where "3,765" should be "3,675."

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the submission of this report to your Committee.

Sincerely yours,

FRED G. AANDAHL,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Single-Purpose Hydro Development by Private Utility, Yellowtail Dam Site

		130,000-kilowatt installation	200,000-kilowatt installation
At-site construction cost:			
Dam and reservoir (includes land and rights, relocations, clearing, dam, roads, and bridges)		$61,216,000	$61,216,000
Afterbay Dam		1,506,000	1,506,000
Powerplant and switchyard		14,410,000	22,170,000
General property		1,341,000	1,341,000
Total		78,473,000	86,233,000
Transmission costs		6,155,000	8,206,000
At-site annual charges:	*Percent of investment*		
Fixed charges:			
Cost of money	5.50		
Depreciation	.41		
Interim replacements	.20		
Insurance	.10		
Taxes:			
Federal	4.64		
State and local	2.16		
Total	13.01	10,209,000	11,219,000
Operation and maintenance:			
Powerplant		208,000	320,000
Switchyard		50,000	62,000
Administrative and general expense (30 percent of operation and maintenance)		77,000	115,000
Total at-site annual charges		10,544,000	11,716,000
At-site average cost per kilowatt-hour:			
$10,544,000 divided by 818,100,000	mills	13.0	
$11,716,000 divided by 818,100,000	do		14.3
Transmission annual charges:	*Percent of investment*		
Fixed charges:			
Cost of money	5.50		
Depreciation	1.00		
Interim replacements	.35		
Insurance	.25		
Taxes:			
Federal	4.64		
State and local	2.16		
Total	13.90	$856,000	$1,141,000
Operation and maintenance:			
Lines		45,000	61,000
Substations		60,000	79,000
Administrative and general expense (15 percent of operation and maintenance)		16,000	21,000
Total transmission annual charges		977,000	1,302,000
Transmission average cost per kilowatt-hour:			
$977,000 divided by 818,100,000	mills	1.2	
$1,302,000 divided by 818,100,000	do		1.6
Total average at-market cost per kilowatt-hour (excluding any component for power-site value)		14.2	15.9

Mr. WATKINS. Senators will notice this conclusion in the February 5 report of the Bureau of the Budget:

On the basis of information now available and without further demonstration of the special values to the United States cited in the preamble, the Bureau of the Budget is unable to agree that payment to the Crow Indian Tribe for the right-of-way under discussion should exceed $1.5 million, the amount proposed some time ago by the Department of the Interior. Therefore, we are not in a position at this time to recommend enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 12.

A very good summary of the shortcomings of the proposed legislation from the legal standpoint is provided in the report of the Department of the Interior dated March 29, 1957. For emphasis, I wish to read a portion of the report, which I have introduced in its entirety into the RECORD.

[Excerpts from Department of the Interior report of March 29, 1957]

When we reported to your committee on February 27, 1956, on Senate Joint Resolution 135, 84th Congress, a somewhat similar measure, we recommended that the sum to be transferred to the credit of the tribe be fixed at $1,500,000. The Congress adopted $5 million as the figure, and the President vetoed the measure (S. Doc. 128, 84th Cong.). His reasons for doing so were that the joint resolution confused the concept of "just compensation" or "fair market value," in terms of which the joint resolution was then written, by including power site value; that there was lacking, either in the joint resolution itself or in its legislative history, any equitable justification for payment of the proposed amount; and that the amount to be paid the tribe was "extravagant."

Senate Joint Resolution 12 attempts to overcome the first of these objections by specifiying that the sum proposed to be paid "includes both just compensation for the transfer to the United States * * * of the right, title, and interest of the Crow Tribe in and to the tribal lands described in section 2 of this resolution and a share of the special value to the United States of said lands for utilization in connection with its authorized Missouri River Basin project * * *." While this successfully separates the "just compensation" element from other factors and thus overcomes one of the stated objections of the President, it does not touch the measurement of "special value."

Its attempt to meet the other two objections of the President is, we believe, unsuccessful. As spelled out in the preamble to the joint resolution, the specific "justifiable considerations" relied on for a $5 million payment are the reduction in the size of the Crow Reservation by acts of Congress over the last hundred-odd years and the approval in two other cases of agreements between Indian tribes and private power companies which "yield proportionately more than proposed in this resolution * * *."

It is true that the reservation as established by the Treaty of Fort Laramie, September 17, 1851, has been severely reduced since that time. The bulk of the reduction—about 77 percent of the original reservation—took place under the treaty of May 7, 1868. Another 17 percent was the consequence of agreements ratified in the acts of April 11, 1882, March 3, 1891, and April 27, 1904. And, since the last of these acts, the tribal lands have been still further reduced by sales, by termination of restrictions on allotments, and by elimination of lands under the Act of August 31, 1937. At present, the area of the reservation under the jurisdiction of the Government embraces about 1,720,000 acres, as compared with the approximately 38,530,000 acres which it had to begin with.

This Department cannot subscribe to mixing compensation for reduction of the reservation, assuming that any is due, with compensation for a proposed acquisition of lands for a Government dam, reservoir, and powerplant. The problems involved in the two should be studied and dealt with separately. In view of the numerous other reductions in the area of Indian reservations throughout the United States that have taken place over the years, the precedent-making character of this ground for the award of $5,000,000 or any part of that amount has tremendous potentialities which cannot be overlooked and that argue against it. In addition, the Crow Tribe now has pending before the Indian Claims Commission, I am advised, a claim for the principal sum of $29,530,764 based upon the diminution of the reservation effected by the treaty of 1868. In establishing the Indian Claims Commission, the Congress provided an orderly method of handling such claims as those on which the proposed $5,000,000 is at least partially based. We recommend, therefore, that the portion of the preamble reciting the reduction in the reservation be deleted from the resolution.

The other "justifiable consideration" mentioned in the preamble to Senate Joint Resolution 12 is the payments being made or proposed to be made to the Flathead Indians in Western Montana and to the Warm Springs Indians in Oregon by licensees of the Federal Power Commission. These cases do not support a payment of $5,000,000 to the Crow Tribe. The fact, if it be a fact, that these payments "yield proportionately more [to the tribes concerned] than proposed in this resolution" (p. 4, lines 9–10) is, of course, no measure of "the share of the special value to the United States of said lands for utilization in connection with its authorized Missouri River Basin project" (p. 5, lines 1–2).

Mr. President, in conclusion, I point out that there are half again as many acres of private lands involved in this project as there are Indian lands. Now, unless we wish to make second-class citizens of the white landowners in that project area, we should be prepared in all fairness, to make the same financial arrangements with them for the acquisition of that required 10,770 acres of private property. If this is done, it could mean an additional $7,500,000 in costs for this project, and a possible precedent that could result in added expense of untold millions for future reservoir projects if the courts follow this formula for acquiring lands required for such purposes.

Mr. President, I do not intend to ask for a yea-and-nay vote on this bill, but I think it is very unwise legislation, because of the possible precedent it might create to vex us at some future time.

If the Indians are to be given a grant, we ought to say it is a grant, and let it be so understood. Let us not change the constitutional formula under which the fair market value at the time of the taking is the measure of damages when private property is taken for public use. If we pass the bill and establish the precedent, there could be no limit to the use of this formula. It would be a very dangerous precedent to establish. I believe the President was justified last year in vetoing the same kind of measure. Even though some amendments have been made to the bill, I still do not think they correct the defects which formed the basis of the President's veto.

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

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. What are the factors injected into the proposed plan of settlement that exceed just compensation on the day of taking?

Mr. WATKINS. They are not specifically spelled out. The President suggested that if we wished to take cognizance of the additional factors, they should be specifically spelled out. I do not believe the defects in the previous bill have been corrected. That is shown in the report of the Department of the Interior and also in the report of the Bureau of the Budget, which I have placed in the RECORD.

I point out that an appraisal of the property was made and that it was appraised at $37,000. If we take it on the basis of $50,000, and award $5 million, it would be at least 100 times more than the fair market value.

The land in question is not land on which the Indians are living. That also should be kept in mind. The Indians, along with the other members of the community, will enjoy some of the benefits which will come from the building of the dam. The reclamation project, on the other hand, is a good project, I favor it now and I believe I voted for it when it came before the Senate some years ago.

Mr. CURTIS. What disposition has been made of the submerged mineral rights? To whom do they belong?

Mr. WATKINS. I believe that under the provisions of the bill the mineral rights are reserved.

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

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not correct to say that under both Democratic and Republican administrations the Department of the Interior did make offers to the Crow Indian Tribe in the sum of $1½ million?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes; I mentioned that earlier.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not also true that this year the Department of the Interior raised the amount to $2,500,000?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes; I believe the Department did do that. That is absolutely wrong as a policy matter. It is impossible to do anything like that and have anything that will be fair to all the citizens of the United States, Indian and non-Indian alike. Even a million and a half dollars is far above the appraised fair market value.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We should not lose sight of the fact that there is involved here the right-of-way and the dam site itself. That should be taken into consideration when we consider what was done in connection with the Warm Springs Tribe and the Flat Head Indians in western Montana. I think it is a very fair price, in view of the fact, particularly, that the Federal Government gains outright control, in comparison with what happened in connection with the Warm Springs and Flat Head Indians.

Mr. WATKINS. Of course the other instances to which the Senator from Montana calls attention were instances in which negotiations were carried on with a private utility. It was not a matter of taking land by condemnation, or anything of that sort. It was done by private negotiations, and all the Federal Power Commission did was to approve a compensation the parties had agreed upon outside of the Commission's proceedings. I do not believe the two cases are similar at all, except that they involved the taking of land for reservoir purposes. That is about the only similarity. If we set this precedent, there will be all sorts of projects it will not be possible to build under the same formula. They would be made unfeasible under the high cost of rights-of-way which would result if the precedent now sought to be established were followed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to add a brief word in support of the measure reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Yellowtail Dam bill. I do this because back in 1944 I had a large part in preparing the authorization of the Missouri River project in the Flood Control Act of 1944.

The purpose of that act in relation to the Missouri River was to make utilization of the waters of the entire Missouri River Basin to the best advantage of all the inhabitants of that vast area.

These rivers and the waters therein have been flowing down to the sea for generations, wreaking ruin and creating waste and offering very little advantage economically to the people who live in the areas where the rivers flow.

ENGINEERS AND RECLAMATION BUREAU AGREE

When the Missouri River project was finally planned, it was only by appeal to the President of the United States that we were able to persuade the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation to come to an agreement as to which of the two would have charge of the construction of the vast projects which were necessary to conserve these waters.

The pending bill is a conservation bill. It is a power bill. It is a reclamation bill. Every member of the committee recognizes the fact that it is a very splendid reclamation proposal. We also recognize the fact that the dam which it is proposed to build will be located on one of the few remaining sites available for the development of power.

It is an excellent site.

Moreover, the site is on the Crow Indian Reservation. There is no question about the propriety of the compensation the bill provides for the Indians. When the Crow Reservation was established in 1851, it embraced 90 million acres. Today it embraces less than 3 million acres. The reservation has been reduced from a broad expanse to a very small area because of the settlers who moved in and who wanted to live in that area.

I do not know how many Members of Congress who represent the State of Montana in the House of Representatives and in the Senate of the United States now live on land which originally belonged to the Crow Indians, but I am confident that there are many in the history of the State of Montana who can make that proud boast.

PRESIDENT'S OBJECTIONS MET

In vetoing the bill last year, the President said:

> If the Congress determines that it wishes to provide for an extra payment in this case, it should not be done under the claim that it is just compensation.

We of the committee have sought to meet that requirement laid down by the President. That the compensation provided in the resolution is in excess of the amount that the Department of the Interior and the Department of Justice call "just compensation" is based upon the fact that those agencies are thinking solely of the appraised value of the six or seven thousand acres in the canyon of the river that will be used as a part of the reservoir site.

The problem cannot be solved on such a basis. In the committee bill we are seeking to compensate the Indians in the light of the history of the tribe for the contribution they are making to the development of the entire region by surrendering to the United States the land and the rights without which the dam, with its truly vast benefits for all, cannot possibly be constructed. Thus, the terms and figures of the ordinary condemnation suit have no application here.

PROJECT HIGHLY BENEFICIAL

It is true that the Crow Indians do not want to make their homes on the floor of this canyon. But the United States wants to lay here the foundations of a dam which will conserve the waters of the stream, which will make those waters available for use above and below the dam, which will become the source of highly important new sources of electric power, and which will contribute in an extraordinary degree to the fulfillment of the original concept of the utilization of all of the waters of the Missouri Basin for the public welfare by improving the whole economy of the entire region. Without the power site and lands for the reservoir the dam cannot be built.

I think, without any question at all, that if we were to take the time to review the history of the Crow Tribe we would find my conclusion to be correct. The United States should not pay the Indians upon the basis of the mere appraised value of these lands in the middle of the canyon, on which the Indians do not live. We should pay them upon the basis of the great contribution which the building of the dam will make, not only to the Indians themselves, but also to the entire community of the non-Indians as well as the Indians in Montana, in Wyoming, and throughout this area. I believe the bill should pass without objection.

YELLOWTAIL DAM VITAL SEGMENT

Yellowtail Dam and powerplant will be another vital segment toward the culmination of the major objectives of the Missouri River Basin project. It is located on the Big Horn River which rises in the great State of Wyoming and flows through Montana into the Yellowstone River, a major tributary of the Missouri.

Senate Joint Resolution 12 paves the way for another major objective of the Misouri River Basin project which is transforming desert areas into thriving irrigated agricultural communities, providing drought protection, and producing power for rural areas, cities and towns, as well as industries.

FUNDS AVAILABLE

Funds to start construction of Yellowtail Dam were appropriated by the Congress for fiscal year 1956. It is our understanding that sufficient unobligated appropriations for the Missouri River Basin project are available for payment of the $5 million to the Crow Indian Tribe without further appropriations for the Indian holdings required for the right-of-way.

The Congress at its last session passed Senate Joint Resolution 135 which had for its purpose the same objective as the pending resolution. The President, on June 7, 1956, sent a message to the Congress "of disapproval" or veto. With all due deference to the Chief Executive, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs felt that the President was laboring under a misconception of the facts which led the Congress to approve last year's resolution.

Senate Report No. 216 of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs recommanding passage of Senate Joint Resolution 12 sets forth fully the committee's views with respect to the $5 million payment. I quote from the objectives and conclusions of the committee, set forth on pages 8, 11, 12, and 13 of the report as follows:

WILL SAVE LONG, EXPENSIVE LITIGATION

In any event, without this legislation, long and expensive litigation is in prospect with the result that the vitally needed Yellowtail Dam development will be further delayed many, many years before the courts make final determinations.

The proposal to pay the Indians $5 million reflects a complete "meeting of minds" on the part of the Crow Indians, on the one hand, and the Congress of the United States, on the other, as is evidenced by congressional approval of Senate Joint Resolution 135 in the 84th Congress.

Unquestionably the legal and equitable considerations that are cited demonstrate that the Crow Indians are entitled to the $5 million award as provided in the resolution. These include the value of the right-of-way as a dam, reservoir, and particularly as a power site. Precedents set by the Congress, by an executive agency (Interior) in its recommendations, and by the Federal Power Commission, an independent agency, show that both legal and equitable factors have been taken into consideration in making awards to Indians in instances akin to the Yellowtail Dam-Crow Indian case.

The committee concludes that the $5 million payment to the Crow Indian Tribe is a fair and equitable payment to the Crow Indian Tribe in the light of all relevant factors, direct and related, in connection with right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and powerplant as a vital unit of the Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944.

In reaching this conclusion, particular deference was accorded the message of the President of the United States (S. Doc. 128, dated June 7, 1956) returning without approval Senate Joint Resolution 135. This earlier resolution had for its ultimate objective a similar payment to the Crow Indian Tribe.

Senate Joint Resolution 12, the current measure reported, retains the same ultimate objective of Senate Joint Resolution 135 of assuring payment of $5 million to the Crow Indian Tribe, but the wording of the current measure is revised in recognition of the President's comments. There is full cognizance that the Chief Executive was properly exercising his constitutional prerogative in connection with this subject.

The committee is of the view that Senate Joint Resolution 12 as amended, meets the President's objections. It perfects the record through citing at least one direct additional precedent of congressional authority to recognize "special values" to the United States in connection with the development of a multiple-purpose project involving hydroelectric power potentials such as is involved at Yellowtail Dam.

In addition to the applicable findings of the committee in connection with Senate Joint Resolution 135, the committee therefore concluded that precedent for a congressional award buttressed, as provided in Senate Joint Resolution 12, had incontestable support in (a) at least one previous recommendation of the Department of the Interior; (b) in a congressional resolution; and (c) approval of the Chief Executive in the Boysen Dam case, Public Law 591, 82d Congress, July 18, 1952.

BOYSEN DAM PRECEDENT

The additional precedent relates to the right-of-way for the smaller multiple-purpose Boysen Dam (Wyoming), also a unit of the Missouri River Basin project. In this instance, Congress authorized payment to the Arapahoe and Shoshone Indian Tribes that recognized power-site values. While the power installation at Boysen Dam is less than one-eighth of that proposed at Yellowtail Dam, and the amount awarded comparatively less, the principle involved is on all fours with that reiterated by the committee in Senate Joint Resolution 12.

The relevant comparisons of the actual Boysen Dam features and allowances, as ex-

tended on a comparable basis to Yellowtail Dam and powerplant are as follows:

	Boysen Dam (actual)	Yellowtail (proposed)
Area	25,600	6,000 plus.
Appraisers' value of land.	$141,000	$37,000.
Power (installed capacity kilowatt).	15,000	200,000.
Total award	$458,000	$5,000,000.
Potential power share.	[1] $317,000	$4,279,000 [2] (to more than $5,000,000).

(This subject is dealt with more fully in exhibit.)

[1] The $317,000 figure represents a compromise from an original estimate of $275,000 by Government appraisers and more than $300,000 claimed by the Indians for power values at Boysen Dam.

[2] Estimated higher figure based on production of more valuable "peaking" power from 30 percent of installation at Yellowtail.

The installed kilowatt capacity proposed for Yellowtail is approximately 13½ times that at Boysen. On the basis of capacity, a minimum award of $4,250,000 at Yellowtail would be justified. Consideration of another factor would increase the Yellowtail figure to $5 million or more. This factor relates to the fact that 70,000 kilowatts, or one-third of the Yellowtail capacity, will produce peaking power which has a sales value much higher than that at Boysen. Thus, a payment of $5 million to the Crow Indians in connection with Yellowtail is again justified.

OTHER PRECEDENTS FOR PAYMENT

Attention is again directed by way of emphasis to previous comparisons cited on page 5 of Senate Report No. 1626, dated March 6, 1956, on Senate Joint Resolution 135. This relates to the 50-year lease payments recommended by the Secretary of the Interior and approved by the Federal Power Commission to Indian tribes. This was in connection with Kerr Dam on the Flathead River in Montana, where power-site lease returns to the Flathead Indians (who would retain title to the site) would approximate $7,375,000 or 50 percent more than the payment to the Crow Indians at Yellowtail Dam.

Another instance of Interior-Federal Power Commission approval is in lease payments to the Warm Springs Indians in connection with Pelton Dam on the Deschutes River in Oregon. On the basis of Federal Power Commission statistics, a payment of $7,318,000 to the Crow Indians would be justified if the same yardstick were used at Yellowtail, which to the committee appears fully justified.

Viewed as a matter in equity, the conclusion is inescapable that the dam site and power privileges were confirmed in Crow tribal ownership by the treaty of 1851 and the act of June 4, 1920. Acquisition of this property by the Government for the use and benefit of the Federal Missouri River Basin project necessarily must be based on compensation to the Crows for their property rights which include the power privilege. A proper means of evaluating that power privilege is provided by the compensation paid to other tribes for comparable power privileges. Inasmuch as the entire dam and powerplant site of the Yellowtail development is Crow tribal land, fully comparable cases exist in the Pelton Dam and the Kerr Dam settlements, both of which have been approved by the Federal Power Commission, on recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior. Using those approved settlements as the standards, the value of the Yellowtail power site would range from $4,279,000 to more than $5 million.

POWER PHASES OF PROJECT

A vital consideration in connection with Yellowtail Dam is that power revenues will repay the entire investment in commercial power facilities in 50 years with interest. This repayment will include the $5-million payment to the Crow Indians for right-of-way.

Reports of the Bureau of Reclamation to the committee show there is not only a market for the Yellowtail power, but that the output will aid the entire Missouri River Basin power system by producing power for so-called peaking purposes when it is most needed.

A surplus in power revenues over 50 years will be more than adequate to absorb the additional payment for right-of-way to the Crow Indians.

ATTITUDE OF DEPARTMENTS

The President, in his veto message, stated that "a statutory settlement of this kind of controversy might be acceptable if soundly and equitably premised and if it reflected a substantial measure of agreement between parties to the dispute."

We submit, Mr. President, that Senate Joint Resolution 12 meets the President's ground rules.

First, the facts and circumstances cited in the report support our position that the settlement is "soundly and equitably premised."

Second, the amount reflects complete agreement between the Congress and the Crow Indian Tribe. There have been claims that the Crows should receive as much as $50 million for the power site. The Department of the Interior first agreed to a payment of $1,500,000 to the Indians. On March 29, 1957, Assistant Secretary Aandahl wrote that the Department would not object to an award of $2,500,000. The Congress last year approved a $5-million payment. In my opinion, it meets the premise laid down by the President.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who is absent this afternoon because of official business, be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURRAY

Senate Joint Resolution 12, as amended, has for its major purpose the just settlement of a longstanding, involved controversy between the Federal Government and the Crow Indians over what is the fair compensation for the right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and powerplant to be built in the Big Horn River, Mont. and Wyo., as a part of the Missouri River Basin project. The Yellowtail Dam project was authorized by Congress 13 years ago in the Flood Control Act of 1944. All agencies of the Federal Government agree as to the desirability and feasibility of this project. All business and industrial interests, the chambers of commerce, and civic and social groups in the area strongly support it.

The sole issue has been over the amount of money the Crow Indian Tribe, on whose reservation lands the dam and powerhouse site will be built, shall receive as fair, legal, and equitable compensation for all their interest in the lands and rights they are surrendering.

The Yellowtail project would conserve the waters of the Big Horn River and permit their maximum use for hydroelectric power, flood control, irrigation, protection of fish and wildlife, and recreation. Eastern Montana and northern Wyoming have urgent need for the additional 200,000 kilowatts of power that the dam will provide. The additional low-cost power and irrigation will speed greatly the area's industrial, commercial, and agricultural expansion, enlarge its tax bases, and develop greater markets for the manufactured products of other sections of the country.

INDIANS TO BENEFIT BUT LITTLE

It is clear that the non-Indian population of both the area itself and of the Nation as a whole will benefit greatly from the project; on the other hand, it will mean very little, comparatively speaking, to the Indians whose reservation will be still more diminished as a result. The Indians have not had the training, nor have they the capital, to take advantage of the benefits that will accrue to the non-Indians from this great development.

In arriving at an asking price for the power site and the reservoir area, the Crow Tribe engaged expert engineers, appraisers, and lawyers and finally voted to sell their lands and rights for $5 million.

In the 84th Congress, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee conducted full and complete hearings and investigation of the issue as set forth in Senate Joint Resolution 135, of that Congress. In order to insure that the committee's approach was objective, I did not myself act as chairman at these hearings, but asked the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] to do so. After examining all of the evidence and weighing the issues carefully, the committee came to the conclusion that the $5 million payment for which the Indians asked was fully justified both in law and equity.

FIVE MILLION DOLLARS FAIR, LEGAL, AND EQUITABLE

Accordingly, the committee reported the measure with that amount determined to be the fair, legal, and equitable compensation to the Indians. As reported, the committee undertook to recognize the factors supporting the $5 million payment. The Senate agreed with its committee, the House of Representatives went along with us, and Senate Joint Resolution 135 went to the President.

However, the President vetoed the measure, and in his message of disapproval set forth in some detail the reasons for his veto.

This year the Interior Committee, in drafting and considering the present measure, gave most careful and full consideration to President Eisenhower's veto message. We conscientiously believe we have met the substance, at least, of all of his objections.

The attention of the Members of the Senate is invited to the committee's report on Senate Joint Resolution 12, Report No. 216, in which is reprinted the veto message and in which is set forth our conscientious efforts to meet the President's objections. True, Senate Joint Resolution 12 retains the $5 million figure which is the price at which the Indians are willing to part with rights in the power site and lands. But we do believe we have set forth the legal and the equitable considerations which form the basis for our recommendation of this amount, as the President directed.

NO NEW APPROPRIATION CALLED FOR

I want to make here a point set forth in the committee report, namely, that no new appropriations of Federal funds will be necessary under this resolution. The funds already have been appropriated. They are in the Missouri River Basin appropriation. All that is needed is authorization for transfer.

I should like to stress again the fact that the non-Indian population in the area and

the Nation will benefit greatly from the development of this project; whereas the Indian population, not trained in business and industrial activities, will gain comparatively little. The great boom in industrial and business activity that the 200,000 additional kilowatts of power from the dam will bring about will increase all land values in the area. There will be a substantial rise in opportunity and prosperity for the non-Indians.

In these circumstances, every effort must be made to see that the Crow Indian Tribe shall receive full legal and equitable consideration for the lands, rights, and interests they are willing to convey to the United States.

The committee report and that of the Department of the Interior point out that the Supreme Court of the United States has repeatedly ruled that the relationship between the Federal Government and the Indians is that of guardian and ward. That fiduciary relationship is and must have the highest moral and ethical basis.

MORAL AND ETHICAL PRINCIPLES

Yet, all the Members of the Senate are aware that in the past the Federal Government, through some of its agents, has not always acted in accordance with those moral and ethical principles laid down by the highest tribunal in our land. The facts speak for themselves. In a land the length and breadth of which once was theirs by right of possession, occupancy, and use, the American Indian has been progressively, or more accurately, retrogressively, crowded into fewer and fewer acres of poorer and poorer land. This is the fact, despite all those solemn treaties, which, with the Constitution are the supreme law of the land, assuring the original owners of the country that "as long as grass shall grow and water shall run" they, the Indians, shall not be disturbed in the peaceful possession and enjoyment of their reservation lands.

Recently the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] made a most moving speech in the Senate on the plight of the Indians in Minnesota. He quoted at length from a series of articles on conditions among the Indians today, written by that outstanding reporter, Mr. Carl T. Rowan, of the Minneapolis Tribune. Mr. Rowan starts his series of articles, based on firsthand observation, as follows:

"This is the story of a forgotten people, of the vanishing Americans who forgot to vanish.

"It is the story of those 400,000 Americans of Indian ancestry who today languish in almost silent misery at the bottom of the totem pole in a land they once ruled alone."

Mr. Rowan's articles go on to depict the truly brutal conditions in which the Indians have been forced to live, by our inactivity in preparing them to meet the conditions of life in the country that was once theirs. He cites the report of United States Public Health Service to Congress last year that "no other group in the United States lives under comparable conditions" and that the Indian is half a century behind the rest of the Nation when judged in terms of health.

What does it mean, in human terms, to be a half century behind? According to the Public Health Service, it means simply this:

"The average Indian dies at age 37—25 years earlier than the average American.

"Fewer than half the Indians born reach the age of 20; one-third of them die before the age of 5.

"Indians are afflicted by tuberculosis at 9 times the rate of the general population; pneumonia at more than 100 times the general rate; trachoma, a contagious eye disease, at 700 times the general rate; dysentery at 40 times the general rate.

"Of every 1,000 Indian babies born, 76 will not live to be a year old—3 times the infant death rate for other Americans."

I could go on and on and cite example after example, case history after case history, of the results of our treatment of the original Americans: How the agents of the Federal Government have, through empty legalisms and technicalities in laws and treaties, overreached, browbeaten, and cheated him out of his lands and rights, and then have left him adrift in an economic system and society which was not of his making, which he did not understand, and with which he was not equipped by nature and training to deal.

JUSTICE FOR THE INDIANS

However, in Senate Joint Resolution 12, the Congress has an opportunity to do full justice and equity to the Crow Tribe of Indians by making a reasonable and just payment. As I have stated, the Interior Committee twice has found that this $5 million price for outright sale of the lands and rights is reasonable, that it is fully justified in fact, in law, and in equity.

This payment will enable the Department of the Interior to supervise a far-reaching welfare and betterment program among the Crow Indians to enable them to take their place in present-day American life and to meet the challenges our economy imposes.

Before concluding these brief introductory remarks, I want to say a few words on how the Crow Indians and the committee, acting on the advice of engineers, appraisers, and legal counsel, arrived at the $5 million figure. First of all, the lands for the dam and powerhouse are wholly tribal lands, and the reservoir is partially so.

The "special value" of the Yellowtail power site was recognized by the 66th Congress in enacting the act of June 6, 1920. This act vested the power site values in the tribe, as a power site. This vesting of power-site values was confirmed in an opinion of the Honorable Harlan F. Stone, late Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, when he was Attorney General of the United States in President Coolidge's Cabinet. I am including as a part of my remarks a memorandum-of-law prepared by our committee counsel, Stewart French, in which the then Attorney General's opinion is cited.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND CONGRESSIONAL PRECEDENTS FOLLOWED

Since the Crows do have this special property right in the power site, as a power site, there remains the question of computing its value. On this matter, the Crows and the committee looked to precedents established by the Federal Government in analagous cases. These cases are set forth in detail in the committee report. They concern the payments to the Flathead Indians in connection with the Kerr Dam in Montana and the Warm Springs Indians in connection with the Pelton Dam in Oregon. In these two cases, the executive branch of the Government followed a method of determining just compensation for the Indians involved which, if used for the Crows, would bring us to approximately the $5 million figure which is the amount the Interior Committee twice has found fully justified after study of all legal and equitable considerations.

For Congressional action such as called for by Senate Joint Resolution 12, we also have a clear-cut precedent. This was the action of the 82d Congress, in 1952, authorizing payment to the Arapahoe and Shoshone Indian Tribes in which power-site values were considered in determining just compensation. While the power installation at Boysen Dam is less than one-eighth of that proposed at Yellowtail Dam, and the amount awarded comparatively less, the principle involved is squarely in accord with that reiterated by the committee in Senate Joint Resolution 12.

Here again, if we use the same principles and methods in computing just compensation for the Crow Indians, we arrive at a figure of approximately $5 million. Details are set forth on page 12 of the report of the committee on Senate Joint Resolution 12.

The facts, the law, and the equitable considerations all show that the $5 million price set by the Crow Indians for the power site and reservoir lands for the Yellowtail project is a reasonable and just figure. The Interior Committee twice has investigated the matter fully and carefully, and twice has come to this conclusion. Last year, the Senate and House both came to the same conclusion.

I am confident that the President, when he considers the legal and equitable factors which he called for in his veto message last year and which are now set forth, will approve this measure. It is difficult to see how, in all conscience, he could do otherwise.

It is my earnest hope that the Senate will approve this measure, supported as it is in law and in equity, and thus take at least a small step forward toward justice for the Indians and for the development of the natural resources of Montana and of our Nation.

MEMORANDUM

To: Senator JAMES E. MURRAY.
From: Stewart French, committee counsel.
Subject: Just compensation under Senate Joint Resolution 12, 85th Congress.

1. "Just compensation" may include power-site values (id est, values "in the flow of the stream" as well as riparian values).

President Eisenhower's message of June 8, 1956, vetoing Senate Joint Resolution 135, 84th Congress, states: "General principles of constitutional law exclude power-site values in determining just compensation, as the Supreme Court recently reiterated in *United States* v. *Twin City Power Co.*, January 23, 1956." The Bureau of the Budget cites this message in its report on Senate Joint Resolution 12.

The Twin City case (350 U. S. 222) was an appeal by the Federal Government from rulings of both the Fourth and Fifth Circuit Courts upholding condemnation awards. The lands that were the subject of the action were fast lands, lands above the high-water line of the Savannah River, found by the court to be a navigable stream. Included in the proposed compensation awards were sums based on the value of the land as a site for hydroelectric power operations.

In holding that the United States was not required to pay for such values, the majority opinion held: "* * * the landowner here seeks a value [in the flow of the stream] (matter in brackets that of the court), a value that inheres in the Government's servitude and one that under our decisions [the Government can grant or withhold as it chooses]" (matter in brackets supplied) (p. 225). The majority further quotes, at page 227, from the Appalachian case: "'exclusion of riparian owners' from the benefits of power in a navigable stream 'without compensation is [entirely within the Government's discretion]'" (matter in brackets added).

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that, in the case relied upon by the President, there is no rule of law enunciated under which power-site values may not be a part of "just compensation"; rather, the matter clearly is one within the discretion of the Congress or the Executive even in a case where there are no special considerations of law and equity. The Twin City decision concerned non-Indian lands in a stream adjudged navigable. Also, the Twin City action was under the Federal Power Act; Yellowtail is under the reclamation law.

2. The Crow Tribe, by act of Congress, has vested property rights in the site as a power site.

The 66th Congress, in the act of June 4, 1920, an act to provide for the allotment of lands to the Crow Tribe, provided in section 10 as follows:

"That any unallotted lands on the Crow Reservation chiefly valuable for the development of water power shall be reserved from allotment or other disposition hereunder, for the benefit of the Crow Tribe of Indians" (41 Stat. 751, 754).

It is submitted that this provision is a recognition of special property values in power sites within the Crow Reservation, and vests said values in the Crow Tribe. Hence, any taking of such vested property rights must be a subject of compensation.

Also as a general legal principle, the right of Indians to the special waterpower values on reservation lands was set forth by the Honorable Harlan F. Stone, late Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, when he was Attorney General in President Coolidge's Cabinet. The then Attorney General in an opinion written at the request of the President held:

"If the extent of the Indian rights depended merely on definitions, or on deductions to be drawn from descriptive terms, there might be some question whether the right of 'occupancy and use' included any right to the hidden or latent resources of the land, such as minerals [or potential waterpower], (matter in brackets supplied) of which the Indians in their original state had no knowledge. As a practical matter, however, that question has been resolved in favor of the Indians by a uniform series of legislative and treaty provisions beginning many years ago and extending to the present time. * * * In all these instances Congress has recognized the right of the Indians to receive the full [sales] value of the land, including the value of the timber, the minerals, [and all other elements of value] (matter in brackets supplied) * * *" (34 Op. Atty. Gen. 171, 178–179, May 12, 1924).

More specifically with respect to the precise lands and power site in question, the Attorney General wrote in an opinion to the Secretary of the Interior:

"Similar provisions have been made in many other cases for the sale of surplus tribal lands, all the proceeds of all elements of value to go to the tribe. In a recent act for further allotment of Crow Indian lands (41 Stat. 751), the minerals are reserved to the tribe instead of passing to the allottees (Sec. 6); and moreover, unallotted lands chiefly valuable for the development of waterpower are reserved from allotment 'for the benefit of the Crow Tribe of Indians' (sec. 10) (34 Op. Atty. Gen. 181–190, May 27, 1924).

"In respect to legislation and treaties of this character, two views are possible. First, that the right of occupancy and use extends merely to the surface and the United States, in providing that the Indians shall ultimately receive the value of the hidden and latent resources, merely giving them its own property as an act of grace. Second, that the Indian possession extended to all elements of value in or connected with their lands, and the Government, in securing those values to the Indians, recognizes and confirms their preexisting right. If it were necessary here to decide as between these opposing views, I should incline strongly to the latter; mainly because Indian possession has always been recognized as complete and exclusive until terminated by conquest or treaty, or by the exercise of that plenary power of guardianship to dispose of tribal property of the Nation's wards without their consent" (id., p. 191).

3. That Indians constitute a special case is so well established in our law as to need no elaboration here. A statement of this policy that appears particularly apposite in the instant case was enunciated in May 1953 by the Court of Claims, in the *Sioux Tribe* v. *U. S.* (125 Ct. Claims 439; 111 Fed. Sup. 766). The court said:

"The argument (of the Government opposing an award) has force, and between equals dealing at arm's length might be controlling * * * we think it was the guardian's (i. e., the Government's) duty to account to the ward for the land which the ward had lost and the guardian had gained * * *."

Also, in *Klamath Indians* v. *United States* (296 U. S. 244) the Supreme Court in 1935 reiterated that the relationship between the Federal Government and the Indians resembled "those arising out of the relation of guardian and ward * * *." The Court went on to rule:

"The obligation of the United States to make good plaintiff's loss is a moral one, calling for action by Congress in accordance with what it shall determine to be right" (p. 255).

STEWART FRENCH,
Committee Counsel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments of the committee will be stated.

The amendments of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on page 5, line 7, after the word "and", to strike out "a share"; at the beginning of line 10, to strike out "justifiable" and insert "equitable", and, in the same line, after the word "considerations", to strike out "Nothing contained herein shall be taken as an admission by the United States that it is under any legal obligation to pay more than just compensation to said Crow Tribe and, in any suit brought as provided in section 3 of this resolution, no amount in excess of the sum above stated shall be awarded unless the court find that the whole of said sum is less than just compensation for the lands taken. No attorney fees shall be allowed out of the amount paid under authority of this resolution."; on page 9, line 22, after "Sec. 3.", to strike out "Unless suit to determine whether an additional amount to that specified in section 1 hereof is due as just compensation is brought in the Court of Claims by the Crow Tribe within three years after the effective date of this joint resolution, the" and insert "The"; and, on page 10, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "In the event of such suit, the court shall have jurisdiction as under section 1505, title 28, United States Code and in determining just compensation shall take into account the sum specified in section 1 hereof and the rights reserved to the tribe by subsections (b), (c), and (d) of section 2 hereof. The amount embraced in such judgment, if any, as may be entered against the United States shall be deposited in the Treasury to be available in like manner as the sum specified in section 1 hereof. Review of the judgment entered shall be in the same manner, and subject to the same limitations, as govern in the case of other claims cognizable under the aforementioned section 1505."; so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That from funds appropriated to the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, for the Missouri River Basin project, there shall be transferred in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Crow Tribe of Indians, Montana, the sum of $5,000,000. Said sum includes both just compensation for the transfer to the United States as herein provided of the right, title, and interest of the Crow Tribe in and to the tribal lands described in section 2 of this resolution and of the special value to the United States of said lands for utilization in connection with its authorized Missouri River Basin project, in addition to other equitable considerations. Neither the initial transfer of such funds to the tribe, as provided herein, nor any subsequent per capita distribution thereof shall be subject to Federal income tax.

SEC. 2. (a) Subject to the provisions of this section, there is hereby transferred to the United States the right, title, and interest of the Crow Tribe in and to lands situated in the Big Horn County, Mont., hereinafter described under the headings "Parcel A" and "Parcel B."

PARCEL A

Lots 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12, northeast quarter of the southwest quarter and the east half of the southeast quarter of section 18; lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter, southeast quarter of the northwest quarter, and the northeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 19, all in township 6 south, range 31 east, Montana principal meridian, and containing 573.84 acres, more or less.

A tract of unsurveyed, unallotted Indian land described as follows: Beginning on the westerly side of the Big Horn River at a point on the west line of lot 9, section 18, township 6 south, range 31 east, Montana principal meridian, said point being at elevation 3,675; thence running upstream along a contour line whose elevation is 3,675, to a point of intersection with the east line of the southeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 22, township 6 south, range 30 east, Montana principal meridian; thence southerly along the east line of said southeast quarter of the northeast quarter to a point on the east line of said southeast quarter of the northeast quarter, whose elevation is 3,675; thence running upstream along a contour line whose elevation is 3,675, to a point of intersection with the south boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation on the westerly side of the Big Horn River; thence easterly along the said south boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation to a point of intersection with the middle of the thread of the Big Horn River; thence running upstream along the middle of the thread of the Big Horn River to a point of intersection with the south line of township 9 south, range 28 east, Montana principal meridian; thence easterly along the south line of said township 9 south, range 28 east, to a point on the south line of said township 9 south, range 28 east, Montana principal meridian, whose elevation is 3,675 feet; thence running downstream along a contour line whose elevation is 3,675 to a point of intersection with the west line of township 6 south, range 31 east, Montana principal meridian; thence northerly along the west line of said township 6 south, range 31 east, to the point of beginning, and containing 4,711.6 acres, more or less.

Also, a parcel of land lying along the south boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation, further described as follows: Beginning at a point where the 3,675-foot contour to the left of the Big Horn River intersects the south boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation, said point being approximately 5,400 feet westerly of the point of intersection of the Big Horn River and the south boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation; thence running upstream on the 3,675-foot contour to a point where the 3,675-foot contour intersects the south boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation; thence running easterly along the south boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation to the point of beginning and containing 5.7 acres, more or less.

Also, a parcel of land lying along the south boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation

and along Hoodoo Creek further described as follows: Beginning at a point on the south boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation where the 3,675-foot contour on the east bank of Hoodoo Creek intersects the south boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation; thence running upstream on the 3,675-foot contour to its intersection with the middle of the thread of Hoodoo Creek; thence running downstream on the 3,675-foot contour to a point where the 3,675-foot contour intersects the south boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation; thence easterly along the south boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation to the point of beginning and containing 1.3 acres, more or less.

The total area above described is 5,352.44 acres, more or less, situated in Big Horn County, Mont.

PARCEL B

Lots 1, 5, and 6 of section 18, lots 4, 6, 7, and 8, and the south half of the northwest quarter of section 17, lots 6 and 7, section 16, all in township 6 south, range 31 east, Montana principal meridian, containing 325.50 acres, more or less, and situated in Big Horn County, Mont.

(b) There is reserved from the right, title, and interest transferred as to parcel B, the Indian Irrigation Service canal and appurtenant facilities, Big Horn unit, Crow Indian Irrigation Department, as now constructed or as they may be hereafter modified, until such time as said canal and appurtenant facilities may be replaced.

(c) Except as to such area as the Secretary determines to be required for the dam site and the construction and operating campsite, the right, title, and interest transferred shall be exclusive of the rights to minerals, including gas and oil, beneath the surface: *Provided*, That no permit, license, lease, or other document covering the exploration for or the extraction of such minerals shall be granted by or under the authority of the Secretary except under such conditions and with such stipulations as the Secretary deems adequate to protect the interests of the United States in the construction, operation, maintenance and use of the Yellowtail unit.

(d) The members of the Crow Tribe of Indians of Montana shall be permitted to hunt and fish in and on the Yellowtail Reservoir and taking area without a license.

SEC. 3. The sum provided by section 1 hereof shall constitute full, complete, and final settlement of any and all claims by the tribe on account of the transfer to the United States as therein provided of the tribe's right, title, and interest in and to the lands referred to in section 2 hereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 12) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was amended so as to read:

Whereas the 84th Congress, 1st session, adopted Senate Joint Resolution 135 providing "for payment to Crow Indian Tribe for right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming," to which reference is hereby made; and

Whereas on June 7, 1956, the President returned said resolution, "without my approval," with comment which included the following:

"In essence, this resolution culminates a decade of negotiation and disagreement between the Department of the Interior and the Crow Indians with respect to the amount of compensation to be paid to the tribe for lands required for the Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, for which the initial construction appropriation was made in the fiscal year 1956 and for which an additional $10,850,000 was included in the budget for the fiscal year 1957.

"The standard of payment for land acquired by the Government is 'just compensation,' or 'fair market value.' However, I recognize that, as a matter of policy, the Federal Government has made awards in excess of 'just compensation' in other cases involving Indian lands. If the Congress determines that it wishes to provide for an extra payment in this case, it should not be done under the claim that it is 'just compensation.' The amount, the method for computing it, and the equitable justification for it should be clearly established on acceptable premises. Neither the resolution nor the legislative history does this.

"A statutory settlement of this kind of controversy might be acceptable if soundly and equitably premised and if it reflected a substantial measure of agreement between parties to the dispute. I regret that the extravagant nature of the award contemplated by Senate Joint Resolution 135 requires this action, which may cause some additional delay in proceeding with the construction of the Yellowtail unit. It is my hope that the Congress can approve a statutory settlement which will permit expeditious action to proceed with the construction of this much-needed project."; and

Whereas the Crow Indians, by a majority vote of its tribal council through Resolution No. 63, adopted January 11, 1956, showed its willingness to cooperate in advancing the construction of Yellowtail Dam as a multiple-purpose development as a part of the Missouri River Basin system for flood control, river regulation, irrigation storage, and hydroelectric power production by a further surrender of a valuable part of the remaining reservation; and

Whereas, by telegram dated May 29, 1956, the duly elected officers of the Crow Indian Tribal Council withdrew opposition to said Senate Joint Resolution 135 and urged the President to sign said resolution into law; and

Whereas the Crow Indian Tribal Council, by resolution on January 25, 1957, reaffirmed its previous position with respect to accepting the $5 million payment in connection with the Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir right-of-way, which resolution has been certified to the Secretary of the Interior; and

Whereas the Congress has repeatedly shown its willingness an l readiness to recognize cooperation by Indian tribes in advancing resource development through multiple-purpose projects such as Yellowtail Dam; and

Whereas the Federal Power Commission and the Department of the Interior have approved awards to Indian tribes in connection with hydroelectric power developments by non-Federal agencies in at least two transactions, where special values and other equitable considerations were essential factors (to the Flathead Indians in western Montana and to the Warm Springs Indians in Oregon, where Indian lands for power-site purposes are leased at rates which in 50 years yield proportionately more than proposed in this resolution); and

Whereas said amounts of special values and considerations in connection with Yellowtail Dam will be repaid to the Federal Treasury through power revenues paid by power consumers of the Missouri River Basin power system; and

Whereas facts and circumstances are available to support the special values and other justifiable considerations and thereby meet the objections set forth in the President's message of June 7, 1956: Now, therefore, be it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the joint resolution was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have followed the very able presentation made this afternoon of the case in support of the Yellowtail Dam proposal. As the Senator knows, I have been a longtime supporter of the Yellowtail project. I want the RECORD to show that I enthusiastically supported the passage of the bill today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Oregon has been an advocate of this particular proposal not merely this year but for many years past. His help has been of great significance in securing the passage of the measure. I want him to know that the Senators from Wyoming and Montana appreciate his unfailing support.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Montana.

TRANSFER OF TITLE OF MIDWEST CLAYPAN EXPERIMENT STATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 181, S. 1034.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1034) to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the University of Missouri for agricultural purposes certain real property in Callaway County, Mo.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, yesterday I sent to the desk an amendment to S. 1034. The amendment was printed in the RECORD on page 5653. I have discussed the amendment with the able and distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and believe it meets in full his objection to the bill as reported by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 22, after the word "less," it is proposed to strike out:

Such property shall be conveyed upon the condition that it shall be used by the curators of the University of Missouri for the purposes of the College of Agriculture. In the event that the curators of the University of Missouri shall cease to use such property for such purposes, all right, title, and interest in and to the said property shall automatically revert to the United States.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

Such property shall be conveyed upon such conditions as in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture will assure the use of such property in the cooperative agricultural experimental work of the Department of Agriculture and the State of Missouri. The conveyance of such property shall contain a reservation to the United States of all the minerals in the land together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same

under such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I assure my friend, the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], that not only am I satisfied with the amendment he has offered, but I wish to offer him exceedingly high commendation for the typical statesmanship he is exhibiting again in this matter as he does in other matters.

The Senator from Missouri in the first instance was not fully aware of the rather technical basis of the objections I raised to his bill, because we were of one mind as to the objectives. Our disagreement was only over a small matter of wording. The Senator from Missouri has studied the statement I made concerning the matter and has assured me that he meant this bill to be identical in objective with the so-called dry-land bills which were passed some years ago by the Senate. The Senator from Missouri has offered an amendment which brings this bill into complete agreement with the so-called dry-land bills.

I thank the Senator from Missouri, and I wish to say to him on the floor of the Senate that no one has cooperated with me more completely in the past several years in the application of the so-called Morse formula to the transfer of Federal property than has the junior Senator from Missouri. I thank him very much for his assistance.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon for his gracious remarks. I am sure the present occupant of the chair, the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], will agree with me that there is no Member of the Senate from whom we would rather have such high commendation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

NATIONAL MENTAL HEALTH WEEK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 233, Senate Joint Resolution 70.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 70) requesting the President to proclaim the week April 28 to May 4, 1957, inclusive, as National Mental Health Week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 70) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the week beginning April 28 and ending May 4, 1957, as National Mental Health Week, and urging the people throughout the Nation to cooperate in the fight for the prevention, treatment, and cure of mental illness, and inviting the communities of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The preamble was agreed to.

BANNING PENSION PAYMENTS TO CERTAIN PRISONERS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 226, H. R. 71.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 71) to prohibit the payment of pensions to persons confined in penal institutions for periods longer than 60 days.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the bill provides that pension granted under public or private laws administered by the Veterans' Administration shall not be paid to an individual who has been imprisoned in a Federal, State, or local penal institution as a result of conviction for a felony or misdemeanor for any part of the period beginning on the 61st day of his imprisonment and ending when the imprisonment ends.

The bill has the approval of veterans' organizations. The pension is merely suspended during the period of imprisonment. It does not apply to veterans whose disability is service connected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 71) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS RELATING TO STATE PLANS FOR AID TO THE BLIND

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 227, H. R. 3035.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3035) to provide a temporary extension of certain special provisions relating to State plans for aid to the blind.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill, as reported, is to extend from June 30, 1957, to June 30, 1959, the provisions of section 344 of the Social Security Act amendments of 1950, which provide for the approval by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of certain State plans for aid to the blind. The original expiration date was extended in 1954 from June 30, 1955, to June 30, 1957. This bill proposes a further extension of 2 years. The bill has application to only two States, namely, Pennsylvania and Missouri.

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia be kind enough to advise me of the reasons why, in the judgment of the Finance Committee, it was desirable to provide for only a 2-year extension to Pennsylvania and Missouri, in connection with this measure?

I should like very briefly to express my point of view to the Senator from Virginia, so that he will be able to answer my question: It has been my understanding that Pennsylvania has for some time had a plan for pensions for the blind, as well as a plan for aid to the needy blind. Pennsylvania and Missouri have somewhat more generous provisions for aid to the blind than do other States.

It has been my hope, as one of the cosponsors of the original bill, that the generosity on our part would not be penalized by a requirement by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that we comply with the requirements of the Federal act and not go beyond the limitations of the Federal act, by making more blind persons eligible for pensions than the Federal act would appear to permit.

It has been my thought that this matter was pretty much a question of States rights, and that we in Pennsylvania should not be required to cut our cloth according to a uniform pattern, so long as the only money we obtained from the Federal Government was used to pay aid to the needy blind, which I understand we now do.

I shall appreciate having the Senator from Virginia comment on that point.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the matter was thoroughly discussed in the committee. We believe Pennsylvania and Missouri should conform with the standard law. They are the only two States in the Union that do not. Information received from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare indicates that the degree of blindness required in these two States is more stringent than that generally required by States which operate programs in full conformity with the Social Security Act. I understand that some needy persons who are not determined to be blind within the definitions used in Missouri and Pennsylvania but who have not sufficient vision to engage in activities for which sight is essential, are denied assistance in these States, whereas they would generally be found eligible in other States. The Committee on Finance favors the full compliance by these two States and believes the 2-year extension will provide sufficient time for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the States of Pennsylvania and Missouri to plan for bringing the programs in full conformity.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I fully intend to vote for the bill; but I should like to have the RECORD show my understanding—which I believe to be correct—that the additional liberality of the Pennsylvania law is paid for by the citizens of Pennsylvania, out of State taxes, and is not a charge on the Federal Government. It was for that reason that it seemed to me that we should not be required to conform, since the matter is one of States rights.

Mr. BYRD. The subject is quite complicated. If the Senator from Pennsylvania will come before the Finance Committee at the expiration of the 2 years, we will consider the matter carefully, from the point of view of making the arrangement permanent.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 3035) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DUTY-FREE ENTRY OF METAL SCRAP

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of Calendar No. 228, House bill 4686, continuing the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4686) to continue until the close of June 30, 1958, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia for the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4686) to continue until the close of June 30, 1958, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the purpose of H. R. 4686 is to continue the existing exemption of metal scrap from import duties and taxes for another year, until June 30, 1958.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 4686) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHICAGOLAND COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY EXPOSITION—BILL PASSED OVER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 229, H. R. 4803.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask that that bill be passed over. It is desired to have it considered at another time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

FREE IMPORTATION OF GIFTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 230, H. R. 6304.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6304) to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad, and for other purposes.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments.

The first amendment was on page 2, line 13, after the word "the", to strike out "United States." " and insert "United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was at the beginning of line 14, to strike out:

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this act shall be effective with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after July 1, 1957.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 2. This act shall be effected with respect to articles entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption on or after the day following the date of its enactment and before July 1, 1959.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, H. R. 6304, as passed by the House, would have made permanent the present temporary privilege accorded to servicemen stationed abroad to send to the United States duty free, bona fide gifts not exceeding $50 in value. The present temporary privilege is scheduled to expire June 30, 1957. The Finance Committee amended the bill to extend the privilege for a period of 2 years, or until July 1, 1959.

I offer a technical amendment to the committee amendment, on page 2, line 18.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 18, after the word "be" it is proposed to strike out "effected," and insert in lieu thereof "effective."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to extend for a period of 2 years the privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad."

EXEMPTION FROM DUTY OF ARTICLES IMPORTED FOR WASHINGTON STATE SIXTH INTERNATIONAL TRADE FAIR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 231, House Joint Resolution 126.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 126) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State Sixth International Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the purpose of House Joint Resolution 126 is to permit the entry, free of duty, of articles imported for exhibition at the Washington State Sixth International Trade Fair, to be held at Seattle, Wash.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHICAGOLAND COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY EXPOSITION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 229, H. R. 4803.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4803) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Chicagoland Commerce and Industry Exposition, to be held at Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Thursday next at 12 o'clock noon.

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

RETIREMENT OF PROF. EDWIN E. WITTE, OF UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his request?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. I withhold my request temporarily.

Mr. MORSE. On March 28 I gave an address at the University of Wisconsin honoring Prof. Edwin E. Witte, who, at the age of 70, is retiring from the University of Wisconsin this next June. Professor Witte was one of my major professors, along with Prof. Selig Perlman, in the field of labor economics when I was a student at the University of Wisconsin. I think it is generally agreed among scholars that Witte and Perlman are today among the very top labor theorists in American scholarship. They are not only great economic theorists and idealists, but they are also very practical men, Mr. President, because, as I pointed out in my address honoring Edwin Witte, their ideals, when put into practice, give sound practicalities in the field of labor-management relationships.

I should like very much, Mr. President, to have unanimous consent to have published at this point in my remarks the speech that I made honoring the great Edwin E. Witte in Madison, Wis., on March 28, 1957.

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

ADDRESS OF SENATOR WAYNE L. MORSE AT A LUNCHEON HONORING PROF. EDWIN E. WITTE, MADISON, WIS., MARCH 28, 1957

Friends, no student can be honored more highly than by an invitation to address a gathering which is met to pay tribute to one of his former teachers.

The invitation that came to me from Professor Young, and from my great friend, Selig Perlman, was accepted eagerly and without hesitation. I would not have missed this occasion for anything less than the most urgent official business, and I am delighted to be here now, sharing in your tribute to Professor Witte.

Although this occasion is dedicated to Ed Witte—and I will have a good deal to say on that subject—I also want to mention the great personal obligation I owe to Selig Perlman. Professors Perlman, Witte, Dean Rundell and Andrew Weaver were the faculty members whom I came to know best at the University of Wisconsin and who had the greatest influence on me while I was here.

It is easy enough for one to look back at his college days—even for one of my mature years—but it isn't quite so easy to look back and pick out the faculty members who did the most to attract one's interest and formulate one's mental standards. For my part, there were many, but I would certainly name these four—Ed Witte, Selig Perlman, Ollie Rundell, and Andrew Weaver. It is a privilege for me to stand before Professors Witte and Perlman today and acknowledge this debt I owe to them.

Fortunately, I am still the beneficiary of their counsel and wisdom. I still depend upon their guidance, both as experts in the fields of labor law and social security with which I am deeply concerned, and as personal friends. It has been a great satisfaction to me that I have continued to enjoy their friendship after having left their classrooms.

You have been here in Madison for 2 days, reviewing the contribution that Edwin E. Witte has made to the science of economics, to the development of a social-security system that has meant new life for millions of elderly and retired Americans, and to the improvement of labor relations and settlement of labor disputes. As a Member of the United States Senate, I have daily contact with the fruits of Ed Witte's work. When we add amendments to the Social Security Act, expanding its coverage and improving its benefits, we are only adding to the basic structure to which Ed Witte contributed so much.

When we discuss Government and industrial relations in the Senate Labor Committee and on the floor of Congress, we start with the history of labor management relations that Witte affected so significantly by his service on the Wisconsin Labor Relations Board and on the National War Labor Board.

His books, articles, and lectures in the fields of social security and labor-management relations mark him as one of the Nation's intellectual leaders in these fields. His work is prime source material not just for students of these subjects but for the legislators and practitioners of government who work in these areas. I think it was most fitting that Professor Witte's retirement from the University of Wisconsin has been marked by symposiums on the subjects to which he contributed so much. The scholars, educators, and Government officials who are here all have brought together new information and given a new dimension to our knowledge of these subjects. I hope the discussions that were held yesterday and this morning will be published so that all of us can share in them. This is the kind of tribute that should be paid to Professor Witte—it is the kind of tribute he deserves. His contribution was of the intellect, of the heart and mind, and to the expansion of our knowledge of human relationships. That is the kind of tribute that should be paid him by his grateful friends and students, and I am glad that that is what has been done.

After leaving the University of Wisconsin I did not again work with Professor Witte until I became a member of the National War Labor Board. In 1942, when I was appointed to the Board, I had the privilege of serving with Professor Witte. During that time—during World War II and the many emergencies that arose from labor-management disputes—he established himself as one of the great national figures in industrial relations.

To many of us who were his students Professor Witte has been the embodiment of what a great teacher should be and the personification of what a great university should do for its students.

It has been the slogan of the University of Wisconsin that the borders of the campus are the borders of the State; it would be more appropriate now to say that the borders of the campus are the borders of the Nation.

It has been men like Witte who have applied the conclusions of the classroom to public affairs, at the local, State, and National levels of society, and who have in fact stretched the borders of this campus to the borders of the country.

As much as any man associated with the University of Wisconsin, Professor Witte has personified the historic "Wisconsin Idea" that scholarship has its greatest use in application. That is a widely known principle today, in Wisconsin and in the Nation. It holds that knowledge and theory are only meaningful when they are tested by application, and that the society that supports an institution of higher learning deserves to reap the reward of its investment. Its reward must be the improvement of its institutions—social, legal, political, and economic. The University of Wisconsin has given that improvement to this State and to the Nation, and Ed Witte has been one of the outstanding figures who has contributed to that improvement.

His membership on the Wisconsin Industrial Commission, the Wisconsin State Planning Board, the Wisconsin Labor Relations Board, the National War Labor Board, and his directorship of the Wisconsin Unemployment Compensation Division, the Wisconsin Legislative Reference Service, and the President's Commission on Economic Security all bespeak Witte's great devotion to the principle of the Wisconsin idea.

His former students and his colleagues and admirers who have joined in honoring him today have tried to live up to his example and to his teachings in their own fields and professions. It is the philosophy of this university, and, I think, of Ed Witte as well, that the end of education and scholarship is the betterment of human life. He has not only left his own monument to this principle, but he has instilled in his students the determination to carry into public affairs not just the results of scholarship but the techniques and methods as well.

And with that statement about the great man we honor today, I would like to apply it for a minute or two to a serious problem which confronts labor and management and the people generally in this country in the field of labor relations.

Important teachings of Witte and Perlman must be applied to the labor problems of today, and one of those basic teachings is that trade unions have the primary obligation of serving and promoting the legitimate rights of the rank-and-file members. I ought to stress, in fact, as far as anything I say in this speech, beyond my reference to the man we honor, that I would have you carry away even for a moment, is the statement that I now make, because it is basic to the teachings of Witte and Perlman—it is that the primary obligation of trade unions in America is to promote the legitimate rights of its rank-and-file members.

We are in for trouble in the field of labor relations today because there are some unions that seem to have lost sight of that ideal. And may I point out to you that whenever you compromise your ideals you lose your principles. Or, let me put it another way: I do not accept the rationale of some labor leaders that seek sometimes to alibi and justify practices of expediencies on the theory that you can't be practical unless you are expedient. These two concepts of adopting expediencies and standing for ideals are irreconcilable. Whenever you adopt the expedient, you destroy the ideal; and whenever you compromise a principle, you lose the principle. I am one who takes the position that ideals can be put into practice in the field of legislation. They can be put into practice in the administering of the policies of a union; and when they are not, a union loses its ideals and becomes impractical. Or, to put it still another way, the only practicality that any one of us ever experiences

is in terms of an ideal put to work, and so I would come to grips for a moment with the serious labor problem that confronts our Nation today.

It is not typical of the work of the unions generally, but the public thinks it is now, and probably will for some weeks to come, until by presentation of a full record the public comes to understand that within the field of labor management, as within the field of employer management, we have a few who have lost their ideals, a few who are adopting expediencies; and as they adopt them, they destroy, of course, the legitimate rights of the rank and file members, whether it is a union or an employers association.

In 1946 and 1947, I warned the major labor leaders of this country that if they did not come forward with legislative proposals and recommendations that would correct some of the unfair labor practices developed under the Wagner Act, they would be confronted with some bad legislation that would destroy some of the legitimate rights of labor. They didn't believe me. I served on the Senate Labor Committee at that time and, without recalling their names, let me say we had a parade of labor leaders before us. Each one of them testified before us and to each one I put the question, "What do you propose?" and I got the answer in varying forms but with the same meaning from each one, "Nothing, because there is no need."

At that time, some of the labor periodicals were not particularly complimentary to me; in fact, some of them seemed to imply that because they endorsed your speaker for election they owned him. I think I have succeeded in correcting that impression. Although having mentioned it, let me expand on it only to this extent—that the duty of representation, of course, in the Senate of the United States is the duty of sitting there as a freeman, free to exercise an honest independence of judgment on the merits of issues. Of course, that means when labor is wrong you have the duty owed to labor and to the public to do what is necessary to correct its abuse. It was in that spirit that I pleaded in 1947 with the labor leaders to give us the recommendations for fair labor legislation which would correct some of the unfair labor practices that had grown up under the Wagner Act. When I got no help from the labor leaders, I then proceeded with what became known as the Morse-Ives bill, a bill that sought to remedy some of the abuses that had developed under the Wagner Act. They need not have developed. There was no reason why that great Wagner Act should have been changed into a vehicle for some labor abuses, and the responsibility for it rested squarely upon the heads of some shortsighted labor leaders. But, in view of the record they had made, it became clear in my judgment that it was the duty of the Congress of the United States to pass some legislation, and I joined in framing the Morse-Ives bill. I'm sorry to say I didn't get any help from labor leaders. But you know what happened; the forces of hysteria and antilabor attitudes were stirred up. In 1947, they were strong enough to go far beyond the Morse-Ives bill, and we got the infamous Taft-Hartley bill.

I want to say to labor from this rostrum this noon in Madison, Wis., "You had better come forward and quickly with some recommendations for labor legislation for this session of Congress, or you'll once again get some labor legislation that will do great damage to the legitimate rights of organized labor in America. I would recommend that you give us your best advice on two phases of that legislation, because, unless I do not take the pulse of the Congress correctly, you are going to get some legislation on these two subjects and it ought to be fair legislation and good legislation that will protect honest, idealistic, sound labor leaders but correct the abuses of the corrupt." That legislation is going to have to deal with the subject of protecting the rank and file interests in the funds of the unions because the funds of the union are union funds and not officer funds.

I don't have to tell anyone in this audience, or anywhere, that any labor leader who dips into the funds of a union and takes any amount of money, whether it is $200,000 or $400,000 or whether it is "X" dollars, as a personal loan to himself or to his friends without paying interest on that loan takes out of the pockets of every member of the union money that belongs to members of the union. I think we ought to call it what it is. That constitutes, to use the most polite legal term, a form of embezzlement at least, if not grand larceny.

We are going to have to have legislation that will protect funds of the members of unions, which means, of course, legislation is going to have to have some provisions in it under which the Government will exercise regulatory rights in regard to union funds, because, after all, a labor union is not a private organization. It is more than that. A labor union is, after all, an institution that is vested with public interest, and the Government regulatory power over it should be limited, but we should have it exercised, however, to whatever degree is necessary to protect the public interest. It should be limited to those regulations and controls necessary to protect the "stockholders" so to speak, in quotation marks, which are the rank and file members.

Of course, we do it in other phases of social and economic activity. What do you think would happen to a bank president, as I said to the press this morning, if he took $200,000 to $400,000 or "X" dollars for a personal loan without interest out of the bank coffers? Well, if the board of directors didn't do something about it quickly by way of getting a new bank president, the stockholders would. So I am satisfied that the labor statesmen of America now have a clear obligation to come forward with some legislation that will protect the rank and file members of unions in respect to their own funds.

Second and a more touchy one, and a more difficult one to handle by way of legislative draftsmanship without running the risk of interfering with legitimate organizational rights of labor, is the subject matter of insisting upon greater democratization of unions, greater control of the unions by the rank and file, greater procedural guaranties that the voice of the rank and file under democratic processes will prevail. It is true in most unions, but not all, and I venture to guess here this afternoon that as abuses are brought by this or further hearings you will find that the abuses are limited pretty much to the unions that are not democratic in their procedures.

The Congress will undoubtedly turn its attention to the rights of the rank and file members, and should, because America's organized labor has now entered into an era in which the public has a right to insist upon Government regulation that will protect the individual members of the union and, in so doing, not in any way injuring the legitimate rights of the union in the field of collective bargaining.

I wanted to digress from this short manuscript long enough to make these points, because the present Senate hearings are costly to American labor, and I would be no friend to the legitimate rights of labor if I didn't tell them so. It is in such periods that men have to stand up against a hysterical public opinion, but that doesn't mean that men have any right in the Congress of the United States to follow the attitude of some labor leaders who would do nothing in order to meet a problem that the public has the right to have corrected.

The old "fire present when there is so much smoke" argument has a terrific effect on the legislative process. We'd better in our preventive legislation methods make sure we do not set the whole prairie afire. I would have the representatives of labor here within the sound of my voice today keep in mind my warning because, although there will be some that criticize me for it, I am perfectly willing to stand on the record that I have made in the past as to legislative predictions. I think I know how to take the temperature of the Senate, and I am satisfied that we are going to be confronted with very bad legislation of the Goldwater type unless labor comes forward quickly and gives us the assistance we need in the passage and draftsmanship of good legislation.

Having mentioned the Goldwater type of legislation, I doubt very much if there will be any substantial amendments to the Taft-Hartley law this year. I think labor legislation is going to be of another nature such as I have referred to already. I think one of the most dangerous proposals for injuring labor is going to be a great push for further delegation of Federal power to the States over labor relations. Some of you have heard me in the past decry the growth of antifederalism in America. The Goldwater proposals are, of course, antifederal proposals; they are proposals that seek to delegate to the States delegated jurisdiction of the Federal Government. I call it the move of antifederalism, and I'd have you be on guard against this threat to social and economic welfare legislation. Progress under the welfare clause of the Constitution will be set back many, many years, if not decades, if we continue to delegate to the States jurisdiction under the Constitution given to the Federal Government. I am not a State righter in that sense; although, may I say, many of you will appreciate, just by mentioning it, that one of the most fallacious arguments used in this field in the State-right argument that we ought to delegate more and more of Federal authority to the States under such amendments as the Goldwater amendment as a matter of State right.

I have listened to that fallacious argument so long in the Senate. Almost any bill proposed that would have the Federal Government carry out its constitutional functions for the welfare of the people is taken by some Senators on the floor of the Senate as a violation of States rights. Two years ago we had a Federal Building and Loan bill before the Senate that sought to grant Federal loan companies the authority to set up branch associations. A Southern Senator got up, and I thought the eagle up in the glass ceiling of the Senate would flap his wings before this Senator got through as he tiraded about States rights. I had heard it so often that I asked him to yield. He is a good friend of mine personally and he made the mistake of yielding on this occasion, as he said afterward. I said, "Is the Senator ready to get to the heart of the States rights argument, because, if his argument means anything—and I have been waiting now for some minutes to find some merit in it—if his argument means anything, it means he is about to tell me in what respects this proposal is unconstitutional. I want the Senator to understand that no State right argument has any footing here on the floor of this Senate unless the proponent wants to come forward and show the Senate of the United States where any piece of legislation we are proposing is beyond the power—the constitutional power—of the Congress to pass. Unless you are ready to sustain the argument that it is unconstitutional, then your State right argument falls to the floor of the Senate as just a deadweight fallacy."

I want you to remember that, because the States rights argument has taken on an emotional sanction aspect in American thinking. The only time a State right argument has any basis in law is when the pro-

ponent of it wants to argue that a legislative proposal by the Congress of the United States is unconstitutional in that it is beyond the delegated power and jurisdiction of the Congress.

Well, he got me out in the cloakroom afterward and he said, "I was waiting for somebody to wrap that around my neck sometime, but I didn't think you would do it."

Now, listen to the argument of the proponents of the Goldwater amendment as to why we ought to delegate authority over labor relations to the States as a State right. What they really want to see as a matter of social policy is a nullification of the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution.

I am always interested in the position of the State righters. Last week in the Labor Committee we were dealing with legislation proposing the extension of coverage of minimum wages. We had this States right argument being made—we ought to leave minimum-wage coverage to the States. I want to tell you I know of no better way of breaking down the protection of workers in this country than to fall for the Goldwater alarm which would delegate more and more authority to the States in the field of labor-management relations. It will not be done with my vote. I want to work cooperatively with the States, but when you come to the basic question of jurisdiction, keep it vested in the Federal Government, because if you delegate away the Federal jurisdiction, as the Goldwater amendments will do, then, of course, you have lost the great right of Congress to see to it that abuses are not developed on a State basis by antilabor legislation such as you are going to get, I think, as the aftermath of the present Senate investigation unless this Congress acts and acts quickly with sane legislation.

I wanted to mention this because it seems to me that in discussing these labor issues I have been living up to the teachings of Witte and Perlman. The tests of the theories we studied with them are to be found in their application; and as you study under Witte and Perlman the theory of labor economics and the theory of unionism, you see how right I am when I say we must take those theories and apply them to specific problems such as I have sought to raise here this noon.

The heritage of La Follette, Van Hise, Commons, Ely, and the other great professors who graced the University of Wisconsin in the first decades of the century has been preserved and enhanced by Professor Witte.

But there is something more than that, which a university or an individual professor must leave with students, if they are to leave school equipped to make a genuine contribution to their communities.

That is a devotion to truth, and to intellectual honesty. It is one thing to be intellectually honest in the classroom; it is quite another to be intellectually honest in business, in politics, in our chosen professions, in our personal relations with each other, and in formulating opinions on social issues. If a university is able to teach its students to seek the truth, to recognize the truth when it is found, and to act upon it, it has given them the greatest instrument for the improvement of society it can give.

Having been a teacher myself for 20 years, I know that this is the hardest thing of all to teach, just as it is the hardest thing of all to learn. But it is the calling of the university to do that, and its degree of success in doing it is the measure of its value to its community.

The same can be said of a professor. It is said that education is what we have left after we have forgotten everything we learned in school. Sometimes students are educated in this sense by their entire experience in college; occasionally by a single teacher who has the quality of being able to transmit it. I think that Ed Witte can safely be judged an overwhelming success according to this standard.

There is one more point I would like to make about Professor Witte, and his contribution to the University of Wisconsin and its students. Those of us who have addressed these meetings and taken part in the discussions are fairly well known, in one field or another, and for one reason or another. I see a great many faces here that are familiar to me—not just as old friends and acquaintances, but as outstanding people in government, labor, and academic life. But I know there are thousands of Professor Witte's students who are not here and are not mentioned on the program, but who honor him every day of their lives by adhering to the standards of intellectual integrity he taught them.

Not all the graduates of a university become outstanding national leaders; that is not the purpose of a State-supported university, nor should it be of any university, in my judgment. It should be its purpose to send back to the communities of the State young men and women who are educated in the sense that they cherish the truth, and have some idea of how to find it. There are thousands of young men and women in this State and in the Nation who attended the University of Wisconsin, and while they did not do their major work under Ed Witte, have sat in his classes and been enriched by that experience. They have been elevated by his instruction just as much as have those of us who are here, and they cherish the experience as much as we do.

They are the people whose quality attests to the success of a college professor, because it is up to them to uphold in their communities and in their local businesses and activities the objectives of education I have been discussing.

I know they are here in spirit.

I want to express one more thought about Professor Witte, and to him, before I close. It is this: I know that your official retirement from the University of Wisconsin will not mean an end to the work you are doing, or the end of your contributions to the study of economics and to your former students. We need your analytical mind and your constructive thinking as much as ever. I did not make this trip back here to write any epitaph, but on the contrary to help erect a milestone.

I hope that you will always continue to bless us with your friendship and intellectual guidance, just as you have in the past.

THE MORSE FORMULA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to renew my request.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to complete my speech without a quorum call.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thought the Senator would like to have a quorum present, in light of the speech he is about to make.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is very kind to me, but persons will read my speech, and I am speaking for the RECORD.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am sure the speech will make interesting reading.

Mr. MORSE. I do not want to disturb anyone at lunch. It is now a quarter after one.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I withdraw my request for a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is withdrawn.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have 2 or 3 so-called chore matters, as we use the term in the Senate, that I should like to dispose of. When I refer to them as chore matters, I do not wish to detract from their significance, but I should like to dispose of them before I talk on the subject on which I rise to speak today.

It will be recalled that some days ago, when we were discussing S. 1034 in the Senate, I pointed out that my attention had been called to a bill, of which I was a cosponsor, offered by very able colleague [Mr. NEUBERGER], S. 1529, a bill that seeks to authorize the conveyance of real property from the Federal Government to Klamath County, Oreg. It was my understanding, when the bill was introduced, that it did not violate the Morse formula, although I had not had the opportunity, prior to its introduction, to study it in detail.

Mr. President, with regard to S. 1529, on March 29, 1957, in a statement on the floor of the Senate I said that I would look into the provisions of the bill to determine whether or not the bill in any way violated the Morse formula. I indicated very clearly I was satisfied that if my colleague had thought the bill violated the Morse formula, he would not have introduced the bill in the first place, but that he, too, might have labored under a mistaken notion, as I might have. I stated that I would report to the Senate at a later date on the bill. I am now prepared to make that report, Mr. President, and to assure the Senate that the bill does not violate the Morse formula.

It is pretty well known, I think, by now, what the Morse formula is. It is the so-called policy which was promulgated for the first time in 1946, when I took the position that any transfer of Federal property to any local government agency—be it a school board, county, city, or any other local government agency—should be considered under a policy based upon the requirement that if the transfer of property was sought for a public use the local government agency should pay at least 50 percent of the appraised fair market value, and if the transfer was sought for a private use recipients should pay 100 percent of the appraised fair market value.

As the record will show, in 1946 I pointed out that Federal property was being thrown into a political "grab bag" and Senators and Representatives were falling over each other to introduce bills in the Congress to secure this property for local government agencies without cost, but that the property belonged to all the taxpayers of the country, no matter where they lived, and that it was not morally right to dispose of Federal property on a "grab bag" basis.

I have consistently and persistently, as the record shows, held fast to that formula for more than 10 years. The record shows that as a result I have saved the Treasury of the United States several hundred million dollars.

Oh, there has been an exception now and then, Mr. President. Senators have gotten around me on occasion, by motion to bring up a particular bill which violated the Morse formula, but they have never gotten around me by the unanimous-consent procedure.

Having said what I have just said, I now wish to express my very deep appreciation to my colleagues in the Senate over the years for the great cooperation they have extended me with regard to this formula. The position has been, by and large, "so long as you are consistent and uniform, we will back you up."

I know of no exception I have ever made, Mr. President. If any bill has slipped through, it has been without my knowledge, or when I have been unavoidably absent from the Senate. Therefore, when the question was raised on March 29 as to whether or not a bill which bore my name might in any way violate the Morse formula, the Senate can be assured I was very much concerned about it, and proceeded forthwith to have a thorough investigation of the bill made. I am now ready to make a report on the bill (S. 1529).

I asked the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for a report on this proposed land transfer, because we had been advised by the offices of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] and Representative ULLMAN, from my State, that the interested agencies were ready to handle the transfer administratively under the provisions of existing law. At my request, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare submitted a report, dated April 3, 1957, which I shall read shortly. It will be noted that in the third paragraph of this statement from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare it is stated:

> In view of the benefits which have accrued and will accrue to the United States from the use of this property by Klamath County, the Department has determined to grant a public benefit allowance of 100 percent from the appraised fair value of the property.

Such action is warranted under section 203 (k) (1) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

Mr. President, in view of the detailed comments set forth in the report of April 3, 1957, submitted to me by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I wish to read the report at this time, with such explanatory comments as I shall make in the process of the reading.

Mr. President, the letter of April 3, 1957, from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, is signed by Chester B. Lund, Director, Office of Field Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The letter reads:

> DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We have received a request from a member of your staff for certain information with respect to the proposed transfer of 86.41 acres of land located at Klamath Falls, Oreg., to Klamath County for educational purposes.
>
> Section 203 (k) (1) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, authorizes the Secretary of this Department, subject to disapproval of the Administrator of General Services, to transfer surplus Federal real property for educational or public health purposes. This section also provides that in fixing the sale or lease value of property to be transferred, the Secretary shall take into consideration any benefit which has accrued or may accrue to the United States from the use of such property by any State, political subdivision, instrumentality, or institution.
>
> On December 7, 1956, Klamath County submitted an application to our San Francisco regional office for the acquisition of the subject property to be used as an agricultural experiment station to be operated by Oregon State College. After reviewing this application, our San Francisco regional office on December 12, 1956, requested the assignment of this property from the General Services Administration for transfer to the county for educational and research purposes. In view of the benefits which have accrued and will accrue to the United States from the use of this property by Klamath County, the Department has determined to grant a public benefit allowance of 100 percent from the appraised fair value of the property.

I digress from the letter long enough to point out, Mr. President, that in the application of the so-called Morse formula whenever it has been shown as to any particular bill that benefits will accrue to the Federal Government from the use of the property by the particular grantee, then the value of those benefits shall be taken into account in determining the amount the State agency should pay for the property.

That is exactly the point, as pointed out by the Department in connection with this particular transfer.

Going back to the letter:

> In 1939, an education and research experiment station project was established on this 86-acre site since it was representative of approximately 10,000 acres of land under the Klamath Irrigation District operated by the Bureau of Reclamation which were considered unfit for agricultural use. Klamath County and the Oregon State College jointly entered into a lease with the Bureau of Reclamation for the use of the 86 acres as an experiment station to conduct a program of soil reclamation and improvement. As a result of the work conducted at the station, approximately 10,000 acres of land previously in class V have been reclassified and put into classes that now bear operation and maintenance costs in the district. Also, considerable information has been obtained on adapted crop varieties for this area and new varieties introduced here have added materially to the local economy. Klamath County has erected structures on this property having a value of $75,000 and has plans for the erection of a new office and laboratory at a cost of $30,000. In addition, the county has financed improvements such as plantings, fencing, deep drainage, land leveling, and soil improvements. The county and Oregon State College propose to continue the same program of soil reclamation and improvement as has been in effect since 1939 when they entered into the agreement with the Bureau of Reclamation.

I digress further from the letter to point out that this is a very important distinguishing factor between this bill and bills which violate the Morse formula.

I stress the point that the agricultural program for which this station was established in the first place will continue. Thus the case is brought into parallel with the so-called dryland experimentation bill, and in line with the Missouri bill, passed earlier in the session today.

In connection with the dryland bill, certain dryland stations were transferred to various States, including Oregon, Wyoming, Montana, and several other States, under a cooperative arrangement with the United States Department of Agriculture, that the program would continue after the transfer. As the Department of Public Health, Education, and welfare points out in its letter, this program, which has been operating in Klamath County, will be continued after the transfer.

Going back to the letter:

> If the property is assigned to this Department by the General Services Administration, it will be conveyed to the county under the following terms and conditions:
>
> 1. For a period of 20 years from the date of the deed the property shall be used continuously for educational and research purposes in accordance with the proposed program and plan set forth in the application of the county.

I digress to point out that the continuation of this cooperative program for 20 years, with the amount of money which will be expended by the Oregon State College and the county of Klamath, will result in the investment of State and local funds, over the 20-year period, of many times the very few thousand dollars the property is worth at the present time. So the requirement that the transfer must be a transfer involving Federal benefits is overwhelmingly met in the bill of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER].

> 2. During the period of 20 years the county will not resell, lease, mortgage, or encumber, or otherwise dispose of the property unless authorized in writing to do so by this Department.

The letter further shows that the bill itself contains the condition of Federal control to the degree set out in the transfer. In other words, this is not a transfer in which the Federal Government loses control in trying to protect all the taxpayers of the country. The Federal Government will see to it that the cooperative program is carried forward for 20 years.

> 3. The county shall file annual reports with this Department on the operation and maintenance of the program.
>
> 4. In the event of a breach of any of these conditions, all right, title, and interest in and to this property shall, at the option of the Government, revert to and become the property of the United States of America.
>
> 5. In the event of a national emergency declared by the Congress or the President of the United States, the Government shall have the right, in perpetuity, to the full use and possession of the property conveyed.
>
> It is our understanding that the General Services Administration is furnishing you with background information regarding the acquisition of this property by the Bureau of Reclamation and its subsequent use by the county and Oregon State College under the lease with the Bureau of Reclamation.
>
> We shall be glad to provide you with further information if you so desire.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> CHESTER B. LUND,
> *Director, Office of Field Administration.*

Mr. President, I now ask that the letter in its entirety, without any of my interpolations, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

> DEPARTMENT OF
> HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
> *Washington, April 3, 1957.*
>
> HON. WAYNE MORSE,
> *United States Senate.*
>
> DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We have received a request from a member of your staff for cer-

tain information with respect to the proposed transfer of 86.41 acres of land located at Klamath Falls, Oreg., to Klamath County for educational purposes.

Section 203 (k) (1) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, authorizes the Secretary of this Department, subject to disapproval of the Administrator of General Services, to transfer surplus Federal real property for educational or public-health purposes. This section also provides that in fixing the sale or lease value of property to be transferred, the Secretary shall take into consideration any benefit which has accrued or may accrue to the United States from the use of such property by any State, political subdivision, instrumentality, or institution.

On December 7, 1956, Klamath County submitted an application to our San Francisco regional office for the acquisition of the subject property to be used as an agricultural experiment station to be operated by Oregon State College. After reviewing this application, our San Francisco regional office on December 12, 1956, requested the assignment of this property from the General Services Administration for transfer to the county for educational and research purposes. In view of the benefits which have accrued and will accrue to the United States from the use of this property by Klamath County, the Department has determined to grant a public benefit allowance of 100 percent from the appraised fair value of the property.

In 1939, an education and research experiment station project was established on this 86-acre site since it was representative of approximately 10,000 acres of land under the Klamath Irrigation District operated by the Bureau of Reclamation which were considered unfit for agricultural use. Klamath County and the Oregon State College jointly entered into a lease with the Bureau of Reclamation for the use of the 86 acres as an experiment station to conduct a program of soil reclamation and improvement. As a result of the work conducted at the station, approximately 10,000 acres of land previously in Class V have been reclassified and put into classes that now bear operation and maintenance costs in the district. Also, considerable information has been obtained on adapted crop varieties for this area and new varieties introduced here have added materially to the local economy. Klamath County has erected structures on this property having a value of $75,000 and has plans for the erection of a new office and laboratory at a cost of $30,000. In addition, the county has financed improvements such as plantings, fencing, deep drainage, land leveling and soil improvements. The county and Oregon State College propose to continue the same program of soil reclamation and improvement as has been in effect since 1939 when they entered into the agreement with the Bureau of Reclamation.

If the property is assigned to this Department by the General Services Administration, it will be conveyed to the county under the following terms and conditions:

1. For a period of 20 years from the date of the deed the property shall be used continuously for educational and research purposes in accordance with the proposed program and plan set forth in the application of the county.

2. During the period of 20 years the county will not resell, lease, mortgage, or encumber, or otherwise dispose of the property unless authorized in writing to do so by this Department.

3. The county shall file annual reports with this Department on the operation and maintenance of the program.

4. In the event of a breach of any of these conditions, all right, title, and interest in and to this property shall, at the option of the Government, revert to and become the property of the United States of America.

5. In the event of a national emergency declared by the Congress or the President of the United States, the Government shall have the right, in perpetuity, to the full use and possession of the property conveyed.

It is our understanding that the General Services Administration is furnishing you with background information regarding the acquisition of this property by the Bureau of Reclamation and its subsequent use by the county and Oregon State College under the lease with the Bureau of Reclamation.

We shall be glad to provide you with further information if you so desire.

Sincerely yours,

CHESTER B. LUND,
Director, Office of Field Administration.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have gone into this subject in great detail, which ordinarily I would not do, only because I am personally involved in the bill, and I would not want the slightest misunderstanding to exist as to the position of the senior Senator from Oregon. I want the RECORD to be perfectly clear that this bill in no way violates the consistent objection I have raised since 1946 to any bill, introduced by any Senator, which seeks to transfer Federal property without some compensation therefor paid to all the taxpayers of the United States, into the Treasury of the United States.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. CARROLL. I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Oregon, in his wide experience, has come across a situation in which the Federal Government gave grants-in-aid to State corporations for governmental purposes. I have listened very carefully to the distinguished Senator's presentation in connection with the particular issue which he has been discussing, and I am thoroughly in accord with the position he has taken. However, it occurred to me that as a result of the 10 or 12 years' experience the Senator has had in connection with this subject, perhaps he may have come across a situation in which, many years ago, State corporations were formed and grants-in-aid were given to the State corporations for a governmental purpose. In a sense such purposes and objectives were laudable. Such a situation exists in Colorado today. I do not wish to commit the Senator in any way. The junior Senator from Colorado has not yet made up his mind. I wonder if I could draw upon the distinguished Senator's experience if in his investigations he has come upon such a situation.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to my good friend from Colorado that, speaking generally, and without any application to a specific bill, if a particular bill involves a factual situation in which a vested interest was created, and there is a continuing vested interest, the Morse formula does not apply, because the Government's word must be its bond. If as a result of legislation, we have created a vested interest which would justify the terms of a particular bill, under those circumstances I would take the position that the Morse formula does not apply.

I cannot say more than that to the Senator from Colorado, unless I have a specific bill before me. The Senator having raised the matter, I wish to emphasize the distinction between a public use—and he refers to a public use—and the use by a so-called corporate device for furthering private use.

We have had some bills in the Senate which involved the making available of some land to a chamber of commerce, for example, to make it possible for the chamber of commerce to invite industry into its town. The chamber of commerce would do that by offering free industrial sites to an industry in order to attract the industry into that town. That is a laudable undertaking for a chamber of commerce.

However, the RECORD will show that I said on the floor of the Senate, in such a case the chamber of commerce ought to pay for the land. I saw no reason why the citizens of the State of Maine or Florida or Colorado or any other State—my State was not involved, so I shall use my State as an example—should see the Federal Government grant to a chamber of commerce in the State of Oregon Federal land, which in turn would be given away to an industry which might like to come into my State. In addition, I said that, although the chamber of commerce had a right to attract industry to its city, I could see no reason why it should not, through its membership, take positions on the Main Street of that city and pass the tin cup and make a collection from its citizens, to make it possible to establish that industrial site.

We have had cases of that type, but offhand I do not recall a particular factual situation the Senator may have in mind. In a situation of that kind we have taken action under the Morse formula.

Mr. CARROLL. If the Senator will yield further, let us assume that many years ago a grant-in-aid came from the Federal Government to a State corporation formed for a public purpose, that purpose being, we will say, the distribution of funds to low-income groups and family-farm groups. If that grant-in-aid flows from the Federal Government to a State corporation, would the Federal Government still continue to retain jurisdiction over the funds?

Mr. MORSE. I believe the Senator has raised two questions. The first refers to whether the Morse formula would apply. In my judgment, the Morse formula would not be applicable in that factual situation.

The second question relates to what our policy should be in view of any proof that could be presented as to changing circumstances that might justify a secession of that policy as to the future. There again I would say that, so far as any vested rights that were created by the original act are concerned, I would be inclined to say that we must keep our word and continue to see to it that those vested rights are protected.

Mr. CARROLL. To be more specific, some of these corporations were formed 20 years ago, and in a few States they are still functioning on the basis of the grant-in-aid given by the United States Government. Incidentally, the kind of corporation I have in mind is not under the jurisdiction of the State government. It is chartered by the State, and it exists

in a more or less no-man's-land, and is neither a part of the Federal Government nor of the State government. It exists by virtue of its own charter and is governed by its own board of directors, with a grant-in-aid which originally came from the Federal Government. The public purpose is still there, and the money is still there.

My question is what jurisdiction, if any, does the Federal Government have over the money it gives as additional grants?

Mr. MORSE. Again speaking in broadest terms, I would say to my good friend from Colorado that we should apply in such a case the good old principle of parental obligation; that he who was responsible for the birth is responsible for the upbringing; and that until some other legislative course of action is followed the Federal Government still has jurisdiction and responsibility.

Mr. CARROLL. But it is possible to wean money, too.

Mr. MORSE. Oh, yes.

Mr. CARROLL. Perhaps they have lost the child in the weaning process.

Mr. MORSE. Oh, yes; that is possible. However, under our adoption laws we have very strict legislation on that subject.

Mr. CARROLL. There is involved also a question of legitimacy, which we will not discuss at this time. When the matter comes up I shall call it to the Senator's attention in connection with the Morse formula.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator has whetted my curiosity. I certainly wish to be further enlightened by my friend from Colorado when one of these matters comes before the Senate. The Senator may be perfectly sure that if the facts show that a public interest is involved, then the public interest would be jeopardized if we did not assume senatorial responsibility. I shall be in favor of assuming that responsibility, and I know my friend from Colorado will be also.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the Senator very much for his comment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now turn my attention to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

PACIFIC AIR SERVICE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there is a great deal of concern, as evidenced by mail I have received, about two cases pending before the Civil Aeronautics Board. One is known as 5031, the Great Circle case, and the other is known as 7725, the West Coast-Tokyo case.

I should like to make clear at the outset of my brief remarks on these two cases that I am perfectly statisfied to leave the disposition of these matters in the administrative tribunal, the Civil Aeronautics Board, which has jurisdiction over the cases, because the parties involved have the right to appeal to the courts if they decide they have been aggrieved.

Nevertheless, as a Senator from Oregon I feel that I have the duty to put into the RECORD today certain information which had been made available to me since the close of the CAB hearing on these two cases. If the hearings were not closed, I would send the information directly to the CAB, even though I probably would still make this factual statement for the RECORD for purposes of future reference.

There is a great deal of concern in our State that the Northwest area may be left off the so-called great circle route to the East. In view of the great increase in our State's population and the unquestioned increase in population that will come into our State from year to year in the future, we naturally are concerned about any discriminatory policy which will detrimentally affect our State.

I wish to make very clear that I am not at all interested in or concerned with any controversy that may exist between Pan American and Northwest Airlines. I am interested only in doing whatever I may, as a Senator from my State, in making sure that my State will get air service.

I do not believe that competition has ever hurt anyone. If the State of Oregon should be left out of this service, I am sure it would be much more difficult at a later date to get the service.

The only thing I can find in the examiner's report which would justify the recommendation that Portland should be left out is the expressed fear that the stops in Portland and Seattle might put the Northwest Airlines back on subsidy.

I am concerned about what is the best service for the people of Oregon; what is desirable in order to have good competition; what is desirable in order to have good service. I am perfectly willing to postpone for future consideration, if the reality develops, the matter of the subsidy problem. Therefore, there is great merit, it seems to me, in the strong representations which are being made to my office by Oregon groups that favorable consideration should be given to the Portland request to be placed on the so-called circle route.

Some figures have been submitted to me. I think they are reliable figures; at least, they should be made a matter of record. If they are shown to be unreliable, or if anyone holding a different point of view thinks the figures are subject to question, let me make it very clear now that I shall insert in the RECORD, with the same spirit and intent with which I am placing these figures in the RECORD today, any figures which answer the contentions of those who have submitted these statistics to me. I shall turn to those figures in a moment.

There is another phase of the problem that I wish to mention in my speech. I point out that Pan American flies to Hawaii en route to Tokyo. I am perfectly willing to say that I think Northwest Airlines should have the same competitive right and privilege. It seems to me that that would be putting both airlines on a comparable and fair competitive basis.

I repeat: My interest is in the community and not in any airline. I do not have any stock in Pan American or in Northwest. I simply do not have any corporate stock. I have not followed an economic course of action in my lifetime which makes me the owner of such stock. I wish I had some.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee—suspicious of what is coming.

Mr. GORE. I know of no Senator who has more acceptable stock in trade than has the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon. His independence, his toughness of mind, his articulate voice, and his incisive vision give to him a stock in trade which is unexcelled by any other Member of this body.

Mr. MORSE. I sincerely appreciate that compliment. The Senator from Tennessee has really taken me by surprise, because when I said I was suspicious of what was about to come, what I thought the Senator from Tennessee was about to say, in reply to my remarks about not being the owner of any corporate stock, was that I have very, very valuable livestock, for which I can get but little money.

As Senators know, the Senator from Tennessee and I really believe in the competitive system, because as the breeder of two competing blood lines or breeds of cattle, I think we have demonstrated our belief in the competitive system. That is what I thought he was about to rib me about, in view of some remarks I have made recently on the floor of the Senate. So I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his kindness and generosity. It is a good example of how sometimes what one expects does not take place.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield. Now I will probably "get it."

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Oregon now has touched upon a different kind of stock, about which he exercises an amazing lack of good judgment. But I will not disparage the breed of cattle which he owns. I shall simply invite him to join with me in treating our Democratic colleagues to the products thereof. I will furnish the steaks from Aberdeen Angus cattle if he will furnish the bone stew from his breed of Devon cattle.

Mr. MORSE. You will note, Mr. President, what a tough competitor the junior Senator from Tennessee is. But even on that basis, I will supply the soupbone. I am certain my colleagues will prefer the soup to the steaks which the junior Senator from Tennessee will supply. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, returning to the point I was making about the airline situation, I wish to make it very clear, in dead seriousness, that I am no party at all to the controversy between the airlines, but that I am a party to the community interest in this matter. I want to make certain that the people of my State are protected from any unfair economic discrimination which might flow from a failure to have all the facts considered in this controversy, which is of such great concern to my State.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, for future reference, the specific

information which bears upon the controversy.

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

In the 5 months July-November, 1956, Northwest's international services earned $1,538,000 according to that carrier's reports to the CAB.

This period is historically 43 percent of that carrier's annual international total. Hence, Northwest's current international earnings amount to $3,577,000 annually.

These earnings were achieved on the basis of 7 weekly round trips between Seattle and Tokyo, only 6 of which carried passengers. By converting the seventh trip from a DC–4 cargo-mail flight to a passenger-property flight using the same aircraft as are used on the other flights, Northwest could carry more traffic and would realize higher yields from the carriage of passengers. Assuming the same load on this converted seventh flight as Northwest experiences on its other flights, a conservative assumption since Northwest's present service is loaded virtually to capacity and the market is growing 20 percent annually, Northwest would increase its annual earnings to $4,636,000.

In addition, Northwest will shortly place DC–7C's in service. By Northwest's own admission, these aircraft are at least 25 cents per mile cheaper to operate than its present aircraft. This will further increase Northwest's international net operating income to at least $5,600,000 annually.

All this assumes that the frequencies of both American-flag carriers remain frozen at seven round trips per week each. If this is increased, Northwest will do even better.

Thus, even if Pan American were to divert a substantial amount of Northwest's traffic, this would not have the effect of forcing Northwest back on subsidy. Actually, Pan American has been allowed no increase in frequency for nearly 3 years, it is operating at capacity and it could not divert so much as one passenger from Northwest by operating its transpacific flights directly. At such time as increases in frequency are allowed, these will be geared to the American-flag share of the United States-Japan market, Northwest will get as many added frequencies as Pan American, and Pan American will still not be in a position to divert appreciable traffic from Northwest.

ECONOMY AND THE SIZE OF THE BUDGET

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now turn to the principal matter which I plan to discuss today.

Lately we have heard a great deal of talk about economy and reduction in the size of the budget. I should like to call to the attention of the Senate how the Comptroller General made a $5 million contribution toward a balanced budget in a review of the Air Force.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Air Force Spurned $5 Million Refund, House Unit Is Told," published in the New York Times of March 30, 1957.

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

[From the New York Times of March 30, 1957]

AIR FORCE SPURNED $5 MILLION REFUND, HOUSE UNIT IS TOLD

WASHINGTON, March 29.—A Government accountant told incredulous Members of Congress today that it sometimes was easier for a company to make $5 million on a Federal contract than to get the Air Force to accept a refund.

The situation was unfolded before a House Armed Services subcommittee by Lawrence J. Powers, head of accounting and auditing for the General Accounting Office. Involved were the Air Force, the Ford Motor Co. and the Boeing Airplane Co.

Mr. Powers said Boeing contracted with Ford for 454 sets of wings for B–47's it was producing. After Ford had started production the contract was revised and Ford's profit jumped $9,800,000 to $21,800,000.

Ford felt this was too much and asked Boeing to revise the contract again. But Mr. Powers said Boeing replied that it could not afford to keep changing the terms. Ford then offered the $5 million to the Air Force.

F. EDWARD HÉBERT, subcommittee chairman, Democrat of Louisiana, asked whether Mr. Powell meant that Boeing and the Air Force showed no interest in recovering this $5 million from Ford, even though the auto company insisted on giving it back.

"We found no evidence that the Air Force or Boeing had endeavored to obtain a refund from Ford," Mr. Powers replied.

But he said Ford, seizing the initiative, submitted a written commitment to the Air Force for the refund and the money now is on its way to the Treasury.

Mr. Powers said Max Golden, Deputy Air Force Secretary for Procurement and Production, told him the Air Force did not like to take refunds in such cases because contractors might want it to make good on unanticipated price increases.

Mr. Powers said the Air Matériel Command told him the situation arose because of Ford's outstanding efficiency in cutting costs, plus "faulty" cost projections and weaknesses in contract negotiations.

After hearing the evidence, Mr. HÉBERT said he feared the case was "one of many which we will be able to uncover."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is futile for us to think of economy unless the executive branch practices economy. When the money is appropriated, it is not "spent." If the Air Force estimates it needs $100 million for B–47 airplane wing sets, and it does not exert itself to see that these items are bought at the least expense consistent with defense standards, it may well be guilty of wasting dollars. This waste reflects itself in higher costs for government. Five million dollars legitimately saved can be used for other programs, or can be unobligated to help reduce the cost of government. There is no obligation to waste money, although in my judgment the Air Force had an obligation to buy the number of planes directed by the Congress.

I am certain there are many opportunities for real savings. I call to the attention of the Senate an editorial entitled "The Deadly Doctrine," published in the April 1 issue of the Wall Street Journal. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE DEADLY DOCTRINE

"I don't know what the amount of taxes represent when we talk about $70 billion. Is that this room full of bills, or is it three truckloads? I don't know. But I do know this: We can't afford what we're spending and stay strong enough to lead the world to peace."

Those words were spoken by General Eisenhower, at Paterson, N. J., in October 1952. The Republican candidate for the presidency was discussing Democratic spending. The country, he said, was maintaining military strength "above our capacity to pay for it." But, "frugality, efficiency, information, knowledge properly used can bring us a defense organism that will be balanced with our capacity to pay and so will keep and make us strong."

In New York City, at the closing session of the Herald Tribune Forum on October 21, 1952, Mr. Eisenhower said, "Certainly, I know that we must find a substitute for the purely temporary business of bolstering the free nations through annual handouts. That gets neither permanent results nor real friends."

The same month, at Peoria, Ill., General Eisenhower said that, if elected: "My goal, assuming that the cold war gets no worse, is to cut Federal spending to something like $60 billion within 4 years."

And in Kansas City, he told of one way to do it by likening Government to the family. "If in your family affairs you find that your plan to build an addition on the house is going to cost a lot more than you figured on, what do you do? You don't go ahead regardless. You call up the carpenter, the painter, and the brickmason, and you call off the project."

During his first 4 years, President Eisenhower carried out his promises of a balanced budget and of a tax cut. The Government reduced spending to a low of $64.6 billion in 1955, almost $10 billion lower than was spent in 1953, a fiscal year he shared with Mr. Truman.

But in 1956, the spending was higher. In 1957, the spending was higher. And for the 1958 fiscal year, the Government budget is $71.8 billion, or nearly $2 billion more than Mr. Eisenhower mentioned at Paterson, N. J., when he talked about spending more than we could if we were to stay strong.

Now, just the other day in his press conference, President Eisenhower discussed this $71.8 billion budget. And he had this to say:

"But I tell you it is futile to talk about the United States keeping up the position it must keep up in the world and measurably sticking to the programs that have already been adopted in the United States or have been agreed to be necessary for the United States and cut that budget severely."

Among the spending he mentioned that could not be cut safely were military expenditures and foreign aid: "And of all of those (in the security field) I would say none is more important than so-called foreign aid." As for much of the rest: "Someone else will have to say that it is not important to keep up our obligations to veterans, that it is not in the interests of all of us to try to keep a healthy agriculture, that it is not in the interest of all of us to get some schools built. * * * If these programs are not essential to us, why, then, of course you can save a lot of money. I happen to think they are essential, and that is the way I am operating."

The difference between what President Eisenhower said the other day and what he was saying in 1952 is obvious. Perhaps conditions have changed a great deal since then; perhaps the temporary business of bolstering foreign nations with annual handouts now is as right as Mr. Eisenhower believed it to be wrong in 1952. Perhaps frugality and efficiency have reduced the military budgets as low as national safety permits. Perhaps, also, programs such as $450 million for schoolrooms across the country are such necessary additions to our national house that it would be wrong to call up the carpenter, the painter, and the brickmason—and call off the project.

Perhaps all these things are essential and perhaps nothing can be done about reducing the budget.

If so, the attitude of the administration has become the attitude of hopelessness General Eisenhower rejected in 1952.

On October 28, 1952, he said at Pittsburgh: "In this—as in our whole national life—we cannot be ruled by the deadly doctrine of: It can't be done."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this editorial is not an April Fool's Day practical joke. Where is the frugality and efficiency this administration was going to give the American people? The Comptroller General practices these great virtues. As an arm of the Congress, he daily goes about his business of making certain that the taxpayer gets a dollar's worth of government for every dollar spent. The present Comptroller, Mr. Joseph Campbell, his interim predecessor, Mr. Frank Weitzel, and the great Lindsay Warren, steadfastly worked toward frugality and efficiency.

Mr. President, every Member of Congress, in my opinion, owes a great debt to these great Comptrollers General. Appointed by the President, in accordance with our constitutional system, they function really as watchdogs for Congress over Federal funds. They have been a great group of public servants. In fact, I think the appointment of Mr. Campbell is one of the few great appointments which this administration has made. It is an outstanding one.

He was a great comptroller of Columbia University before his service with the Federal Government. I have developed great admiration for the patriotic public service that this courageous man renders the American people.

I wish to say I am sure that in the executive branch of the Government there is room for great economy. We can make the dollars that are appropriated give the taxpayer full value if we only give a little more support and pay timely attention to the reports on waste and inefficiency sent to Congress by the Comptroller General.

In my judgment, savings of up to $100 million in the cost of Government are possible, and these savings will be real. Furthermore, with the Comptroller giving us the facts, and committees of the Congress following up, we can reduce waste. As a constitutional liberal, I have never subscribed to the deadly doctrine of "It can't be done." Instead, I hold to the doctrine that it can be done, and that it must be done, and in this instance that it is being done.

While we have in a high office one general who now swallows his own campaign words, we have another general—the Comptroller—who is so independent that he refuses to concede that waste and inefficiency cannot be reduced. I urge that we support this general in every way possible.

I wish also to mention the Ford Motor Co. and its effort to help save the taxpayers' money. I think this company deserves credit for its interest and initiative in trying to refund excessive profits to the Treasury.

Mr. President, economy in Government is now a favorite topic of conversation among politicians. Everyone seems to be for it, especially when economy is applied to a program that does not affect his own particular interest or his own particular district.

I try to make a conscientious effort to study the programs that affect my State. If I can be convinced that a reduction in funds is wise, I shall support that reduction, even though the State of Oregon is involved. If I find that the budget request is too low, I shall—and do—proudly go before the Appropriations Committee to seek an increase, and offer my proof in support thereof.

Mr. President, the action proposed for the Forest Service in the supplemental budget is, in my judgment, an example of an unsound proposal. I was amazed when I discovered recently that the Department of Agriculture, in a request for supplemental funds, contemplated cutting the 1957 Forest Service budget by $2,300,000, despite the fact that the proposed 1958 budget for the Forest Service is $22 million more than it was in 1957. I studied the accounts for decreases, and found that almost every program for 1958 is either to be increased or is for essentially the same amount. I want to record my opposition to the policy proposed in this supplemental bill.

After careful consideration I reached the opinion that perhaps this is a "phoney" saving for 1957 that the Executive is proposing; and I took the liberty of communicating my views to the leadership in the House and to our able Appropriations chairman, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I should like to make that letter a part of the RECORD. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

MARCH 22, 1957.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I notice that the supplemental appropriation submitted by the President in House Document 115 proposes that the Forest Service and the Department of Agriculture will absorb $2,300,000 in expenses already incurred for vital fire-fighting and insect-control programs. The proposed supplemental appropriation calls for $1,500,000 of the $6,500,000 incurred in fire-fighting costs to be absorbed, and $800,000 for insect control to be absorbed.

I want you to know that I am opposed to this as an unsound budgetary practice, and I find that the following language from H. R. 1510 in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill (H. R. 8779) for the fiscal year 1955 supports my view.

FREEZING OF APPROPRIATIONS

"Another development deplored by the committee was the arbitrary action taken last fall to freeze the funds of many of the action agencies. This action was taken only a few months after the Department had presented testimony to the committee strongly supporting amounts even in excess of the funds finally approved by Congress for the current fiscal year. Reference is made particularly to the freezing of over $1 million of the funds of the Farmers Home Administration at the expense of essential field activities, which money was eventually turned over to the Extension Service to meet penalty mail costs.

"The committee believes that such action is a breach of faith with the Congress and seriously damages confidence and working relationships. It is of the opinion that transfers of funds between agencies should be restricted to the limits allowed by law in the future, unless prior clearance is obtained from appropriate Congressional committees.

"The committee would like to impress on the Department that it is the authority and responsibility of the Congress to determine the scope of the various programs within the Department. The committee welcomes legitimate savings, but does not agree with the impounding of funds where it destroys the intent of Congress as to the size and nature of the programs of such agencies as the Soil Conservation Service, the Farmers Home Administration, the Rural Electrification Administration, the Forest Service, and the pest and disease control activities."

To carry this analogy through, I wish to point out that the absorption of these fire-fighting expenses already incurred runs counter to the practice Congress has long recognized—namely, that forest-fire fighting costs cannot be predicted as can many other expenses. Last year the Forest Service had some very terrible fires that were expensive to extinguish.

Should we now say that the cost of fighting fires set by an act of God should be paid for out of funds appropriated—after careful and meticulous study by Congress—for timber sales, watershed protection, construction and maintenance of roads and trails, and recreational development?

Here we have an example of the Department of Agriculture, having come before Congress last year to request funds for the fiscal year 1957, now implying: "We sought more than we needed for 1957, and we can absorb $2.3 million in other action programs that were expended on fire fighting and insect control without damage to these other programs." To further compound this grievous error, they have just appeared before the Appropriations Committee requesting increases totaling $22 million over the 1957 appropriation for the fiscal year 1958. Again, I emphasize that they have *said* that all of these increases for 1958 are necessary.

I cannot but conclude that their approach on this supplemental appropriation is unsound.

All of these fires occurred last summer. The Department knew the expense. If they knew they could absorb this expense in the 1957 budget, how could they come forward with an even larger budget for 1958?

I am convinced that if this supplemental appropriation is approved as submitted, it will result in the cutback of vital programs for the balance of the fiscal year 1957. In fact, these cuts will be concentrated in the last quarter of the fiscal year. Then, on July 1 the Department will race ahead full tilt at an even higher level of expenditure in these very programs.

I hope you will carefully scrutinize the effect of the proposals set forth by the Department of Agriculture.

Where Congress has agreed, as it has in fire fighting and insect control, that a supplemental appropriation will be based upon actual costs, I believe the Executive has a moral obligation to request, and Congress the duty, to appropriate these funds. For other programs where a new need occurs after the regular appropriation has been made, there should be a well defined prohibition of the executive branch expending funds in anticipation of securing favorable action by Congress. They should immediately come up here and at least discuss the matter with the leadership.

Finally, the transfer of funds from one program to another should be severely limited. If, in fact, the Executive has requested more funds than can be wisely expended upon a given program, or if the Congress has appropriated more than can be effectively utilized, the Executive should advise Congress of the savings that can be made by not expending the funds. However, when Congress believes that a given level of expenditure is in the public interest, the Execu-

tive must then be required to comply with the appropriation law and expend the funds.

I view the course of action suggested by the Executive as another effort to flaunt the will and judgment of Congress. Further, it is an effort to cripple and unbalance other needed programs for which specific funds have been appropriated by Congress. Even if a reduction in some program is feasible, I do not believe the executive branch should be permitted to decide where a cutback will be made. We should require that they indicate exactly where they recommend cuts be made, and Congress should write into the appropriation bill the reduction for each appropriation.

This present case is a good example of the fatal defect in the Executive approach to the problem. I am concerned that cuts will be made in vital capital-improvement programs, such as timber-access roads, rather than by a direct effort to find areas where permanent reductions may be made in the annual expenses of Government.

Instead of saving money, the taxpayer's precious dollar will be wasted. Instead of programs operating in a stable, efficient manner, they will stop and go with jerks and jumps. Just as we would not dream of letting an inexperienced engineer operate a valuable passenger train with its irreplaceable human cargo, we in Congress should not let the inexperienced and reckless engineers at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue manipulate important Government programs when they know not whether they are pushing the throttle or pulling on the brake.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

(Copies to the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, the Honorable MICHAEL KIRWAN, the Honorable DON MAGNUSON, and the Honorable CARL HAYDEN.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it seems to me that if the Department of Agriculture can absorb $2.3 million of fire- and insect-fighting costs in other programs in the last quarter of the year, it should be possible for the Congress to detect some real saving opportunities. Arithmetic tells me that 4 times $2.3 million equals $9.2 million. It may well be that programs for which savings are proposed for 1957 can be cut back by $9.2 million for 1958. If the administration has proposed increases for 1958 in these programs, the savings opportunity might be even greater.

However, we already have a record made. Department head after department head has testified in favor of the budget as presented. Either real savings opportunities exist, or else these are phony savings.

For my part, I believe that the savings claims are really phony. Over in the Defense Department, through slipshod management, $5 million of the taxpayers' money was almost wasted. In the Department of Agriculture, savings are apparently proposed by cutting back temporarily on programs in the last quarter of the fiscal year, while added funds are sought for next year.

I think this administration would be pleased if we had an appropriation bill that merely read: "There is hereby appropriated $72 billion to be spent any way the President desires."

That is the net effect of the proposal in the supplemental bill, if we in the Congress allow the executive branch to save money by cutting back authorized programs and transferring the money to other activities. Mr. President, let me stress the point that in using the word "save" in that connection, I used the word with quotation marks around it.

I believe that the interests of economy might well be served by going over the supplemental bill in great detail. Let the Executive outline where every last cent of savings can be made. Then let the Congress assess the facts and look at the proposed expenditures for 1958. If a saving can really be made between now and June 30, 1957, let us not appropriate a penny more for that function for the year that starts July 1, 1957.

We in the Congress have many ways open to explore the possibility of savings. I commend two courses. First, let us have the Comptroller General study whether the appropriated money has been effectively spent. Through improving efficiency and insuring the careful use of funds available, we can promote real savings.

Second, let us examine these proposals to absorb extraordinary expenses by planned cutbacks in other programs. If funds can be transferred from a program without crippling its effectiveness, let us not in the subsequent years honor requests exceeding the net amount spent in the preceding year.

Above all, let us in the Congress be the final judge as to how and where the funds are expended. Let us not write a blank check addressed to whoever occupies 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, be he a Republican or be he a Democrat.

It behooves all of us to remember that it is we in Congress who frequently are made to appear as ne'er-do-well spendthrifts foisting tremendous budgets on an unwilling Chief Executive. If we in Congress are to pay the piper, then it is we who should call the tune.

Furthermore, if the Chief Executive and his agents are playing a game of semantics with the people, let us expose the fraud.

In my opinion, that is exactly what the administration is doing.

The only thing consistent about this administration is its inconsistency. It ran on an economy ticket, and then proceeded to request more than has been requested in any four peacetime years. Instead of moaning and crying about the size of the budget, let us tell the American people the truth.

We are budgeting for the welfare and security of our Nation. We need no excuse. By our oath of office, we are obliged to promote our Nation's welfare. We appropriate, in good faith, the funds needed for our Nation's welfare.

The greatest part of the budget is requested by the President. We study that budget; and we may cut funds in one place, and we may add funds in another. The President tells us that cuts in funds he has requested are harmful, and then he tells us that essential increases for vital public works—which his big-business friends have not recommended—are not only unwise, but are pork-barrel politics. The implication to the people is that if we would just let the President have his way, the budget would be balanced.

Mr. President, for my part, I am getting tired of the political posture I see at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. One who forever sits astride a political fence and waits to learn the direction of political winds continually exposes his ineffectiveness as a political leader.

I think it is about time we got some constructive help from the administration, and it is we in Congress who must work together in this direction.

Mr. President, today, in making this speech, I plead again, as I have done many times since 1947, when I first proposed a capital budget—for the adoption by the Congress of a capital budget. As the record shows, that recommendation of mine was based on the early recommendation of the Committee for Economic Development—a committee composed of outstanding business leaders; and there was not one Government person on the committee.

I see that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has just taken a seat in front of me, here in the Senate Chamber. I wish to state that in my opinion the Senator from Illinois is not only the greatest economist in the Congress, but he is one of the 10 great economists in the United States; and he is one of the economists who for some time have been urging the importance of having us face the budget problem from the standpoint of a capital budget.

I want to say, Mr. President, that I do not think we are going to have a sound budget procedure in this country until we provide for it. Yet there has not been a whisper of encouragement by this administration for such a budget procedure. There is not a single corporation in America which would think of conducting its financial affairs except on the basis of a capital budget, because a corporation would not get very far in sound bookkeeping if it tried to carry on its books capital investments as operating costs. That is what we do in running our national budget. We mix up operating costs and capital investments, both creating projects. We cannot do much about major budget provisions such as for military purposes, to pay interest rates, for veterans costs, and other so-called fixed costs, and we should not, because, as I have stated so many times, and I repeat today, I do not believe in economizing at the expense of the security of my country. However, the matter of the security of my country is not limited just to foreign affairs or military affairs. We have got to take a look at the security of our country from the standpoint of the future economic needs of American boys and girls. I respectfully point out that the Eisenhower administration is doing irreparable damage to the future needs and the heritage of future generations of American boys and girls in respect to their natural resources, of which the Eisenhower administration, during its term of office, is but the trustee of God's gift of these natural resources to each generation. I make that statement on the floor of the Senate today, as I have elsewhere in America, and will continue to do so so long as this budget issue is of such importance to future generations.

All one has to do, if one wants to see the false economy, is see the Eisenhower

administration's position with regard to water resources. Let the American people remember an ugly lesson of history. Civilizations go down as their water tables go down; and America's water table is going down. One of the reasons why America's water table is going down is that this administration is playing cheap politics with full river basin development. This administration is segmentizing the river basins of America, and this administration is following a profiteering and privateering course of action with America's water supply, by playing right into the monopolistic interests that are destroying the future water supply of American boys and girls in the decades ahead.

I say to the Senate and to the American people, I want you to look at the natural resources of our country and see something besides trees and mountains and streams and valleys. I want you to see this problem in terms of the imagery of the faces of unborn millions of American boys and girls who are going to follow us throughout the course of this national history of ours. I want to ask this question, What kind of a history will it be? Will it be a history in which shortsightedness and false economy caused us to exploit God's gift of natural resources to each generation, as we are doing under the Eisenhower administration? Or are we going to insist, before it is too late, that thousands of square miles of America shall not become another eroded China? Are we going to act before it is too late, Mr. President, in order to prevent what has developed in the course of history in the Middle East, when not so many centuries ago four times the area in the Middle East was then under cultivation as compared to now? Why? Because past centuries of people in the Middle East forgot to protect their water table.

One may say, "Mr. Senator, what has it got to do with this budget problem?" It has a great deal to do with it, because when we get down to the final cuts, if we yield to some of the hysteria in this economy drive, we cut off funds for great wealth-producing natural resource projects that will protect full river-basin development and protect the water supply for future generations.

Yes; I supported the upper Colorado project. I got a lot of criticism from my home State, too. It was said, "How can you support the upper Colorado River project? That is a very expensive project from the standpoint of cost-to-benefits." It is so expensive that the administration never even suggested that any of the power developments in that area should be taken over by the private utilities, because they are too expensive.

I will state why I supported the upper Colorado project. The upper Colorado project is primarily and fundamentally a water-conservation project, and I see the faces and imagery, to which I have alluded, of thousands and thousands of American boys and girls who are going to live in the upper Colorado project in the decades ahead. I considered it was my duty of statesmanship, during by service in the Senate, to see to it that I did attempt to get an adequate water supply. I took note of the fact that Denver is on water rationing several months each year. I take note that 244 counties of Texas out of 254 are water-disaster areas today.

I think when we come to grips with salient facts such as these, when we face the fact that there are literally hundreds of communities in America that are short in water supply today, the place to economize in this budget is not in great wealth-producing projects of the type advocated by Pinchot, Norris, Theodore Roosevelt, Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, and others, because they recognized the soundness of that doctrine in this field of service.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield to my good friend from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. First, may I say I want to congratulate the Senator from Oregon on the general nature of the speech which he is making and his plea for a capital budget, in which I most heartily join. I think the Senator from Oregon knows I have always supported him in the development of power projects along the Columbia River. Is not that true?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct. The Senator from Illinois is a great friend of ours, and I want to assure him the people of my State approve of his statesmanship.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think such projects are sound, because the flow on the Columbia is tremendous, amounting to 180 million acre-feet. It is the greatest water resource on the continent. But I will say that, though the Senator from Oregon has in general made a very fine record in the Congress, and though I approve of most of his efforts in the field of power development and water conservation, he made the greatest mistake in his life when he supported the upper Colorado project, because that is a project where the cost per acre on irrigation ran from $800 an acre up to, in some cases, $2,000 an acre, in high altitudes, where farmers will never be able to grow anything but hay and perhaps a few apples, and where not more than $100 an acre can be paid back from the revenue received for crops raised on that land.

The richest soil in the country is in the central belt of counties across Illinois. This land does not have a value, at present, of more than $650 an acre. Yet the Senator from Oregon has the nerve to stand here on the floor of the Senate and say that he did a great job for the public when he voted to spend from $300 to $2,000 an acre on high altitude land, 5,000 feet above sea level, where the growing season will be less than 100 days per year.

The Senator from Oregon is one of the great Senators of all time. I suppose he is entitled to his share of mistakes. I believe that when the Senator from Oregon reaches the conclusion of his long and illustrious life, when he looks back at his vote on the upper Colorado, he will say, "That time I erred."

Mr. MORSE. I think everyone in the Senate knows I love the Senator from Illinois very, very much. He usually exercises great influence on my judgment, Mr. President.

I listened to the Senator from Illinois during the debate on the upper Colorado River bill, and I came to the conclusion that this was one of only a few times that my good friend from Illinois suffered from historical myopia—that he was not seeing far enough ahead into history.

I recognize the high cost of this project as of now. I hope the Senator from Illinois is not correct. I hope I am not mistaken about it, Mr. President. But I do wish to say that facts such as the following are facts that concern me very much, as to the upper Colorado River debate: The testimony before our committees was that the population experts are raising the question, "Where will the food come from by the year 2000?" Their concern is that we will not, by the year 2000, be able to produce enough food to feed the population of the United States.

So, Mr. President, with that kind of concern, we had better act now and take the steps now, costly as it is going to be, for insurance purposes for the future, to see to it that we follow this water-conservation program in order to obtain that food.

Mr. President, I think we have to agree that when we come to the problem of the adequacy of food, the problem of having enough food to meet the needs of our population, we cannot pay too much to solve the problem.

I know the Senator from Illinois has performed a great service here in the Senate by checking up on these various reclamation projects, elsewhere than in the upper Colorado River Basin, some of which do cost a great deal.

But I do think, Mr. President, in terms of history, these projects are going to be cheap investments on the part of the American people. I may be wrong in this premise. If I am, then my argument falls to the floor of the Senate, Mr. President. However, in my judgment one cannot accomplish what is needed on a piecemeal basis. One has to work on the basis of a comprehensive river basin development program. That is why I go along, Mr. President, with some projects which are highly expensive.

I assure the Senator from Illinois—and I speak quite facetiously about it—that I listened to what he just said about the value of Illinois land and about the population of Illinois, a State with wonderful land and wonderful people, but I do not have anything to do with the fact that many of those people are migrating to the upper Colorado River Basin.

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

Mr. MORSE. I think I ought to serve those ex-Illinoisans by seeing to it that when they get to the upper Colorado River Basin they will have enough water to drink.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield. The Senator knows I am just having a little fun with him.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that one of the areas of the country which lost population in the period from 1940 to 1950 was the area of these Mountain States, from Montana down through Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, and so on?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As a matter of fact, the population is upheld very largely by subsidies paid by the Federal Government, such as the irrigation subsidy, the silver subsidy, and the wool subsidy. There is also the prohibition against importation of cattle to this country, when such cattle could be imported to sell at prices lower than sales prices of domestic cattle in the United States.

Believe me, the political power of those Mountain States is exercised very frequently at the expense of the consumers and taxpayers of the country.

Mr. MORSE. I understand the point of view of the Senator from Illinois. I will say to the Senator, good-naturedly and seriously, that of course one of the reasons this out-migration has been taking place is the very major premise I am laying down here today, the fact that we are not protecting the water supply of that area and the water table is falling.

We must have a total nation—not a nation in which there is a density of population in one part of the country, with great physical erosion, so far as natural resources are concerned, in other parts of the country, for that will bring human erosion, too. What happens, Mr. President, when we do not protect the natural resources of the people living in an area, is that the people erode, too, so far as their regional culture and their civilization are concerned.

I desire a total nation. I wish to have a nation, Mr. President, where a person can go to any of these areas, to which the Senator from Illinois has referred, and find the same great standards of living that are enjoyed in the State of Illinois. Of course, we all have to pay part of the bill.

I do not mean to imply that the Senator from Illinois is a regionalist, because he is not. His great record in the Senate shows he is not. This is only one small facet of this problem, on which he and I have disagreed. I think part of that disagreement is because the Senator does not fully appreciate, I feel, the fact that a little bit of regionalism has crept into his economic philosophy. But that does not in any way do any great damage to the magnificent economic record the Senator has made as a wonderful economist. That is our difference.

I am glad the Senator has raised these points today. I wish to state to the Senator from Illinois that I shall continue to weigh his point of view; but I shall continue to fight with all my ability in the Senate, such as I may have, for the total development of the natural resources of our country, for the benefit of the future generations of American boys and girls, to whom I refer so frequently in my discussions of the subject.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

PROPOSED CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD two memorandums. Both relate directly to so-called civil rights legislation. One is a memorandum, which I sent to all members of the Judiciary Committee. It deals with the broad question of the alleged denial of a jury trial under the pending legislation. The second deals with the more specific question of a right to a jury trial in labor dispute cases.

I think these memorandums will be of interest to all Members of the Senate.

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

MEMORANDUM

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., March 23, 1957.

To: All Members of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

From: THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.

Subject: Alleged denial of jury trial in pending civil rights legislation.

During the past week or so, an effort has been made, both in the press and otherwise, to convince the Congress and the public that the injunctive relief contained in the pending civil rights legislation would result in a deprivation of "the right to a trial by jury." To lay minds, there might seem to be something superficially plausible in this allegation. However, I am certain that lawyers will see that the charge is essentially without foundation in fact.

As all lawyers know, the concept of jury trial is a limited one, both traditionally and constitutionally. It is well-known that a person is not entitled to a jury trial in every conceivable type of criminal proceeding, or, indeed, in every type of criminal proceeding for that matter. In fact, the Constitution provides for jury trial in only two types of proceedings: (a) criminal prosecutions and (b) civil actions at law for money damages in excess of a certain amount.

One field of the law in which jury trial is very limited is in equity proceedings. To listen to the opponents of civil rights legislation, one would think that injunctive relief was something new. As we all know, it goes back for hundreds of years in Anglo-American legal history.

The injunctive process was first established to provide relief in unusual circumstances, where the regular law courts could not, in fact, be counted upon to provide relief. The injunctive process continues to serve the same purpose today.

One such unusual circumstance exists today where the civil and criminal procedures cannot be relied upon to provide relief in certain cases of violations of voting rights. We know that, regardless of the facts, juries in some such cases are not likely to convict. An alternative is the grant of injunctive relief to the United States.

If an injunction against the violation of the right to vote were issued by a Federal judge, and if this injunction were willfully disobeyed by voting officials, such officials would then be in contempt of the court. Contempt proceedings could be undertaken by the Federal judge, without a jury. However, there is nothing in either our Constitution, our historical development, or our tradition which guarantees a jury trial in a chancery or equity proceeding. Furthermore, in both civil and criminal contempts to punish for violation of an injunction, there is no right to a trial by jury if the United States has been a party litigant in the proceedings (with one exception, below). In fact, Congress has denied a jury trial in contempt proceedings where the injunction was instituted by the United States (18 U. S. C. 3691).

There is only 1 exception to this rule, only 1 type of case in which a person charged with contempt is entitled by law to a trial by jury where the United States is a party. This is in the case of labor disputes where injunctions are obtained under the Norris-La Guardia Act. And even this exception is, today, for all practical purposes a dead letter, since injunctions are now obtained under provisions either of the Taft-Hartley Act (which does not provide for trial by jury for violations of injunctions) or under State laws (which may or may not provide for jury trial).

My conclusions have been thoroughly documented in two attachments to this memorandum. The first is an excellent analysis by the chief counsel of the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee.

The second is a list of 28 Federal statutes in which injunctive relief lies. As outlined above, with one exception, there is no right to trial by jury in cases for criminal contempt of court for violations of injunctions, under these statutes, where the United States is a party to the case.

ATTACHMENT A

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON
CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS,
March 12, 1957.

To: The Honorable THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., Chairman, Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

From: Charles H. Slayman, Jr., Chief Counsel and Staff Director, Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

Subject: Some notes supporting the position that proposed civil-rights legislation, with its provision for Federal injunctive relief, will not infringe constitutional rights of Americans to trial by jury.

1. Proponents of the proposed civil-rights legislation maintain that no person will be denied the right to trial by jury in any situation in which he is now guaranteed that right.

2. Subject notes are attached in support of this position.

Respectfully submitted.

CHARLES H. SLAYMAN, Jr.

Some notes supporting the position that proposed civil rights legislation, with its provisions for Federal injunctive relief, will not infringe the constitutional rights of Americans to trial by jury:

1. The present legal and equitable situations in civil rights cases.

(a) Private plaintiffs may sue for damages resulting from deprivations of civil rights under 42 U. S. C. 1983, and 1985. Constitutional procedural guaranties apply for civil actions at law.

(b) Private plaintiffs may seek equitable relief, including injunctions and declaratory judgments, pursuant to 42 U. S. C. 1983, where such remedies would be appropriate under the historical doctrines of equity. Constitutional procedural guaranties apply for suits in equity.

(c) The Federal Government may institute criminal prosecutions under 18 U. S. C. 241, 242, or 594, as appropriate. Constitutional procedural guaranties apply for criminal prosecutions.

2. The legal and equitable effects of the proposed additional civil remedies for civil rights cases.

(a) The Federal Government would be authorized to bring a suit for damages either on its own behalf or on behalf of the aggrieved party. The constitutional procedural guaranties appropriate to civil actions at law would apply here in the same manner as in private actions for damages.

(b) The Federal Government would be able to seek equitable relief, including injunctions and declaratory judgments, whereever such remedies would be appropriate under the historical doctrines of equity. The procedural rules historically governing equity proceedings would apply along with all the constitutional guaranties provided for such cases in the same manner as in private suits, except that the equity doctrine requiring exhaustion of administrative remedies would be modified.

(c) The Federal Government would still be empowered to institute criminal prosecutions in which all of the constitutional guaranties appropriate to such prosecutions would apply.

3. Jury trial would not be denied.

(a) The constitutional right to trial by jury would not be infringed. Under the United States Constitution, the defendant has such a right in criminal prosecutions and in civil actions at law but not in civil suits in equity. The proposed legislation makes no change; the defendant is not now entitled to a jury when a private person brings a civil suit for injunction.

(b) It is not a valid argument to say that the proposed legislation would deprive a person of a right to trial by jury by permitting the Government to institute proceedings for preventive relief as well as criminal prosecutions. Such an argument seems to say that persons who propose to violate the Constitution provisions guaranteeing civil rights have a constitutional right to be subjected only to a criminal prosecution. Congress has always had the power—and, as shown by the list of 28 statutes placed in the record of the hearings by the Attorney General, has frequently exercised it—to decide whether forbidden conduct shall be reached by civil proceedings or by criminal proceedings or by both.

(c) In proceedings for contempt of court as the result of a violation of an injunction, the defendant has no constitutional right to a jury trial. Congress has provided for a jury trial in certain contempt cases and not in others. The Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, provide, in section (b) of rule 42, on criminal contempt:

"The defendant is entitled to a trial by jury in any case in which an act of Congress so provides."

It has long been the declared policy of Congress that—except in labor-dispute cases—there shall be no right to a jury trial where the contempt charge is disobedience of an injunction obtained in a proceeding in which the United States Government was the plaintiff. Title 18, United States Code, sections 3691 and 3692 specifically provides for a jury trial for contempt in labor-dispute cases. The proposed legislation does not alter this long-standing Congressional policy.

4. Right to counsel, right to confront and cross-examine witnesses, right to a fair trial would not be denied.

(a) Normal equity procedures apply to a trial on the merits of a plaintiff's request for an injunction or declaratory judgment. Witnesses are heard in person and subject to cross-examination by counsel. Affidavits are not used to establish facts. With respect to the right of the defendant to be represented by counsel and to confront and cross-examine witnesses and to have all the other procedural requisites for a fair trial, such a proceeding is the same as any other civil suit.

(b) Courts of equity have inherent power to issue restraining orders and temporary injunctions, for the purpose of preserving the status quo pending the final outcome of the suit, and to do so on the basis of affidavits. The proposed legislation does no more than recognize this standard equitable power and purports to give no special power to the Federal courts in civil-right cases. Similar language in this respect will be found in many Federal statutes. See, e. g., Atomic Energy Act of 1954, authorizing the Attorney General to seek injunctive relief and providing that "a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order may be granted" (42 U. S. C. 2280). Similar language is in the Federal Power Act (16 U. S. C. 825m) and many other statutes. In all these situations, the relief granted on affidavits is only temporary and at the trial on the merits witnesses are heard and examined as described above.

(c) The Federal courts have clearly defined the law to be that "the purpose of a preliminary injunction is to preserve the subject matter of the controversy in its then existing conditions—to preserve the status quo." (*Seagram Distilling Corp.* v. *New Cut Rate Liquors* (22 F. 2d 815, 820 (1955)).) A restraining order or preliminary injunction is not proper where the effect would be to compel the defendant to take affirmative action beyond that necessary to preserve the status quo. (*Eighth Regional War Labor Bd.* v. *Humble Oil and Refining Co.* (145 F. 2d. 462, 464 (1942)).) "Where the granting of a preliminary injunction would give to a plaintiff all the actual advantage which could be obtained by the plaintiff as a result of a final adjudication of a controversy in favor of the plaintiff, a motion for preliminary injunction should be denied." (*Selchow & Richter Co.* v. *Western Printing and Lithographing Co.* (112 F. 2d 430 (1940)).) There is nothing in the proposed statute which would modify such established doctrines of equity practice. If the Federal court in equity would not be able to proceed to a full hearing on the merits prior to an election, for example, it would not be authorized to decide the issue on affidavits. If the complaint were a refusal to register the voter, no preliminary injunction would be proper since it would go beyond the status quo. If, on the other hand, the complaint was that the registrar was about to strike the name of a voter from the rolls, then a preliminary injunction might be proper to preserve the status quo—that is, to maintain his existing status as a registered voter.

5. Many judicial limitations are placed upon equity proceedings to insure fairness to the defendant.

(a) In an equity proceeding, the plaintiff, whether it be a private person or the Government, must satisfy the historical requisites for equity jurisdiction. He must show irreparable injury and the inadequacy of the remedy at law. The court has a much broader discretion to deny the requested relief than it has in actions at law.

(b) The judicial attitude in such cases and the safeguards placed by the court is illustrated by the following quotations from the Supreme Court opinion in *Eccles* v. *Peoples Bank of Lakewood Village* (333 U. S. 426 (1948)), a case in which the Court upheld the refusal of the district court to grant relief to the plaintiff in an injunction proceeding on a motion for summary judgment heard on affidavits: "A declaratory judgment, like other forms of equitable relief, should be granted only as a matter of judicial discretion, exercised in the public interest. * * * It is always the duty of a court of equity to strike a proper balance between the needs of the plaintiff and the consequences of giving the desired relief. Especially where governmental action is involved, courts should not intervene unless the need for equitable relief is clear, not remote or speculative. * * * A determination of administrative authority may of course be made at the behest of one so immediately and truly injured by a regulation claimed to be invalid, that his need is sufficiently compelling to justify judicial intervention even before the completion of the administrative process. But, as we have seen, the bank's grievance here is too remote and insubstantial, too speculative in nature, to justify an injunction against the Board of Governors and therefore equally inappropriate for a declaration of rights. This is especially true in view of the type of proof offered by the bank. Its claims of injury were supported entirely by affidavits. Judgments on issues of public moment based on such evidence, not subject to probing by judge and opposing counsel, is apt to be treacherous. Caution is appropriate against the subtle tendency to decide public issues free from the safeguards of critical scrutiny of the facts, through use of a declaratory summary judgment. Modern equity practice has tended away from a procedure based on affidavits and interrogatories, because of its proven insufficiencies."

6. Legislation would not transfer to Federal courts power to determine qualifications of voters.

If a State establishes voter qualifications and registration procedures applicable to all voters without discrimination based on race, color, etc., and if the election authorities comply with the State statute, the Federal courts now do not have jurisdiction to interfere and would not have under the proposed legislation. It is only when the registrar fails to comply with the State law and discriminates against certain voters that the Federal courts have jurisdiction. The jurisdiction of the Federal courts is not to determine the qualifications of the voter but rather it is to prevent or punish, as the case may be, action by the election officials which (in violation of State and Federal law) results in a discriminatory application of the local qualifications.

ATTACHMENT B

Statutes authorizing injunctive relief to the United States Government and agencies authorized to seek the same

1. Antitrust laws, restraining violations (by U. S. attorney under direction of Attorney General) (15 U. S. C. 4).

2. Associations engaged in catching and marketing aquatic products restrained from violating order to cease and desist monopolizing trade (by Department of Justice) (13 U. S. C. 522).

3. Association of producers of agricultural products from restraining trade (by Department of Justice) (7 U. S. C. 292).

4. Atomic Energy Act, enjoining violation of act or regulation (by Atomic Energy Commission) (42 U. S. C. 1816).

5. Atomic Energy Act, enjoining violation of act or regulation (by Attorney General) (42 U. S. C. 2280).

6. Bridges over navigable waters, injunction to enforce removal of bridge violating act as to alteration of bridges (by Attorney General) (33 U. S. C. 519).

7. Clayton Act, violation of enjoined (by U. S. attorney, under direction of Attorney General) (15 U. S. C. 25).

8. Electric utility companies, compliance with law enforced by injunctions (by Federal Power Commission) (16 U. S. C. 825).

9. False advertisements, dissemination enjoined (by Federal Trade Commission) (15 U. S. C. 53).

10. Freight forwarders, enforcement of laws, orders, rules, etc., by injunctions. (Interstate Commerce Commission or Attorney General) (49 U. S. C. 1017).

11. Fur Products Labeling Act, to enjoin violation (by Federal Trade Commission) (15 U. S. C. 69g).

12. Inclosure of public lands, enjoining violation (by U. S. attorney) (43 U. S. C. 1062).

13. Investment advisors, violations of statute, rules and regulations governing, enjoined (by Securities and Exchange Commission) (15 U. S. C. 80b–9).

14. Gross misconduct or gross abuse of trust by investment companies, enjoined (by Securities and Exchange Commission) (15 U. S. C. 80a–35).

15. Use of misleading name or title by investment company, enjoined (by Securities

and Exchange Commission) (15 U. S. C. 80a–34).

16. Violation of statute governing, or rules, regulations, or orders of SEC by investment companies, enjoined (by Securities and Exchange Commission) (15 U. S. C. 80a–41).

17. Fair Labor Standards Act, enjoining of violations (by Administrator, Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor, under direction of Attorney General; see 29 U. S. C. 204b) (29 U. S. C. 216 (c), 217).

18. Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, enforcement of order by injunction (by U. S. attorney; see 29 U. S. C. 921a) (33 U. S. C. 921).

19. Import trade, prevention of restraint by injunction (by U. S. attorney, under direction of Attorney General) (15 U. S. C. 9).

20 Wool products, enjoining violation of Labeling Act (by Federal Trade Commission) (15 U. S. C. 68e).

21. Securities Act, actions to restrain violations (by Securities and Exchange Commission) (15 U. S. C. 77t).

22. Securities Exchange Act, restraint of violations (by Securities and Exchange Commission) (15 U. S. C. 78u).

23. Stockyards, injunction to enforce order of Secretary of Agriculture (by Attorney General) (7 U. S. C. 216).

24. Submarine cables, to enjoin landing or operation (by the United States) (47 U. S. C. 36).

25. Sugar quota, to restrain violations (by U. S. attorney, under direction of Attorney General; see 7 U. S. C. 608 (7) (7 U. S. C. 608a (6))).

26. Water carriers in interstate and foreign commerce, injunctions for violations of orders of ICC (by ICC or Attorney General) (49 U. S. C. 916).

27. Flammable Fabrics Act, to enjoin violations (by Federal Trade Commission) (15 U. S. C. 1195).

28. National Housing Act, injunction against violation (by Attorney General) (12 U. S. C. 1731b).

Right to a Jury Trial in Labor-Dispute Cases

The contention has been made in connection with the pending civil-rights bill that in labor-dispute cases there is a general statutory right to a jury trial for contempt. From this contention it is argued that a similar right to a jury trial for contempt should be given in civil-rights cases.

The brief answer to this line of argument is that unions and employers do not now enjoy any significant or substantial rights to jury trials in contempt cases arising out of labor disputes. To demonstrate that this is so requires, however, a fairly detailed explanation of the law on this subject.

To begin with, there is no constitutional right to a jury trial in any contempt proceeding, civil or criminal. In re *Debs* (158 U. S. 564, 594, 595, 15 S. Ct. 900 (1894)). (If there were a constitutional right to a jury trial, the present controversy in connection with the so-called civil-rights legislation would, of course, not arise.) Thus, any right to a jury trial in contempt cases must, in the case of the Federal courts, rest on the Federal statutes, and, in the case of State courts, on State statutes.

Let us see then what the controlling statutes provide.

Federal statutes: The only Federal statute which confers any right to a jury trial for contempt in labor-dispute cases is section 3692 of the Criminal Code (title 18 of the United States Code). The first sentence of this section reads:

"In all cases of contempt arising under the laws of the United States governing the issuance of injunctions or restraining orders in any case involving or growing out of a labor dispute, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the contempt shall have been committed."

There then follows a provision that the section shall not apply to contempts committed in the presence of the courts, etc.

On its face this section provides generally for jury trials for criminal contempt in labor-dispute cases. However, it is not entirely clear that this statute will be applied literally.

This section is derived from section 11 of the Norris-La Guardia Act (act of March 23, 1932, c. 90, 47 Stat. 72, formerly 29 U. S. C. sec. 111 (1940 ed.)). In its original form it applied only to contempt of injunctions issued under the Norri-La Guardia Act. In the famous Mine Workers case the Supreme Court ruled that the Norris-La Guardia Act, including section 11, does not apply to suits brought by the United States; and that the union was accordingly not entitled to a jury trial when Judge Goldsborough fined it $3,500,000 for criminal contempt. (The fine was reduced to $700,000 by the Supreme Court.) *United States* v. *United Mine Workers* (330 U. S. 258, 298, 67 S. Ct. 677, 698 (1947)).

Further, the Taft-Hartley Act explicitly provides (secs. 10 (h), 203 (b), 302 (e)) that the Norris-La Guardia Act shall not apply to the issuance of injunctions under Taft-Hartley.

Finally, the Norris-La Guardia Act, in actual practice, virtually ended the issuance of injunctions by the Federal courts in labor-dispute cases between private parties.

Thus, following the United Mine Workers decision and the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act, section 11 of the Norris-La Guardia Act (29 U. S. C. 111) was a dead letter. It had no application to contempt of injunctions obtained by the United States or by the NLRB; and since the enactment of the Norris-La Guardia Act, injunctions have almost never been obtained by employers in labor-dispute cases in the Federal courts.

At this point the 1948 revision of the Criminal Code was enacted. In this revision section 11 of the Norris-La Guardia Act was repealed and in a revised form became section 3692 of title 18. In its new form as section 3692, the provision is phrased generally and states that "in all cases of contempt" in any case growing out of a labor dispute the accused shall enjoy the right to a jury trial.

The question thus arises whether, in view of this revision and generalization of the section, there is now a right to a jury trial for criminal contempt (1) in labor-dispute cases to which the United States is a party—like the United Mine Workers case—or (2) in cases involving disobedience of court orders issued under the National Labor Relations Act.

No flat answer to this question can be given. Although the 1948 recodification and revision of the Criminal Code was enacted into positive law, and the prior statutes repealed, the courts will still to some extent look to the wording and purpose of the predecessor statute. *Amalgamated Clothing Workers* v. *Richman Brothers* (348 U. S. 511, 75 S. Ct. 452 (1955)). If the courts look to section 11 of the Norris-La Guardia Act as a guide to the meaning of the present section 3692 of title 18, they may conclude that, despite the latter's general phraseology, it was meant to apply only to contempt of injunctions issued under the Norris-La Guardia Act. And it seems unlikely that Congress intended, in approving this section as a part of the 1948 revision of the Criminal Code, to restore jury trial in contempt cases arising under the Taft-Hartley Act when Congress had explicitly provided the year before that the Norris-La Guardia provisions, including that for jury trial, should not apply under the Taft-Hartley Act.

On the other hand, the language of section 3692 is general and unequivocal, and the courts may conceivably hold that its scope is not limited to contempt of injunctions issued under the Norris-La Guardia Act.

No single case arising since the 1948 revision is found in the annotations to section 3692; and the possible application of section 3692 does not seem to have been urged in any contempt case arising under the Taft-Hartley Act.

However, even if section 3692 be taken as a general provision, extending beyond the Norris-La Guardia Act, its practical significance is not great. That is because, as part of the Criminal Code (title 18), it applies only to criminal contempt and not to civil contempt. (See Moore's Federal Practice (2d ed., vol. 5, p. 260).) Even apart from the section's incorporation in the Criminal Code, the Supreme Court interpreted a similar provision in the Clayton Act as applying only to criminal, and not to civil, contempt, and it even expressed doubt whether Congress could accord a right to jury trial in a civil-contempt proceeding without encroaching upon the equity jurisdiction intended by the Constitution. See *Michaelson* v. *United States* (266 U. S. 42, 45 S. Ct. 18 (1924)).

Normally the same facts give rise to both civil and criminal contempt: the only difference is that the punishment for civil contempt must be remedial while that for criminal contempt may be punitive as well. See the *United Mine Workers* case (Moore's Federal Practice (2d ed.) vol. 5, pp. 256–265). Thus, if a union strikes in violation of a court order it can, in either a civil or criminal contempt proceeding, be fined a thousand dollars a day for each day the strike continues, and its leaders can be imprisoned while the strike lasts. The only difference between the two types of contempt is that in a criminal contempt proceeding a fine and jail sentence can be levied even after the union has complied with the court order.

Not only does the same state of facts normally give rise to both civil or criminal contempt, but the courts usually resort to civil rather than to criminal contempt proceedings. That is probably why, though there have been scores of contempt proceedings under the Taft-Hartley Act, in many of which it would have been advantageous to the defendant to seek a jury trial, there is no record that any jury trial has never been claimed.

Since the courts are thus free to resort to civil contempt rather than criminal contempt (and normally prefer to) and since there is no right to a jury trial in civil contempt, it makes little practical difference whether section 3692 of title 18 gives a right to a jury trial for criminal contempt in labor dispute cases. Here again, that is no doubt why no single case has arisen under that section since 1948.

This point is equally applicable to section 3691 of title 18, which provides for jury trial of criminal contempts when the act done constitutes a criminal offense. (The statute excepts from this general rule suits brought by the United States, and the proposal which has been made in connection with the so-called civil rights legislation is to create an exception to this exception by providing for jury trial of contempts in civil rights cases even though they are brought by the United States.) Since this section, too, applies only to criminal contempt proceedings, and not to civil contempts, it is not really of major significance. The prosecuting authorities can always avoid a jury trial by proceeding for civil, rather than criminal, contempt.

Thus, as far as the Federal courts are concerned, there is no meaningful right to a jury trial in contempt cases arising out of labor disputes.

State proceedings: Since the enactment of the Norris-La Guardia Act in 1932, employers have resorted primarily to the State courts in their quest for injunctions in labor dispute cases. See report on State Court Injunctions, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, 81st Congress, second session, Document No. 7.

Since there is no Federal constitutional right to a jury trial in contempt cases, either civil or criminal, it is wholly up to each State whether or not to accord a right to jury trial in contempt proceedings. Some States do provide for a jury trial in criminal contempt proceedings, but many States do not. Some States do not even apply the preponderance of evidence rule in criminal contempt cases. Jury trials in civil contempt proceedings are virtually unknown.

Since the great bulk of the injunctions in labor dispute cases are issued by the State courts, and since the State courts do not normally provide jury trials in contempt cases, it is manifest that there is little substance to any assertion that unions enjoy the right to a jury trial in contempt cases growing out of labor disputes.

SUMMARY

Unions may or may not enjoy a theoretical right to jury trial in criminal contempt cases in the Federal courts: this issue has not been ruled upon. Unions and employers do not enjoy any right to a jury trial in civil contempt cases in the Federal courts, of which there are a considerable number. In the State courts, it is strictly up to the States whether to accord a jury trial in contempt cases—civil or criminal—and most States do not grant a jury trial.

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION WITH THAILAND

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an amendment to the agreement for cooperation with Thailand, with accompanying correspondence. The agreement makes an additional amount of material available to Thailand, under its research agreement, up to 100 grams of contained uranium-235, 10 grams of plutonium, and 10 grams of uranium-233.

It also clarifies the responsibility of the Governments of Thailand and the United States with respect to any liability arising out of the research agreement. This agreement, which arrived before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on March 29, comes before the Joint Committee in accordance with the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

There being no objection, the amendment to the agreement, with accompanying correspondence, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., March 29, 1957.

Hon. CARL T. DURHAM,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR MR. DURHAM: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, there is submitted with this letter:

1. An amendment, signed at Washington March 27, 1957, to the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy signed at Bangkok on March 13, 1956;

2. A letter dated March 5, 1957, from the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission to the President recommending approval of the amendment;

3. A letter dated March 12, 1957, from the President to the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission approving the amendment, authorizing its execution and containing his determination that it will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

Article II of the amendment would permit the transfer of limited amounts of special nuclear materials, including U-235, U-233 and plutonium, for defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Articles I and III of the amendment include new provisions which are designed to clarify the responsibilities that the parties to the agreement have assumed with respect to liability for any information, special nuclear material or fuel elements transferred pursuant to the agreement.

The amendment will enter into force when the two governments have exchanged notifications that their respective statutory and constitutional requirements have been fulfilled (art. IV).

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS L. STRAUSS, *Chairman.*

Enclosures: (1) Amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation with Thailand (3 certified copies), (2) letter from Commission to President (3 certified copies), (3) letter from President to Commission (3 certified copies).

UNITED STATES ATOMIC
ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., March 5, 1957.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the attached amendment to the agreement entitled "Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy," which was signed on March 13, 1956. The Commission believes that the proposed amendment will, if effectuated, advance the peaceful uses of atomic energy. It is also recommended that you authorize the execution of this proposed amendment by appropriate officials of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

Article II of the amendment would permit the transfer of limited amounts of special nuclear material, namely, U-235, U-233, and plutonium, for defined research projects in the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Articles I and III of the amendment include new provisions which are designed to clarify the responsibilities that the parties to the agreement have assumed with respect to liability for any information, special nuclear material, or fuel elements transferred pursuant to the agreement.

Subject to your approval, and to the authorization requested, the proposed amendment will be executed by appropriate authorities of Thailand and the United States. In compliance with section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the amendment will then be placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Respectfully.

LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman.

I certify this to be a true copy.

W. T. MALLISON, Jr.,
Acting Chief, Asian-African Branch, Division of International Affairs.

(Enclosure: Amendment to agreement for cooperation with Thailand.)

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 12, 1957.

The Honorable LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STRAUSS: By letter dated March 5, 1957, the Atomic Energy Commission recommended that I approve a proposed amendment to the "Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy," which was signed on March 13, 1956.

The Commission's letter states that article II of the amendment will permit the transfer of limited amounts of special nuclear materials to the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand for research in the peaceful uses of atomic energy. I have also noted that articles I and III of the proposed amendments are designed to make the responsibilities of the parties to the agreement more explicit.

I have examined the proposed amendment to the agreement and I share the belief of the Commission that the performance of the amendment will serve to advance the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Accordingly, pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and upon the recommendations of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby

1. Approve the proposed amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy;

2. Determine that the performance of the proposed amendment to the agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States; and

3. Authorize the execution of the proposed amendment to the agreement for the Government of the United States by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

I certify this to be a true copy.

W. T. MALLISON, Jr.,
Acting Chief, Asian-African Branch, Division of International Affairs.

AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE KINGDOM OF THAILAND CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand;

Desiring to amend the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy, signed on March 13, 1956, hereinafter referred to as the "Agreement for Cooperation";

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

Article I of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended to read as follows:

"A. Subject to the limitations of article V, the Parties hereto will exchange information in the following fields:

"1. Design, construction and operation of research reactors and their use as research, development, and engineering tools and in medical therapy.

"2. Health and safety problems related to the operation and use of research reactors.

"3. The use of radioactive isotopes in physical and biological research, medical therapy, agriculture, and industry.

"B. The application or use of any information or data of any kind whatsoever, includ-

ing design drawings and specifications, exchanged under this Agreement shall be the responsibility of the Party which receives and uses such information or data, and it is understood that the other cooperating Party does not warrant the accuracy, completeness, or suitability of such information or data for any particular use or application."

ARTICLE II

The following new article is added directly after Article III of the Agreement for Cooperation:

"ARTICLE III (A)

"Materials of interest in connection with defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy undertaken by the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand, including source materials, special nuclear materials, byproduct material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes, will be sold or otherwise transferred to the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand by the Commission for research purposes in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed when such materials are not available commercially. In no case, however, shall the quantity of special nuclear materials under the jurisdiction of the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand by reason of transfer under this article, be, at any one time, in excess of 100 grams of contained U–235, 10 grams of plutonium, and 10 grams of U–233."

ARTICLE III

1. Article VI, paragraph A of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended by deleting the phrase "uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 leased from the Commission" and substituting in lieu thereof the phrase "special nuclear materials received from the Commission."

2. The following new paragraph is added to Article VI of the Agreement for Cooperation:

"D. Some atomic energy materials which the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand may request the Commission to provide in accordance with this arrangement are harmful to persons and property unless handled and used carefully. After delivery of such materials to the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand, the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand shall bear all responsibility, insofar as the Government of the United States is concerned, for the safe handling and use of such materials. With respect to any special nuclear materials or fuel elements which the Commission may, pursuant to this agreement, lease to the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand or to any private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction, the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand shall indemnify and save harmless the Government of the United States against any and all liability (including third party liability) from any cause whatsoever arising out of the production or fabrication, the ownership, the lease, and the possession and use of such special nuclear materials or fuel elements after delivery by the Commission to the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand or to any authorized private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction."

ARTICLE IV

This amendment shall enter into force on the date on which each government shall receive from the other government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such amendment and shall remain in force for the period of the agreement for cooperation.

In witness whereof the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this amendment.

Done at Washington in duplicate this 27th day of March 1957.

For the Government of the United States of America:

WALTER S. ROBERTSON,
Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs.

LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission.

For the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand:

P. SARASIN,
Ambassador of Thailand.

I certify this to be a true copy.

W. T. MALLISON, Jr.,
Acting Chief, Asian-African Branch, Division of International Affairs.

RESEARCH AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION WITH IRAN

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the research agreement for cooperation with Iran, with accompanying correspondence, which arrived at the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on March 13, 1957.

There being no objection, the research agreement, with accompanying correspondence, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., March 13, 1957.

Hon. CARL T. DURHAM,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR MR. DURHAM: Pursuant to section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, there is submitted with this letter:

1. An executed agreement for cooperation with the Government of Iran;

2. A letter dated December 6, 1956 from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the agreement;

3. A letter dated December 22, 1956, from the President to the Commission approving the agreement, authorizing its execution and containing his determination that it will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

This agreement, as executed, makes cooperation possible between the United States and Iran on the design, construction, and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems; the use of such reactors in medical therapy; and the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture and industry. Iran, if it desired to do so, would be able to engage United States companies to construct research reactors, and private industries in the United States will be permitted, within the limits of the agreement, to render other assistance to Iran. No restricted data would be communicated under this agreement. The Atomic Energy Commission, however, would lease to Iran up to six (6) kilograms of contained U–235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U–235, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in Iran or while fuel elements are in transit. This expressed limitation will restrict Iran in determining the choice of reactor to be constructed to a research reactor.

You will also note that the agreement includes in article V provisions for the sale or transfer of research quantities of materials of interest in connection with defined research projects, which I described to you in my letter of March 30, 1956. The amount of special nuclear material which would be made available to Iran under this agreement would not be important from the military point of view.

Article VIII of the proposed agreement records the obligations undertaken by Iran to safeguard the special nuclear material to be leased by the Commission and article II contains the guaranties prescribed by section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act.

This agreement expresses the hope and expectation of the two Governments that this first stage of cooperation will lead to further development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Iran.

Sincerely,

H. S. HAUER, *Acting Chairman.*

(Enclosures: (1) Agreement with the Government of Iran, (2) letter from Commission to the President, dated December 6, 1956, (3) letter from the President to the Commission, dated December 22, 1956.)

UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., December 6, 1956.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed proposed agreement entitled "Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of Iran and the Government of the United States of America," and authorize its execution.

This agreement has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and is, in the opinion of the Commission, an important and desirable step in advancing the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Iran in accordance with the policy which you have established. The agreement would permit cooperation between the two countries with respect to the design, construction, and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems; the use of such reactors in medical therapy; and the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture, and industry. Iran, if it desires to do so, may engage United States companies to construct research reactors, and private industry in the United States will be able, under the agreement, to render other assistance to Iran. No restricted data would be communicated under this agreement, and the Government of Iran has signified its agreement to the guaranties prescribed by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 which are part of this agreement.

Further provisions permit the Atomic Energy Commission to lease to Iran up to 6 kilograms of contained U–235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U–235 for use as initial fuel charges in research reactors plus such additional quantity of such material, as in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of such reactors. You will note, in addition, that article V of this agreement would permit the transfer of limited amounts of special nuclear materials, including U–235, U–233, and plutonium, for defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy. This agreement expresses the hope and expectation of the two governments that this first stage of cooperation will lead to further discussions and agreements relating to the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Iran.

Following your approval and subject to the authorization requested, the agreement will be formally executed by the appropriate authorities of Iran and the United States and then placed before the Joint Committee on

Atomic Energy in compliance with section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

Respectfully,

LEWIS L. STRAUSS, *Chairman.*

(Enclosure: Agreement for Cooperation with the Government of Iran.)

I certify this to be a true copy.

W. T. MALLISON, Jr.,
Acting Chief, Asian-African Branch,
Division of International Affairs.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 22, 1956.

The Honorable LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STRAUSS: Under date of December 6, 1956, you informed me that the Atomic Energy Commission had recommended that I approve a proposed agreement between the Government of Iran and the Government of the United States for cooperation concerning the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The agreement recites that the Government of Iran desires to pursue a research and development program looking toward the realization of the peaceful and humanitarian uses of atomic energy and desires to obtain assistance from the Government of the United States and United States industry with respect to this program.

I have examined the recommended agreement. It calls for cooperation between the two Governments with respect to the design, construction, and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems; the use of such reactors as research, development and engineering tools, and in medical therapy; and the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture, and industry. The agreement contains all of the guaranties prescribed by the Atomic Energy Act. No restricted data would be communicated under the agreement, but the Commission would lease to the Government of Iran special nuclear material for use as reactor fuel. In addition, the Commission would be permitted to sell or otherwise transfer limited quantities of such material, including U–235, U–233, and plutonium, for use in defined research projects related to the peaceful application of atomic energy.

Pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby

1. Approve the proposed Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States and the Government of Iran enclosed with your letter of December 6, 1956;

2. Determine that the performance of the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States; and

3. Authorize the execution of the proposed agreement for the Government of the United States by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

It is my hope that this agreement represents but the first stage of cooperation in the field of atomic energy between the United States and Iran, and that it will lead to further discussions and agreements relating to other peaceful uses of atomic energy in Iran.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT EISENHOWER.

I certify this to be a true copy.

W. T. MALLISON, Jr.,
Acting Chief, Asian-African Branch,
Division of International Affairs.

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Whereas the peaceful uses of atomic energy hold great promise for all mankind; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Iran desire to cooperate with each other in the development of such peaceful uses of atomic energy; and

Whereas the design and development of several types of research reactors are well advanced; and

Whereas research reactors are useful in the production of research quantities of radioisotopes, in medical therapy, and in numerous other research activities, and at the same time are a means of affording valuable training and experience in nuclear science and engineering useful in the development of other peaceful uses of atomic energy, including civilian nuclear power; and

Whereas the Government of Iran desires to pursue a research and development program looking toward the realization of the peaceful and humanitarian uses of atomic energy and desires to obtain assistance from the Government of the United States of America and United States industry with respect to this program; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America, acting through the United States Atomic Energy Commission, desires to assist the Government of Iran in such a program;

The parties agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

For the purposes of this agreement:

(a) "Commission" means the United States Atomic Energy Commission or its duly authorized representatives.

(b) "Equipment and devices" means any instrument or apparatus and includes research reactors, as defined herein, and their component parts.

(c) "Research reactor" means a reactor which is designed for the production of neutrons and other radiations for general research and development purposes, medical therapy, or training in nuclear science and engineering. The term does not cover power reactors, power demonstration reactors, or reactors designed primarily for the production of special nuclear materials.

(d) The terms "restricted data," "atomic weapon," and "special nuclear material" are used in this agreement as defined in the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

ARTICLE II

Restricted data shall not be communicated under this agreement, and no materials or equipment and devices shall be transferred and no services shall be furnished under this agreement to the Government of Iran or authorized persons under its jurisdiction if the transfer of any such materials or equipment and devices or the furnishing of any such services involves the communication of restricted data.

ARTICLE III

1. Subject to the provisions of article II, the parties hereto will exchange information in the following fields:

(a) Design, construction, and operation of research reactors and their use as research, development, and engineering tools and in medical therapy.

(b) Health and safety problems related to the operation and use of research reactors.

(c) The use of radioactive isotopes in physical and biological research, medical therapy, agriculture, and industry.

2. The application or use of any information or data of any kind whatsoever, including design drawings and specifications, exchanged under this agreement shall be the responsibility of the party which receives and uses such information or data, and it is understood that the other cooperating party does not warrant the accuracy, completeness, or suitability of such information or data for any particular use or application.

ARTICLE IV

1. The Commission will lease to the Government of Iran uranium enriched in the isotope U–235, subject to the terms and conditions provided herein, as may be required as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of research reactors which the Government of Iran, in consultation with the Commission, decides to construct and as required in the agreed experiments related thereto. Also, the Commission will lease to the Government of Iran uranium enriched in the isotope U–235, subject to the terms and conditions provided herein, as may be required as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of such research reactors as the Government of Iran may, in consultation with the Commission, decide to authorize private individuals or private organizations under its jurisdiction to construct and operate, provided the Government of Iran shall at all times maintain sufficient control of the material and the operation of the reactor to enable the Government of Iran to comply with the provisions of this agreement and the applicable provisions of the lease arrangement.

2. The quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 transferred by the Commission under this article and in the custody of the Government of Iran shall not at any time be in excess of six (6) kilograms of contained U–235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of twenty percent (20%) U–235, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in Iran or while fuel elements are in transit, it being the intent of the Commission to make possible the maximum usefulness of the six (6) kilograms of said material.

3. When any fuel elements containing U–235 leased by the Commission require replacement, they shall be returned to the Commission and, except as may be agreed, the form and content of the irradiated fuel elements shall not be altered after their removal from the reactor and prior to delivery to the Commission.

4. The lease of uranium enriched in the isotope U–235 under this article shall be at such charges and on such terms and conditions with respect to shipment and delivery as may be mutually agreed and under the conditions stated in articles VIII and IX.

ARTICLE V

Materials of interest in connection with defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy undertaken by the Government of Iran, including source of materials, special nuclear materials, by-product material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes, will be sold or otherwise transferred to the Government of Iran by the Commission for research purposes in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed when such materials are not available commercially. In no case, however, shall the quantity of special nuclear materials under the jurisdiction of the Government of Iran, by reason of transfer under this article, be, at any one time, in excess of 100 grams of contained U–235, 10 grams of plutonium, and 10 grams of U–233.

ARTICLE VI

Subject to the availability of supply and as may be mutually agreed, the Commission will sell or lease, through such means as it deems appropriate, to the Government of Iran or authorized persons under its jurisdiction such reactor materials, other than special nuclear materials, as are not obtainable on the commercial market and which are required in the construction and operation of research reactors in Iran. The sale or lease of these materials shall be on such terms as may be agreed.

ARTICLE VII

It is contemplated that, as provided in this article, private individuals and private organizations in either the United States or Iran may deal directly with private individuals and private organizations in the other country. Accordingly, with respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article III, the Government of the United States will permit persons under its jurisdiction to transfer and export materials, including equipment and devices, to and perform services for the Government of Iran and such persons under its jurisdiction as are authorized by the Government of Iran to receive and possess such materials and utilize such services, subject to:

(a) The provisions of article II.

(b) Applicable laws, regulations and license requirements of the Government of the United States and the Government of Iran.

ARTICLE VIII

1. The Government of Iran agrees to maintain such safeguards as are necessary to assure that the special nuclear materials received from the Commission shall be used solely for the purposes agreed in accordance with this agreement and to assure the safekeeping of this material.

2. The Government of Iran agrees to maintain such safeguards as are necessary to assure that all other reactor materials, including equipment and devices, purchased in the United States under this agreement by the Government of Iran or authorized persons under its jurisdiction shall be used solely for the design, construction, and operation of research reactors which the Government of Iran decides to construct and operate and for research in connection therewith, except as may otherwise be agreed.

3. In regard to research reactors constructed pursuant to this agreement, the Government of Iran agrees to maintain records relating to power levels of operation and burn-up of reactor fuels and to make annual reports to the Commission on these subjects. If the Commission requests, the Government of Iran will permit Commission representatives to observe from time to time the condition and use of any leased material and to observe the performance of the reactor in which the material is used.

4. Some atomic energy materials which the Government of Iran may request the Commission to provide in accordance with this arrangement are harmful to persons and property unless handled and used carefully. After delivery of such materials to the Government of Iran, the Government of Iran shall bear all responsibility, in so far as the Government of the United States is concerned, for the safe handling and use of such materials. With respect to any special nuclear materials or fuel elements which the Commission may, pursuant to this agreement, lease to the Government of Iran or to any private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction, the Government of Iran shall indemnify and save harmless the Government of the United States against any and all liability (including third party liability) from any cause whatsoever arising out of the production or fabrication, the ownership, the lease, and the possession and use of such special nuclear materials or fuel elements after delivery by the Commission to the Government of Iran or to any authorized private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction.

ARTICLE IX

The Government of Iran guarantees that:

(a) Safeguards provided in article VIII shall be maintained.

(b) No material, including equipment and devices, transferred to the Government of Iran or authorized persons under its jurisdiction, pursuant to this agreement, by lease, sale, or otherwise will be used for atomic weapons or for research on or development of atomic weapons or for any other military purposes, and that no such material, including equipment and devices, will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of Iran except as the Commission may agree to such transfer to another nation and then only if in the opinion of the Commission such transfer falls within the scope of an agreement for cooperation between the United States and the other nation.

ARTICLE X

It is the hope and expectation of the parties that this initial agreement for cooperation will lead to consideration of further cooperation extending to the design, construction, and operation of power-producing reactors. Accordingly, the parties will consult with each other from time to time concerning the feasibility of an additional agreement for cooperation with respect to the production of power from atomic energy in Iran.

ARTICLE XI

1. This agreement shall enter into force on the day on which each government shall receive from the other government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such agreement and shall remain in force for a period of 5 years.

2. At the expiration of this agreement or of any extension thereof the Government of Iran shall deliver to the United States all fuel elements containing reactor fuels leased by the Commission and any other fuel materials leased by the Commission. Such fuel elements and such fuel materials shall be delivered to the Commission at a site in the United States designated by the Commission at the expense of the Government of Iran and such delivery shall be made under appropriate safeguards against radiation hazards while in transit.

In witness whereof the parties hereto have caused this agreement to be executed pursuant to duly constituted authority.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, this 5th day of March 1957.

For the Government of the United States of America:

WILLIAM M. ROUNTREE,
Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern, South Asian, and African Affairs.

LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission.

For the Government of Iran:

A. AMINI, *Ambassador of Iran.*

TRADE RESOLUTIONS LEGISLATURE STATE OF NEVADA

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the State legislature of my State in the 1957 session, recently terminated, took official notice of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act—and its effect upon the economy of this Nation.

Mr. President, special reference was made to textiles, machine tools, precision instruments, critical materials, and materials, chemical and electrochemical products, crockery, glass, and several hundred additional products, making up the economy of specific areas in this country.

Mr. President, we are living on a $40 billion annual war economy, while the cheap labor nations divide our markets among them.

GATT—1934 TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. President, at this time, 34 competitive foreign nations are sitting in Geneva, Switzerland, dividing this Nation's markets among them through the simple expedient of continually lowering our duties or tariffs.

The cheap labor nations of Europe and Asia are exercising the constitutional responsibility of Congress in the regulation of our foreign trade and national economy.

All this has been accomplished under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—which was organized and placed in Geneva by the President in 1947, under the authority granted him by the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. It was so testified by the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, before the Senate Committee on Finance, of which I am a member.

NEVADA SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 14

Senate Joint Resolution 14, of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, adopted on March 11, 1957, is entitled "Joint Resolution Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Resume Its Responsibility of Regulating Foreign Commerce, and To Allow the 1934 Trade Agreements Act To Expire in June 1958." I ask unanimous consent to have the joint resolution printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, Senate Joint Resolution 14, of the Legislature of Nevada, dated March 11, 1957, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 14

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to resume its responsibility of regulating foreign commerce, and to allow the 1934 Trade Agreements Act to expire in June 1958

Whereas the promotion of world trade should be on the basis of fair and reasonable competition and must be done within the principle long maintained that foreign products of underpaid foreign labor shall not be admitted to the country on terms which endanger the American workingmen's jobs or American investments; and

Whereas article I, section 6, of the Constitution of the United States, provides that the Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, and shall regulate foreign commerce; and

Whereas the Congress transferred the constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade to the executive branch through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, as extended to June 1958, with authority to transfer such responsibility to Geneva under the general agreements on tariffs and trade: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada (jointly), That the United States Congress is hereby urged to resume its constitutional responsibility of regulating foreign commerce and the national economy, through the adjustment of duties, imposts, and excises, through its agent, the Tariff Commission, and allow the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, which transferred such responsibility to the President, to expire in June 1958; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Nevada shall transmit copies of this

resolution to each member of the Nevada congressional delegation.

Adopted by the senate, March 11, 1957.

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

Adopted by the assembly March 15, 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.

NEVADA ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 9

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks Assembly Joint Resolution 9 of the Legislature of Nevada, adopted by the Assembly on February 28, 1957. It is entitled:

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to allow the 1934 Trade Agreements Act to expire on June 30, 1958, so that the regulation of foreign trade and the laying of tariffs and import fees will immediately vest in Congress as the Constitution requires and thereby stop the lowering of the American standard of living by the importation of foreign-made goods.

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

TRADE RESOLUTION, NEVADA LEGISLATURE,
APRIL 4, 1957

Assembly Joint Resolution 9

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to allow the 1934 Trade Agreements Act to expire on June 30, 1958, so that the regulation of foreign trade and the laying of tariffs and import fees will immediately vest in Congress as the Constitution requires and thereby stop the lowering of the American standard of living by the importation of foreign-made goods

Whereas the Legislature of the State of Nevada is aware of the fact that the selective so-called free trade policy, adopted by the State Department of the United States under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, is lowering the American living standard through the lowering of wages and is causing unemployment and a subsequent decline of the demand for minerals, agricultural products, and other commodities produced in the State of Nevada; and

Whereas the indiscriminate lowering of import fees and tariffs, without regard to the differential between the costs of production due largely to the difference in living standards of this Nation and foreign competitive nations, has a demoralizing effect on the mining and agricultural markets of this country and thereby causes unemployment and loss of labor; and

Whereas the State of Nevada is in a particularly vulnerable position in attempting to compete with foreign sweatshop labor because the products produced in Nevada, such as livestock, wool, tungsten, lead, zinc, copper, magnesite, chemicals, manganese, mercury, silicon, and many others, are readily importable at a lower cost from sources outside of this country under the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act, all to the great detriment and economic hardship of this State; and

Whereas many mining companies in the State of Nevada are practically shut down and almost all of the zinc miners are out of work and the cattle industry is being endangered because our ranchers cannot compete with the importation of hides, beef, or live cattle from Argentina or Mexico; and

Whereas the haphazard lowering of the floor under wages and investments represented by the tariffs and import fees destroys American workingmen and shifts their jobs to foreign soil; and, as a result, many of our mines, mills, and factories have been closed and our farm production saved only by subsidies; and

Whereas those industries which depend upon the power of Hoover Dam and Davis Dam are in danger because similar products are being imported at a price less than production costs in this State; and

Whereas the Nevada wool industry has found it impossible to compete with the importation of wool from Australia, New Zealand, and elsewhere; and, for the first time, the wool industry of Nevada is only being saved from destruction by the use of subsidies; and

Whereas it is essential to the protection of the American standard of living that world trade should only be on the basis of fair and reasonable competition and based on the principle that foreign products produced by underpaid labor should not be admitted to this country on terms which endanger the living standard of our workers, farmers, and miners; and

Whereas article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States requires that Congress should lay duties, imposts, and excises, and regulate foreign commerce, but the Congress of the United States has abrogated its constitutional duties by virtue of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 by transferring the duty of fixing tariffs to the executive department of the Government which has, in turn, carried out policies inconsistent with the welfare of American agriculture, industry, and commerce; and

Whereas the free-trade policies fostered by the State Department under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act have resulted in our dependence upon foreign nations across one or both major oceans for many of the materials and minerals which we would need to fight a war and to prepare our own defense and thus stifled the initiative to explore, develop, and produce such needed materials in our own country; and after having become dependent on foreign sources for criticail materials the foreign countries have been able to cause us great embarrassment by manipulation of export permits and fees so that we must bow to their demands and submit to international blackmail; and

Whereas the United States has in the last several decades only been able to prosper because of war or the threat of war and under this cover of war the industrially inexperienced State Department has been wrecking the national economy by the simple expedient of tampering with tariff and import fees so as to open the door to foreign commodities, which in turn prevents the flow of venture capital into the business stream of the Nation even in time of emergency since investors know that when the emergency is over their investment will be destroyed through foreign sweatshop labor competition; and

Whereas it is mandatory to the future economical growth and development of this country, and Nevada in particular, that the 1934 Trade Agreements Act be allowed to expire on June 30, 1958, so that Congress can immediately recover its constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade through the adjustment of tariffs and import fees, and with such an expiration of the act the so-called trade agreements already made and in effect will in no way be affected but will continue in effect for their full terms: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of Nevada most respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to stop the dreadful deterrent to American economic well-being and the lowering of our standard of living and that it return to its traditional and constitutional method of fixing tariffs based on the principle of protecting American industry, agriculture, and commerce by allowing the 1934 Trade Agreements Act to expire by its own force and limitation on June 30, 1958; and be it further

Resolved, That until the expiration of the agreement, the Department of State should exercise its powers in fixing tariffs only in accordance with the traditional principles of American policy as set forth in this resolution until such time as the responsibility for regulating foreign commerce be vested where it belongs, in the Congress of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States after June 30, 1958, should set up a flexible import fee which would be based upon fair and reasonable competition administered by a reorganized and experienced tariff commission functioning much in the same manner as the long-established Interstate Commerce Commission so that the market for foreign goods in this country would be based on a fair and reasonable competition with our own agricultural, industrial, and mining production; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution, duly certified by the secretary of state of the State of Nevada, be promptly transmitted by him to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore of the Senate, and the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce, and to the United States Senators and Congressmen from Nevada.

Adopted by the senate, March 12, 1957.

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

Adopted by the assembly, February 28, 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.

FOREIGN TRADE RESOLUTIONS, CIVIC BODIES OF NEVADA

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I have before me a series of resolutions which I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. They are as follows:

A resolution on foreign trade adopted by the Churchill County (Nev.) Chamber of Commerce on July 12, 1956;

A resolution on foreign trade adopted by the Reno Chamber of Commerce on June 19, 1956;

A resolution on foreign trade adopted by the Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce on December 19, 1955;

A resolution passed by the Humboldt County Chamber of Commerce in June 1956;

A resolution on foreign trade adopted by the White Pine Chamber of Commerce and Mines in June 1956;

A resolution by the Mina Chamber of Commerce, Inc., adopted on June 21, 1956;

A resolution of the 1955 Western Governors' Mineral Policies Conference on Foreign Trade;

A resolution on foreign trade by the Reno Central Trades and Labor Council, adopted in December 1955;

A resolution adopted at the 30th annual meeting of the Nevada State Farm

Bureau on domestic and foreign policy, at Ely, Nev., on December 2, 1949;

A resolution adopted by the White Pine County Central Labor Council in January 1950;

Resolutions by the Colorado River Water Users Association, accepted and passed December 1, 1955; and

A letter from Pioche, Nev., signed by Thomas L. Hutchings, president, Local No. 407, CIO.

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

TRADE RESOLUTIONS, NEVADA CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE AND OTHERS, JULY 1956

RESOLUTION, CHURCHILL COUNTY (NEV.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Whereas the promotion of world trade should be on the basis of fair and reasonable competition and must be done within the principle long maintained that foreign products of underpaid foreign labor shall not be admitted to the country on terms which endanger the living standards of the American workingman or the American farmer, or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry; and

Whereas article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States provides that the Congress shall have the power to lay and collect—duties, imports, and excises (tariffs or import fees) and to regulate foreign commerce; and

Whereas the Congress transferred the constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade to the executive branch through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as extended from time to time: Therefore, be it,

Resolved, That the United States Congress is hereby urged to resume its constitutional responsibility of regulating foreign commerce and the national economy, through the adjustment of duties, imposts, and excises, through its agent the Tariff Commission and to repeal the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, which transferred such responsibility to the President.

REPEAL OF THE 1934 TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

(Resolution on foreign trade adopted by the Reno Chamber of Commerce, June 19, 1956)

Whereas the promotion of world trade should be on the basis of fair and reasonable competition and must be done within the principle long maintained that foreign products of underpaid foreign labor shall not be admitted to the country on terms which endanger the living standards of the American workingman or the American farmer, or threatens serious injury to a domestic industry; and

Whereas article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States provides that the Congress shall have the power to lay and collect duties, imposts, and excises (tariffs or import fees) and to regulate foreign commerce; and

Whereas the Congress transferred the constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade to the executive branch through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as extended from time to time: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Congress is hereby urged to resume its constitutional responsibility of regulating foreign commerce and the national economy, through the adjustment of duties, imposts, and excises, through its agent the Tariff Commission and to repeal the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, which transferred such responsibility to the President.

WILLIAM BRUSSARD,
Director, Reno Chamber of Commerce.

RESOLUTION ON FOREIGN TRADE ADOPTED BY THE LAS VEGAS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, DECEMBER 19, 1955

Whereas the promotion of world trade should be on the basis of fair and reasonable competition and must be done within the principle long maintained that foreign products of underpaid foreign labor shall not be admitted to the country on terms which endanger the living standards of the American workingman or the American farmer, or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry; and

Whereas article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States provides that the Congress shall have the power to lay and collect duties, imposts, and excises (tariffs or import fees), and to regulate foreign commerce; and

Whereas the Congress transferred the constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade to the executive branch through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as extended from time to time: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the United States Congress is hereby urged to resume its constitutional responsibility of regulating foreign commerce and the national economy, through the adjustment of duties, imposts, and excises, through its agent the Tariff Commission and to repeal the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, which transferred such responsibility to the President.

HERB MCDONALD,
Director, Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce.

RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE HUMBOLDT COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, JUNE 1956

Whereas the promotion of world trade should be on the basis of fair and reasonable competition and must be done within the principle long maintained that foreign products of underpaid foreign labor shall not be admitted to the country on terms which endanger the living standards of the American workingman or the American farmer, or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry; and

Whereas article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States provides that "the Congress shall have the power to lay and collect * * * duties, imports, and excises" (tariffs or import fees) and "to regulate foreign commerce"; and

Whereas the Congress transferred the constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade to the executive branch through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as extended from time to time: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the United States Congress is hereby urged to resume its constitutional responsibility of regulating foreign commerce and the national economy, through the adjustment of duties, imposts, and excises, through its agent the Tariff Commission and to repeal the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, which transferred such responsibility to the President.

KAY FLOYD JOHNSON,
Manager, Humboldt County Chamber of Commerce.

RESOLUTION ON FOREIGN TRADE ADOPTED BY THE WHITE PINE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND MINES, JUNE 1956

Whereas the promotion of world trade should be on the basis of fair and reasonable competition and must be done within the principle long maintained that foreign products of underpaid foreign labor shall not be admitted to the country on terms which endanger the living standards of the American workingman or the American farmer, or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry; and

Whereas article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States provides that "the Congress shall have the power to lay and collect * * * duties, imposts, and excises" (tariffs or import fees) and "to regulate foreign commerce"; and

Whereas the Congress transferred the constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade to the executive branch through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as extended from time to time: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the United States Congress responsibility of regulating foreign commerce is hereby urged to resume its constitutional and the national economy, through the adjustment of duties, imposts, and excises, through its agent the Tariff Commission and to repeal the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, which transferred such responsibility to the President.

JAMES E. HEALD,
Executive Secretary, White Pine Chamber of Commerce and Mines.

RESOLUTION BY MINA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, INC., JUNE 21, 1956

The importation of low-wage materials and various products without protection of any kind has caused the closing of American mines and factories and resulting in unemployment throughout our State; and

Whereas the present situation regarding the adjustment of tariff has been delegated to a world conference in which our representative is 1 in 35 instead of being in our Congress where the time-to-time changes in tariff schedules require prompt action to remedy the situation: Be it therefore

Resolved, That it is the spirit of this chamber that we urge our Congress to repeal the Foreign Trades Act and place the tariffmaking powers back where it belongs in our Congress so that our mines and factories can have the protection to which they are entitled.

MINA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
JAMES SHARMAN, *President.*

RESOLUTION OF 1955 WESTERN GOVERNORS MINERAL POLICIES CONFERENCE ON FOREIGN TRADE

Whereas the promotion of world trade should be on the basis of fair and reasonable competition and must be done within the principle long maintained that foreign products of underpaid foreign labor shall not be admitted to the country on terms which endanger the living standards of the American workingman or the American farmer, or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry; and

Whereas article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States provides that "the Congress shall have the power to lay and collect—duties, imposts, and excises (tariffs or import fees)"—and "to regulate foreign commerce"; and

Whereas the Congress transferred the constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade to the executive branch through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as extended from time to time: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the United States Congress is hereby urged to resume its constitutional responsibility of regulating foreign commerce and the national economy, through the adjustment of duties, imposts, and excises, by its agent the Tariff Commission through the repeal of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as amended, which transferred such responsibility to the President.

RESOLUTION ON FOREIGN TRADE BY RENO CENTRAL TRADES AND LABOR COUNCIL, DECEMBER 1955

Whereas the promotion of world trade should be on the basis of fair and reasonable competition and must be done within the principle long maintained, that foreign products of underpaid foreign labor shall not be admitted to the country on terms which endanger the living standards of the American workingman or the American farmer, or threatens serious injury to a domestic industry; and

Whereas article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States provides that "the Congress shall have the power to pay and collect—duties, imposts, and excises" (tariffs or import fees) and "to regulate foreign commerce"; and

Whereas the Congress transferred the constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade to the executive branch through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as extended from time to time: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the United States Congress is hereby urged to resume its constitutional responsibilty of regulating foreign commerce and the national economy through the adjustment of duties, imposts and excises, through its agent the Tariff Commission and to repeal the 1934 Trade Agreements Act which transferred such responsibility to the President.

PAULA DAY,
TOMMY BLAKE,
LOU LEVITT,
C. D. BYRD,
Musicians Local 368.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE 30TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NEVADA STATE FARM BUREAU ON DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN POLICY, ELY, NEV., DECEMBER 2, 1949

Whereas the selective free-trade policy adopted by the State Department, based upon the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, is lowering the American living standard through the lowering of wages and is causing unemployment and a subsequent decline in the demand for agricultural products: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Nevada State Farm Bureau adopts and recommends that the American Farm Bureau Federation support a domestic and foreign policy containing the following features:

I. Foreign policy

(a) Protection of private investments in foreign countries.

(b) Free convertibility of European currencies in terms of dollars.

(c) Consolidation of the European nations into a United States of Europe, and the erasing of all present trade barriers.

(d) Equal access to the trade of all nations of the world subject only to the action of the individual nations.

II. National policy

(a) Set up a flexible import fee which would be based upon "fair and reasonable" competition administered by a reorganized experienced Tariff Commission in the same manner as the long established Interstate Commerce Commission adjusts freight rates for the carriers on a basis of the principle laid down by Congress, of a reasonable return on the investment. Under a flexible import-fee principle, a market is immediately established for the goods of foreign nations on a basis of a "fair and reasonable" competition with our own—other nations in good conscience cannot ask for more. By so doing, America's domestic agricultural market would be greatly stabilized and cease to be a dumping ground for world surpluses. We are a land of agricultural abundance striving to maintain a standard of living unparalleled by any other nation in the world; Be it further

Resolved, That the lowering of import fees and tariffs without regard to the differential of the cost of production due largely to the difference in living standards of this Nation and of foreign competitive nations has a demoralizing effect on our agricultural markets as well as those of other industries, thereby causing unemployment and loss of revenue to the American farmer.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE WHITE PINE COUNTY CENTRAL LABOR COUNCIL JANUARY 1950

Whereas the selective free trade policy is removing the floor from under American wages and investments, causing unemployment and loss of taxable property; and

Whereas the haphazard lowering of the import fees and tariffs without regard to the differential of the cost of production due largely to the difference in living standards of this country and foreign competitive nations, has severely injured the nonferrous mining industry: Therefore be it

Resolved, That a telegram be sent to each of our national Senators asking them to do what they can toward correcting this deplorable situation.

DOUG HAWKINS,
President, White Pine County General Council.

RESOLUTIONS BY COLORADO RIVER WATER USERS ASSOCIATION ACCEPTED AND PASSED DECEMBER 1, 1955

Whereas much industry in the Colorado River Basin States, including mining, the beneficiation of ores, manufacturing of industrial chemicals, fuels, military supplies, and the successful agriculture of irrigated areas is dependent upon water supply from the Colorado River system; and

Whereas such industries are essential to the public welfare in peacetime and doubly so in time of war, when foreign sources of supply might be lost; and

Whereas much of such industry has been destroyed or seriously injured by the competition of imported products manufactured at lower labor costs than are possible or desirable in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Colorado River Water Users Association urges the United States Congress to resume its constitutional authority of regulating foreign commerce by the Tariff Commission through repeal of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, which transferred that responsibility to the President.

PIOCHE, NEV.

DEAR SIR: By unanimous vote Pioche Union Local No. 407 CIO disapproves part 4 plan of the President which includes the International Trade Organization agreement and urge that you do everything possible to substitute flexible import fee. (As outlined in your talk at Pioche, Nev., on December 15, 1949.)

THOMAS L. HUTCHINGS,
President, Local No. 407.

SOUND MONEY: PROTECTION OF AMERICAN LABOR AND INVESTMENTS—LONGVIEW (TEX.) NEWS-JOURNAL, BY GEORGE ROTHWELL BROWN

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, on March 17, 1957, the Longview, Tex., Sunday News-Journal published an article by George Rothwell Brown, entitled "Nevadans Asking for Honest Dollar." I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

NEVADANS ASKING FOR HONEST DOLLAR

(By George Rothwell Brown)

WASHINGTON.—It is a curious fact that although the Eisenhower administration has deplored the tendencies in this country today working for inflation, nobody in the Government has even so much as mentioned the one sure cure for it.

Inflation in the last analysis springs from the unholy union of a printing press and a stack of paper. If the Government really wants to stop inflation and prevent its further disastrous spread it will have to go back to the honest little dollar—the gold standard which F. D. Roosevelt repudiated in frightful violation of his most solemn campaign pledges in 1932.

(NOTE.—United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, of Nevada, is the inspiration and moving force behind the plea for return to an honest dollar and an end to sky-high taxes and inflationary free spending. For editorials on Senator MALONE's position and the general subject, "Foundations of Our Freedom and Progress," and the popular response his stand is being accorded by the people, see below.)

Now the metal minded State of Nevada has revived a question of recent times all but unheard of in Washington.

The Republican State Central Committee of Nevada has come up with three recommendations of policies based on principles embodied in the United States Constitution.

First, it expresses the opinion that the Republican Party must advocate a free market for gold, with removal of all restrictions upon its purchase, sale, and ownership.

Coupled with this is a recommendation for a return to the hard money standard, gold and silver certificates redeemable in those precious metals.

It is more than an economic absurdity, it is an economic sin, that American gold mines should be shut down, idle, and unproductive, while Communist Russia reaps the benefit of a world gold market from which American gold at only $35 is excluded. That price, fixed by law, has paralyzed the American gold-mining industry.

Nevada Republicans also urge that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act be permitted to expire next year. Under this law the tariffmaking power was transferred by Congress to the President, and by him relegated to obscure bureaucrats in the State Department.

The administration wants to extend State Department authority still further by legalizing GATT through the establishment of an international trade organization.

Nevada also suggests that the Republican Party rally to the support of States rights.

Commenting on this forward-looking stand taken by the Republican Central Committee, Senator MALONE told the Senate the other day that Nevada is the first State to reaffirm the principles of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln in 24 years.

"Since 1933," said Senator MALONE, "inflation has been encouraged, so that Congress can appropriate any amount of money for any purpose at any time, including billions of dollars to European and Asiatic countries, and can have the money printed without regard to its ultimate value.

"Under the free-trade policy of sending billions of dollars to Europe and Asia, more than $30 billion of American capital has gone abroad to operate plants with cheap labor and to ship the products to the United States to compete with our own labor and investments."

This word from Nevada sounds almost like a voice crying in the wilderness, but it isn't. Evidence piles up in Congressional mail from back home every day that national public opinion strongly supports the point of view of Nevada and her senior Senator.

Runaway Government spending is properly spotted as the prime cause of inflation.

Mr. MALONE. In the Longview, Tex., Sunday News-Journal of March 17, 1957, there was published an article entitled "Foundations of Our Freedom and Progress." I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

FOUNDATIONS OF OUR FREEDOM AND PROGRESS

Constitutional government, based upon our traditional American principles, is sound and safe government. It is most refreshing, therefore, to note the encouraging response that comes to Senator GEORGE W. MALONE on his forthright call for a return to constitutional government and restoration of those basic principles upon which American freedom was founded and our strength and prosperity developed.

Senator MALONE, Nevada Republican and a professional engineer, for some years now has been a lone voice crying in the wilderness of party politics and Federal Government councils in Washington against pouring out the economic lifeblood of our Nation in the form of billions upon billions of dol-

lars of subsidy money from the Federal Treasury to foreign countries.

Recently, the Senator more strongly than ever had advocated a return to the Constitution in the regulation of foreign trade and the national economy, ending of the ruinous free-trade policies which are enabling foreign sweatshop labor factories to compete in the American market and endangering our workingmen's jobs and investors' money, and return to our traditional gold standard which would do away with the funny-money regime and the ruinous inflation that has been riding high, wide, and handsome for the past 24 years.

The note of popular concern and public response which Senator MALONE's vigorous advocacy of these policies has aroused in his own State and elsewhere across the Nation is perhaps best illustrated by three editorials from prominent Nevada newspapers. Republican and Democratic newspapers alike carried editorials and feature news articles explaining their Senator's position and complimenting him for his bold stand.

The editorials carried in Nevada Democratic newspapers, however, are most significant and revealing in their content. Because of their unusual significance and bearing upon current national policy, we are reproducing two of them and one from a Republican newspaper in the following order, and we will comment further at the end of the third one.

Mr. MALONE. On March 17, 1957, there was published in the Longview (Tex.) Sunday News-Journal an editorial entitled "Three Principles of Freedom." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

THREE PRINCIPLES OF FREEDOM

We want to go on record as being 100 percent in favor of Senator MALONE'S position calling for a return to a sound money policy, protection of the workingman's job and investors' money, and recognition of States rights.

These three principles, enunciated by the Republican Party 100 years ago, are foundation stones of the Constitution and as such are the basis of our individual freedom and the springboard from whence arises our national strength and prosperity.

The first of these three great principles is a sound money policy. This kind of a policy was in effect when America had its great basic growth and expansion. It includes a free market for gold, with removal of all restrictions upon its purchase, sale, and ownership, and a return to our traditional firm money standard, using gold and silver certificates redeemable in these metals. As long as big government can control and depreciate the value of our money through inflation to meet its free-spending and giveaway programs, there can be no sound basis for saving and investing, nor any assurance that the workingman's wages will buy reasonable value in merchandise and services. Progress and prosperity thus eventually must bog down and fail.

The second of these principles calls upon Congress to resume its constitutional responsibility of regulating foreign commerce through the adjustment of duties, imposts, and excises, through the Tariff Commission, which is an agent of the Congress, and to let expire in 1958 the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act which transferred this responsibility to the President, who then delegated it to the State Department where it has become little more than an instrument of foreign meddling and giveaways.

The third principle would require the Congress to respect the rights of the individual States in all those matters which have been historically matters of State concern. This is fully in line with the Constitution which specifically declares that all rights not transferred to the Federal Government by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States "are reserved to the States and to the people."

It has been no accident that the people of this Nation now are free people, and that as free people they have been able to plan and work and produce and sell in our own market so that we have developed the strongest nation in the world and the highest living standard of all time. The underlying principles which have permitted such progress had to be just and right.

These great fundamental principles of freedom and justice and sound economics have not been repealed, although they have been pushed into the discard in recent years by a "tax and spend and tax" wild-money philosophy, a "buy friends by the dollar" diplomacy, and a denial of individual and States rights by a mushrooming Washington bureaucracy—all of which is bleeding the Nation of its economic lifeblood, robbing the workingman of his wages through exorbitant taxes, and taking away his job and the investor's capital by a free dumping of foreign-made goods in America.

These principles, since they are constitutional and fundamental, have been in bad repute in Washington. It is quite natural that in calling for a new recognition and practice of them in the Federal Government, Senator MALONE has been as a lone voice crying in the wilderness.

It is now a most encouraging sign to find the leading newspapers of Nevada, including both Republican and Democratic papers, coming out in strong support of the Senator's stand. It can only be a reflection of the way more and more people in Nevada are thinking today.

We commend you, Senator MALONE, for your bold stand. And we commend your position, and a restudy of the principles which you have cited, to all public officials everywhere and to every citizen who prizes his freedom, is proud of his heritage, and wants to protect and preserve his rights and privileges.

S. 28: AMEND 1930 TARIFF ACT IN ACCORDANCE WITH NEVADA RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, on January 7, I introduced a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes. Under the heading "Declaration of Policy," the following language is to be found in section 1:

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is declared to be the policy of the Congress—

(a) to facilitate and encourage trade with foreign nations on the basis of fair and reasonable competition.

(b) to maintain an investment climate through the principle applying equally to the whole country.

(c) to provide necessary flexibility of import duties thereby making possible appropriate adjustments in response to changing economic conditions.

(d) to assure the accomplishment of these objectives by returning to the provisions of the Constitution (art. I, sec. 8) in the control over American import duties now subject to international agreements.

On page 3 of the bill, in subparagraph (2) of subsection (b) of section 3, the Commission is authorized and directed, among other things—

(2) to prescribe, upon termination of any foreign-trade agreement, that the import duties established therein shall remain the same as existed prior to such termination, and such import duties shall not thereafter be increased or reduced except in accordance with this act.

It is also provided, in subparagraph (1) of section 3 (b), that the Commission is authorized and directed—

(1) to terminate as of the next earliest date therein provided, and in accordance with the terms thereof, all the foreign-trade agreements entered into by the United States pursuant to section 350 of this act.

That is to say, the 1930 Tariff Act.

Section 4 (a), under the heading "Periodic Adjustment of Import Duties," provides as follows:

PERIODIC ADJUSTMENT OF IMPORT DUTIES

SEC. 4. Title III, part II, section 336, of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 336. Periodic adjustment of import duties

"(a) The Commission is authorized and directed from time to time, and subject to the limitations hereinafter provided, to prescribe and establish import duties which will, within equitable limits, provide for fair and reasonable competition between domestic articles and like or similar foreign articles in the principal market or markets of the United States."

Mr. President, the bill was introduced in connection with and to carry out resolutions passed by the Legislature of the State of Nevada and the State central committee of the Republican Party of the State of Nevada.

SOUND MONEY

On April 1, 1957, I introduced a bill to authorize private transactions involving the sale, acquisition, or holding of gold within the United States. The bill, in part, reads:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, gold in any form, mined subsequent to the enactment of this act, within the United States, its Territories, and possessions may be melted, smelted, concentrated, or otherwise treated so as to prepare it to be sold, or held and stored as is, or has been customary with gold, and it may be thought, held, sold, or traded upon the open market within the United States, its Territories, and possessions for any purpose whatsoever without the requirement of licenses and it may be exported without the imposition of duties, excise taxes, the requirement of licenses, permits, or any other restrictions whatsoever.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the entire bill, whose title is "To authorize private transactions involving the sale, acquisition, or holding of gold within the United States," be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of law, gold in any form, mined subsequent to the enactment of this act, within the United States, its Territories, and possessions may be melted, smelted, concentrated, or otherwise treated so as to prepare it to be sold, or held and stored as is, or has been customary with gold, and it may be bought, held, sold, or traded upon the open market within the United States, its Territories, and possessions for any purpose whatsoever without the requirement of licenses and it may be exported without the imposition of duties, excise taxes, the requirement of licenses, permits, or any restrictions whatsoever.

SEC. 2. Gold imported into the United States after the date of enactment of this act may be held, bought, sold, or traded upon the open market within the United States, its Territories and possessions, for any purpose whatsoever and may be exported without the imposition of duties, excise taxes, the requirement of licenses, permits, or any restrictions whatsoever.

SEC. 3. All gold held or bought by the United States Treasury, or mints, or assay offices, or by the Federal Reserve banks, shall be construed to be monetary gold. Such gold shall not hereafter be sold for commercial use or for the arts, and such gold shall not hereafter be sold by the Treasury or by the Federal Reserve banks (or for the account of either), directly or indirectly, in any free gold market in the United States, its Territories, or possessions, for the purpose of depressing such market and thereby lessening the price and value of gold: *Provided*, That the United States Treasury shall purchase as monetary gold any gold mined after the date of enactment of this act in the United States, its Territories, or possessions, which is offered to it for sale at the rate of $35 an ounce.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill for appropriate reference. It is a bill "to provide the United States with a gold standard and redeemable currency, and to correct other defects in the monetary system of the United States."

This bill, Senate bill 1775, for a free market for gold, is necessary for an additional reason, which is to determine what the free market price for gold really is under our inflated currency.

In section 10, the bill provides:

All money of the United States, including money issued by banks, shall be maintained on a parity with the standard gold dollar by freedom of exchange at its value with standard gold bullion or coin at the United States Treasury.

Mr. President, if the price of gold should be raised in legislation to return to the metal standard that price can be closely determined through a free market for gold under Senate bill 1775.

S. 1897: GOLD STANDARD AND REDEEMABLE CURRENCY

The bill (S. 1897) to provide the United States with a gold standard and redeemable currency, and to correct other defects in the monetary system of the United States, introduced by Mr. MALONE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, these bills were introduced in response to demands from my State that we return to a sound metal money system.

SOUND MONEY—PROTECTION OF AMERICAN JOBS AND INVESTMENT—AND STATES RIGHTS

On December 15, 1956, the executive committee of the Republican Party of the State of Nevada met and officially adopted, as a part of its platform, the request that the United States return to the constitutional requirement of a sound money system for the United States—for the protection of the American workingmen's jobs and American investors, through a duty or tariff, as we have come to refer to it, as set down in the Constitution in article I, section 8, which provides that Congress shall adjust the duties, imposts, and excises, and shall regulate foreign trade—and for States rights.

The Legislature of my State of Nevada—through senate and assembly joint resolutions—demanded the same legislation and procedure.

FINANCE COMMITTEE INVESTIGATION—DETERMINE STATUS OF MONEY SYSTEM

Mr. President, the Committee on Finance, of which I am a member, very recently adopted a resolution that provides for an investigation:

The committee shall examine, investigate, and make a complete study of the financial condition of the United States, including (1) the revenues, bonded indebtedness, and interest rates on all public obligations including contingent liabilities, (2) policies and procedures employed in the management of the public debt and the effect thereof upon credit, interest rates, and the Nation's economy and welfare, and (3) factors which influence the availability and distribution of credit and the interest rates thereon as they may apply to public and private debt.

It is the opinion of the Senator from Nevada that the Committee on Finance has a definite responsibility under the Legislative Reorganization Act for matters dealing with the public debt of the United States, inflation, and related matters.

We believe it is necessary, in order to discharge that responsibility, to conduct a study of both Treasury and Federal Reserve policies as they affect debt management, and also as the policies of this Nation in regard to the money system affect inflation, the value of the money, and the purchasing power of the money.

INFLATION LOWERS WAGES, PENSIONS, AND ANNUITIES

Mr. President, the inquiry and investigation may show the effect of our removing this Nation from the hard-money standard in 1934, and thereby starting an avalanche of inflation, merely because the money is not tied to the metal standard.

Congress may appropriate any amount of money and simply print the money, because there is no definite tie to the metal money standard. Possession of gold has been definitely prohibited, so far as the individual citizens of this country are concerned. Inflation has definitely affected wages, pensions, and retirement annuities. Wages and pensions must constantly be adjusted, then inflation continues, and in a few months the wages have again been effectively lowered because of the lessening of the purchasing power of the paper which we use for money.

GIVING SMALL BUSINESS LIPSERVICE AND DESTROYING IT

Our tax policies have kept just a little ahead of the inflation. In that way taxes and inflation, in the opinion of many of our citizens, have been the cause of increased business failures and bankruptcies.

We are giving small business lipservice and utterly destroying it.

DELIBERATE INFLATION

When we left the hard-money standard, we started an avalanche of deliberate inflation. We are following a policy of continually higher appropriations, higher wages—a deliberate spiral that can only ultimately destroy us.

I believe the investigation will show that the real purchasing power of the dollar, referred to the value of the dollar in 1934, is about 33 cents. That is the actual purchasing power of today's dollar based on the purchasing power of the dollar in 1934.

Of course we have been very clever. We have changed the date of reference. Instead of 1934, it is now 1948. If we should refer the purchasing power to the value of the dollar of 1957, the purchasing power will be practically 100 percent.

However, on the basis of 1948 value, it is admitted that the purchasing power is less than 50 cents.

If my statement is correct, that, compared with the 1934 value, the purchasing power of the dollar today is approximately 33 cents, or about one-third, then a man receiving $10 a day in 1934, in order to have the same purchasing power today, would have to receive $30 a day. Five dollars a day in 1934 would be $15 a day at this time.

These things are all the result of dependence upon paper or unsound money—and that, coupled with our foreign-trade policy—virtually free trade with sweatshop foreign labor, all of the duties, imposts, and excises which we refer to as tariffs, have been lowered well below the differences in the effective wages and costs of doing business in the United States and the chief competing country on each product. Therefore, there is no protection. It means that the sweatshop labor of Europe and Asia is being used to compete with labor in this country.

All that is necessary to be done is to examine the markets. Consider the crockery, textile, critical minerals and materials, machine tools, livestock, and 5,000 other products which I have mentioned in this statement. The increasing imports of these products from foreign countries are flooding our markets every day, while we live on a wartime economy of $40 billion a year and think we are sound financialy.

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8, OF THE CONSTITUTION

I wish to read from article I, section 8, of the Constitution, which was a very effective section so long as it was followed. However, over the last 24 years ways and means have been found to circumvent the Constitution. I read as follows:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

The duties, imposts, and excises are what we call tariffs. I continue:

To borrow money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States;

To establish * * * uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures.

CONGRESS TRANSFERRED POWER TO THE EXECUTIVE

I submit that Congress has transferred practically all of the power contained in article I, section 8, to the executive branch of the Government.

About all of the power that Congress has retained is the power to appropriate the amount of money which the executive branch suggests should be appropriated. Sometimes Congress lowers the amount by about 5 percent, but Congress, in the last 24 years, has not had the intestinal fortitude to go below that amount.

Congress retains the power to fix the tax rate and to then maintain whatever dignity it can by refusing to answer the public questions.

Mr. President, the basic tenets upon which this Nation was founded included sound money, protection of the American workingmen's jobs and the investors' money, and States rights.

HOUSING

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the opportunity for every American family to acquire a good home in a pleasant neighborhood is and has been for 25 years a basic objective of the Congress. In working toward this objective Congress created the Federal Housing Administration in 1934, the loan guarantee program of the Veterans' Administration in 1944, and the improved Federal National Mortgage Association in 1949. These three programs have made it possible for millions of American families, who could not otherwise have done so, to buy good homes of their own. The FHA, the VA, and the FNMA were created to make it possible for the average families of the United States to buy their own homes on terms they could afford—and without either subsidy or interference from the Federal Government.

These programs are the best things that have ever happened to the American consumer. They enabled millions of American families to move from flats and tenements into homes of their own. They brought home ownership up from 40 percent to 60 percent in 15 years. They are the outstanding example of Government and business partnership, in the public interest, developed in this or any other nation on earth. Yet the facts and figures I have outlined with this statement clearly demonstrate that we are already in grave danger of losing everything we have gained during the past 25 years. Certainly we cannot afford to let these programs fail now.

The Congress in creating these programs has clearly indicated its concern for, and has taken steps to make possible, the moves which make us the best housed nation in the world. Unfortunately, however, these measures have become increasingly ineffective in recent years because of the monetary situation and because current legislation is not adapted to current housing needs. For these reasons I am today introducing a new revised FHA downpayment housing program which will again create a framework to provide housing for the American people on a basis they can afford.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a comparison table showing the required downpayment under existing law; the downpayment that would be required under the administration's proposal, S. 1609 if enacted into law; the downpayment that would be required under a House Banking Committee proposal; and the downpayment that would be required under the bill which I propose.

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

Comparison table: FHA downpayments

FHA value	Present statute [1]	Proposed Senate bill [2]	Administration proposal (S. 1609) [3]	House Banking Committee bill [4]
$5,000	$250	$100	$200	$200
$6,000	300	120	240	240
$7,000	350	140	280	280
$8,000	400	160	320	320
$9,000	450	180	360	360
$10,000	700	200	400	400
$11,000	950	280	550	600
$12,000	1,200	360	700	800
$13,000	1,450	440	850	1,000
$14,000	1,700	520	1,000	1,200
$15,000	1,950	600	1,150	1,400
$16,000	2,200	850	1,300	1,600
$17,000	2,450	1,100	1,600	1,900
$18,000	2,700	1,350	1,900	2,200
$19,000	2,950	1,600	2,200	2,500
$20,000	3,200	1,850	2,500	2,800
$21,000	3,450	2,100	2,800	3,100
$22,000	3,700	2,350	3,100	3,400
$23,000	3,950	2,600	3,400	3,700
$24,000	4,200	2,850	4,000	4,000
$25,000	5,000	3,100	5,000	5,000
$26,000	6,000	3,350	6,000	6,000
$27,000	7,000	3,600	7,000	7,000
$28,000	8,000	3,850	8,000	8,000
$29,000	9,000	4,000	9,000	9,000
$30,000	10,000	5,000	10,000	10,000

[1] 95 percent of $9,000 value, plus 75 percent of excess; maximum mortgage, $20,000.

[2] 98 percent of $10,000 value, plus 92 percent of next $5,000, plus 75 percent of excess; maximum mortgage, $25,000. A similar bill introduced by Congressman TEAGUE (Democrat, Texas).

[3] 96 percent of $10,000 value, plus 85 percent of next $6,000, plus 70 percent of excess; maximum mortgage, $20,000.

[4] 96 percent of $10,000 value, plus 80 percent of next $6,000, plus 30 percent of excess; maximum mortgage, $20,000. (Veterans: 98 percent of $10,000, plus 90 percent of next $6,000, 85 percent of excess.)

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, considering, for example, a home with a Federal Housing Administration appraised value of $15,000, existing law requires a downpayment of $1,950, the administration's proposal would require a downpayment of $1,150, the House Banking Committee proposal would require a downpayment of $1,400, and the legislation which I propose would require a downpayment of $600.

It is my firm conviction that downpayments such as would be required under the proposed legislation are absolutely essential for the revival of the home-building industry, as well as to insure adequate housing needs for the American people. It is in line with the amount of cash which the typical purchaser can provide, taking into consideration the necessity for closing costs and prepaid charges, which generally amount to $500 in a typical case, plus moving and refurnishing expenses.

Simply stated, the legislation which I propose would provide for a one-family residence a maximum mortgage equal to 98 percent of the first $10,000 of appraised value, 92 percent of the next $5,000, and 75 percent of such value in excess of $15,000. The proposed legislation will provide a new downpayment schedule for the FHA which will enable the American home-buying public with modest means to obtain necessary housing.

The average young home-buying family of today has not had the opportunity to save a large amount of money and does not have much in the way of available cash—seldom more than about $1,000. Under the present FHA downpayment schedule, this would mean that such a family could afford a house valued at not much more than $10,000, since cash requirements for closing costs average generally between $400 and $500. At today's costs, to obtain a home typically suited to its needs, such a family should be enabled to buy a home valued at approximately from $13,000 to $15,000.

Unless builders can count on the presence in the market of large numbers of potential home buyers, they cannot mass-produce homes and must, therefore, shift to fewer and more expensive homes. Advance planning for this year and next is already seriously curtailed because of the absence of effective mass financing to make possible mass production. Present FHA downpayment schedules do not permit such planning.

The extent to which the downpayments are changed measures the degree to which progress can be made toward providing housing for families of modest income. The decline in housing production of the past year has been entirely in that sector of the market which depends on low downpayment financing. Statistics indicate that such financing in the past produced 90 percent of the homes selling for under $15,000. Failure adequately to reduce downpayments to a level which families of modest income can afford will mean that such families—who have always been the prime concern of Congress in its housing policy—will continue to be excluded from the possibility of purchasing their homes.

In the absence of a method of financing suited to their ability to pay, many of these families in order to acquire homes will be forced to resort to unsound second mortgages or contracts for deed or similar devices, the use of which has been increasing during the past year. Financing of this sort characterized residential financing prior to the conception of the FHA low downpayment, low monthly payment plan, and contributed materially to real estate difficulties of the early 1930's.

Let me draw attention to recent events which dramatically underline the importance of passing the bill I introduce today. Last week, as Senators are aware, the seasonally adjusted annual rate of private starts dropped to 880,000 in March—the lowest level since May, 1949. Since the beginning of 1955, the annual rate of housing starts has dropped more than half-a-million.

Altogether, housing starts totaled 83,000 in March, a less-than-seasonal increase, and 16 percent below a year ago. Publicly owned starts numbered 7,500, which were all Capehart-Rains housing.

There were 75,500 private starts in March, which was the lowest in 8 years.

Starts under the VA program declined 45 percent from a year ago, to only 11,400 units; FHA starts declined 34 percent from a year ago, to 11,300; and conventional starts declined 6 percent, to 52,800. All categories were below March of 1956.

The last time housing starts were at an annual rate as low as 880,000 was in 1949, but at that time home building was moving upward and the industry was on its way to a new high of 1,400,000 starts in 1950. Now, however, we have reached an annual rate of 880,000, and the prospect for the future is even less. The rate at which we are building indicates that the industry is moving downward and is not accelerating, as it was in 1949.

The best indication of what the immediate future holds in prospect for home building at any given time are the FHA applications and the VA appraisal requests. These applications mean that a purchaser is submitting his application for an FHA insured loan or a VA guaranteed loan with the present intention of purchasing a home. Thus, although housing starts indicate the rate at which building is going forward, FHA and VA applications indicate the rate at which home purchases are being made.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a VA and FHA table for the States of Texas, California, Florida, and Alabama, comparing the years 1955, 1956, and 1957.

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

Total proposed new homes, FHA and VA

State	March of each year			Percent change, March 1957 from—	
	1955	1956	1957	March 1955	March 1956
Texas	9,624	3,876	2,663	−72	−31
California	22,546	9,292	3,774	−83	−59
Alabama	1,946	1,190	453	−77	−62
Florida	4,203	1,808	1,364	−68	−25
United States total	107,536	62,395	35,713	−67	−43
VA appraisal requests:					
Texas	5,822	2,757	1,349	−77	−51
California	17,573	5,270	1,794	−90	−66
Alabama	1,392	938	148	−89	−84
Florida	3,314	1,043	722	−78	−31
United States total	71,939	37,511	19,508	−73	−48
FHA applications:					
Texas	3,802	1,119	1,314	−65	+17
California	4,973	4,022	1,980	−60	−51
Alabama	554	252	305	−45	+21
Florida	889	765	642	−28	−16
United States total	35,597	24,884	16,205	−54	−35

New dwelling units in building permits issued

State	February of each year			Percent change, February 1957 from—	
	1955	1956	1957	February 1955	February 1956
Alabama	1,265	887	765	−40	−14
California	15,881	16,298	12,858	−19	−21
Texas	6,581	4,213	3,997	−39	−5
Florida	4,510	4,979	[1] 4,598	+2	−8
United States total	78,864	71,110	[1] 55,000	−30	−23

[1] Preliminary.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, this table shows very clearly that the downward trend is much more severe in the South and the West than the nationwide figures indicate, and the nationwide figures are down very sharply too. Nationwide, in March 1957, VA appraisal requests for new homes were only 19,508 as compared with 71,939 in 1955, a drop of 73 percent. The FHA totals for March 1957 amounted to 16,205 as compared to 35,597 during March 1955. The only reason the FHA is not so badly off as the VA is that some of the proposed VA units have switched to FHA because of the change in the interest rate.

As a solution to the problem, I believe that two major objectives are necessary: First, a new downpayment schedule in the FHA; second, sufficient funds in FNMA to support the market on a reasonable basis so that builders can get back into business. It is reasonable to assume that builders cannot make application to the VA for certificates of reasonable value without some assurance that the mortgages can be sold at a price which will give them at least the possibility of a reasonable profit.

It is my understanding that the Senate Banking and Currency Subcommittee on Housing is already studying plans which would authorize the Federal National Mortgage Association to support the mortgage market on a reasonable basis.

I feel that unless Congress takes immediate steps along the lines I have suggested, we will slip back into the type of residential mortgage financing which characterized the 1920's and led to the housing bankruptcy of the early 1930's—that is, high downpayments, high interest rates, short-term mortgages.

At this time, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 203 of the National Housing Act. For the reasons I have set forth, I sincerely trust that the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, to which my proposal will undoubtedly be referred, will act promptly and favorably on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1898) to amend section 203 of the National Housing Act, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Florida for the proposal he has just made. I certainly hope the Banking and Currency Committee will give early and serious consideration to the proposal, because I believe something must be done to break the logjam now in existence in connection with the home-building industry.

Again I wish to say to the Senator from Florida that he is to be commended for submitting a proposal which seems to be very much worth while at this particular time, and certainly may have a great effect in breaking down the obstruction placed in the way of those who wish to obtain homes at reasonable prices and at reasonable rates.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Florida for his wise proposal. All of us wish to see more people own their own homes. The bill introduced by the Senator from Florida is a wise move in that direction. I congratulate the Senator from Florida, and desire to join him in working for the enactment of the bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I desire to express my approval of the legislation proposed by the distinguished Senator from Florida. Particularly as one of the Senators from Oregon, which is the foremost lumber-producing State in the Nation, I wish to point out that we who live in Oregon have reason to know what has happened during the past year in the United States in the field of home building. Throughout the Nation, and particularly among those who are active in the construction industry, it is said that housing is the cream of the lumber industry. When housing is up, lumber is up; when housing is down, lumber is down.

Unfortunately, during the past year the construction industry, in the case of home building, has been down—both for home builders and for home buyers. We who live in Oregon know this, because of the impact on lumber.

I wish to express the appreciation of myself and of all the other people of my

State to the Senator from Florida for the bill he has introduced today.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I am very much indebted to the Senator from Oregon for the kindness of his remarks. Of course, I know of his keen interest in housing and his great concern with getting this facet of our economy back on its feet.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6870) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

CONFISCATED PROPERTY: THE MORAL ISSUE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a very interesting article which deals with the confiscation of property. The article, entitled "Confiscated Property: The Moral Issue," was published in the Christian Century of April 17, 1957. The Christian Century is a nondenominational religious journal published in Chicago.

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

CONFISCATED PROPERTY: THE MORAL ISSUE

(By Glenn D. Everett)

On December 11, 1941, as one of the first acts of the war between the United States and Germany and Japan, President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed an executive order seizing all assets in the United States owned by nationals of the enemy countries and establishing an Office of Alien Property Custodian to supervise the property thus expropriated. The action was a proper one under the emergency in time of war, although it was exceedingly harsh on the commercial firms and private citizens that were affected. In the case of Germany alone, the United States Government made 34,000 separate vestings, totaling more than half a billion dollars. Ninety percent of these were of less than $10,000 and included such items as the bank accounts, automobiles, houses, and other personal property of German citizens, including many who were residents of the United States but had not yet completed their American naturalization.

UKULELES, TEACUPS, AND LIFE INSURANCE

While its major aim was to seize the assets of the Nazi and Japanese Governments and to prevent them from manipulating the funds of their private citizens to the detriment of the American war effort, the Office of Alien Property Custodian was exceedingly thorough in interpreting its mandate. In the case of one girl in Honolulu, for instance, a list of 250 items seized included pillows, dresses, dolls, teacups, hairbrushes, mirrors, tableware, a coffee percolator and a toy ukulele. The test for seizure was not sympathy or association with the enemy, but nationality alone. Thus a German-born widow residing in Baltimore found the Government seizing the $10,000 life insurance left her by her son when he was killed fighting in the American Army. The estates of Americans who on dying left bequests to relatives in Germany or Japan were seized. An 80-year-old native of Germany who had been in business in the United States for many years had his life's savings seized as an enemy asset. When he died his American-born daughter was made defendant in the suit by the Government which sought to retain these assets and to seize in addition the $5,000 trust fund left to the aged widow.

A DECISION IN THE OFFING

The passions of war have now cooled and we can look back with a sense of shame at the vindictiveness practiced against individuals because of their race or nationality. It comes as a shock to realize that today, more than a decade after the war ended, the United States still holds nearly all the assets it seized from private citizens of Germany and Japan. The Office of Alien Property Custodian is still doing business and still controls an estimated $500 million in confiscated property.

Government agencies of this kind have a tendency to be long lived. It was only in June 1956 that Congress passed a law disposing of the last $800,000 in assets seized during World War I. However, the matter of the World War II assets is rapidly nearing a decision. Either the United States will give back the property to its owners or it will order the remaining property sold off and proceeds turned in to the Federal Treasury.

Legislation for the return of the confiscated property to its owners was one of the hotly debated issues in the 84th Congress. The Eisenhower administration, recognizing the justice of the claims of many private individuals who were subjected to harsh treatment during the war, proposed last year that all property up to $10,000 for each person be returned, but none to corporations. The Senate Judiciary Committee, however, unanimously reported a bill sponsored by Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, Democrat, South Carolina, which would return all ex-enemy assets. But the House was still conducting public hearings on the thorny issue when Congress adjourned; so action on this bill was prevented. Since the 84th Congress did not resolve the question, it is again being debated in the 85th. On April 4 the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on the Trading With the Enemy Act began hearings on the return of confiscated German and Japanese property.

A TITHE OF ASSETS RETURNED

Uncle Sam has taken a few steps to give back the property he seized during World War II. All assets owned by Italians were returned to them shortly after hostilities ceased. Property owned by private citizens of such countries as Hungary and Bulgaria is likewise being returned. The Japanese residing on the west coast who had been prevented by American law from becoming citizens won back some of their property through a court decision that they were not properly classified as nationals of Japan since they had expatriated themselves during the war by swearing loyalty to the United States. Persons in Germany who were persecuted and deprived of their civil rights by the Nazis had their United States-seized property restored to them through an act of Congress in 1946. Most of these claimants were Jews who had been held in concentration camps. However, less than 10 percent of the confiscated property was affected by all these actions.

In considering the moral issues involved in this question one point should be made clear: this is the property of private citizens and commercial firms. That the assets of the Hitler and Tojo governments were a proper prize of war cannot be disputed. That our Government had the right to control all assets owned by Japanese and German citizens in this country during the war is likewise indisputable. But now that peace has been restored the question at stake is whether we should keep this private property permanently and dispose of it without any compensation to the owners.

In 1946 this writer, while on a mission for UNRRA and the Heifer project, watched in helpless horror as thousands of residents of Breslau, Stettin, Danzig, Allenstein, and other areas of eastern Germany were routed out of their homes by the Communists. Carrying only little suitcases or knapsacks, these people were herded westward to the Oder-Neisse line, on foot or in boxcars. At the new border, even what little they had was taken from them on the ground that they could not export such articles as watches and cameras from "People's Poland." These Germans were forced to leave behind their homes of a lifetime and all their possessions, for the sole reason that they were German in nationality or ancestry and happened to be living in the provinces which Russia wanted to annex to Poland to make up for the Polish territory she was taking. If punishment was to be meted out to the German people, it seemed tremendously unjust to make a few suffer so much while their fellow Germans in the rest of the country escaped any loss at all, even if they were Nazi Party members.

Such a policy was unjust and immoral when pursued by the Russians; and it is no less unjust and immoral when pursued by the United States. What our Government did in 1941 was to seize the property of all Germans and Japanese residing in the United States, and any assets of people in Germany and Japan that happened to be located in the United States. What we propose to do now is to confiscate this property permanently, without any regard to the merit of the individual owner. This is exactly the same as the cynical policy of expediency pursued by the Communists.

In 1948, in a demogogic effort to justify this gun-point confiscation, Congress enacted a War Claims Act for the benefit of American servicemen who, as prisoners of war in Germany and Japan, did not receive treatment according to the standards set forth in the Geneva Convention. For every day of confinement on which he was underfed or ill-treated, each American serviceman was entitled to collect $1.50. Where was the money to come from? Congress provided that assets in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian be sold to pay the veterans' claims. Naturally, in a campaign year there was little opposition to the bill.

GREED REARS ITS HEAD

Germany and Japan ought to pay whatever is proper under international law for their violation of the rights of prisoners of war. But should the burden be laid universally on the entire population or should the payment be taken only from the pockets of a few who were so unfortunate as to have property which was within Uncle Sam's reach during the war? For the sake of expediency, Congress decided to use the property already under Government control without regard to the propriety or justice of so doing. It was contended that the German Government ought to reimburse its citizens for their losses.

However, let us look reality in the face. Is the German Government going to recompense those who lost their property in America as a result of confiscation, without recompensing the millions who lost all their property in Silesia and East Prussia? Or the millions who lost homes and possessions in West Germany in bombing raids? The answer from the overburdened Bonn government is that, obviously, it is not in a position to assume this additional obligation. Politically as well as economically it is an impossible requirement.

Why is there opposition in Congress to legislation such as the Johnston bill to restore the confiscated property? Primarily because several large industrial holdings, such as General Aniline and Film (manufacturers of Agfa cameras and Ansco film), are involved. American competitors and

speculators are anxious to buy these plants, and considerable jockeying has been done in financial circles to facilitate their purchase. The companies are widely described as cartels which supported Hitler. But if this is true, retort some advocates of the Johnston bill, let the companies be tried before an appropriate judicial tribunal and a legal penalty exacted. If their assets in Germany have not been seized in satisfaction of Hitler's debts to international society, why should their assets in America be seized? Or, in short, why it is immoral for our Government to confiscate private property valued at less than $10,000, and moral for it to take more than $10,000? That question has often been asked with respect to the administration bill.

COMMITTEE FORMED TO FORWARD JUSTICE

A committee of American citizens has been organized by the venerable 82-year-old Frederick J. Libby, who for many years directed the National Council for the Prevention of War, to focus attention on the moral issues of the problem. "We have come together because of our sense of justice and fair play and our concern for the good name of America," he declares. "To steal $1 million is not more honorable than to steal $100. The insurance policies that have been paid into the United States Treasury instead of to beneficiaries and the little legacies left by American soldiers to relatives in Germany are in principle no more sacred than the investments of thousands of stockholders in large companies."

Learned Hand, the noted jurist, who is a member of Libby's Committee for the Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, declared that in the light of modern jurisprudence "this confiscation is a step back to savagery." John A. Scherzer of Washington, D. C., a Lutheran clergyman, stated during the hearings before the 84th Congress: "There is a difference between right and expediency. It might be economic or expedient from a political, social or some other point of view to hold fast to that property which belongs to citizens of another country, but that expediency does not prove it right. It is important that we set forth our true character as a nation." O. K. Armstrong, writer, prominent Baptist layman and former Congressman, pointed out at the hearings that America wants Germany and Japan as allies in a struggle against world forces which do not respect the rights of individuals or private property; yet we persist in perpetrating what their citizens regard as galling injustice and in denial of our own principles.

It remained for Representative BROOKS HAYS, Democrat, of Arkansas, whose House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee had conducted an investigation into the subject, to summarize the moral issues involved. In response to questions as to the cost of making full return of the confiscated property, Mr. HAYS said: "In the determination of this country to live by high moral standards, the question of cost hardly seems to come into the equation. There may be various shadings of virtue as respects the various German and Japanese owners, but a person doesn't lose his claim just by being German or Japanese. No one can feel more strongly about German or Japanese aggression than I, but I recall that during the war we said we were not making war upon the people, but against their tyrants. There is enough merit in the proposal of the Johnston bill to wind it up with full return. That is, if we believe in the old legal adage that "justice must be done though the heavens fall."

Moved by such testimony and by its own investigation of the facts concerning the wartime seizure, the Senate Judiciary Committee in the 84th Congress voted unanimously for full return of the confiscated property. Will the corresponding committee in the 85th make a similar recommendation? And will Congress as a whole accept and act on it? The answer will be given only after a soul-searching contest between the expediency of keeping the property and the morality of giving it back to those who own it.

CONGRESSIONAL PAGES—WHY NOT PAGE GIRLS IN THE FUTURE?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I always have known that our Congressional pages were extremely bright and gifted young men. However, I was particularly impressed from a favorable standpoint when I viewed the National Broadcasting Co. network program Teen Talk on Sunday, April 14, 1957.

Four fine Capitol Hill pages interviewed Representative JOHN DINGELL, of Michigan, himself a former page. These boys were Jay Sourwine, George Weaver, Tommy Allen, and Jerry Bostich.

They made a splendid presentation, and were particularly articulate in pointing out the high quality of the Capitol Page School, which is operated so efficiently for Senate, House, and Supreme Court pages by the District of Columbia public school system. I must confess, however, that I felt the page boys were a little weak in their arguments as to why there should never be any page girls in Congress. I rather approve of the idea myself, and I do not see any reason—in these enlightened days of female suffrage—why the position of page should be exclusively a masculine prerogative.

I myself have been proud of my own three fine appointees as Senate page boys—Michael Forrester, of Pendleton, Oreg.; Keith Schroeder, of Myrtle Point, Oreg.; and Richard Allender, Jr., of Oswego, Oreg.

AUTHORIZATION FOR PRESIDING OFFICER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Presiding Officer be authorized to sign enrolled bills during the adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SYMINGTON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, notwithstanding the order, entered earlier today, that the Senate adjourn from today until Thursday, at noon, at this time I move that the Senate adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 17, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 16, 1957:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Roy Richard Rubottom, Jr., of Texas, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, vice Henry F. Holland, resigned.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

J. Sinclair Armstrong, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy, vice William B. Franke.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

A. Pratt Kesler, of Utah, to be United States attorney for the district of Utah for a term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires May 8, 1957.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Bernard A. Boos, of South Dakota, to be United States marshal for the district of South Dakota for a term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires April 16, 1957.

Clement W. Crahan, of Iowa, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Iowa for a term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires May 21, 1957.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 16, 1957:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

William B. Franke, of New York, to be Under Secretary of the Navy.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Caleb R. Layton III, of Delaware, to be United States district judge for the district of Delaware.

THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following for permanent appointments to the grade indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, subject to qualifications provided by law:

To be captains

Henry O. Fortin (effective April 1, 1957).
Lawrence W. Swanson.
Gilbert R. Fish.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of colonel, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1211:

Friedersdorff, Louis C., O15732.
Nemo, Ralph, O8362.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3294 as amended by Public Law 497, 84th Congress, title 10, United States Code, section 3291, and Public Law 294, 84th Congress, title 10, United States Code, section 3311, title 10, United States Code, section 3292, and Public Law 737, 84th Congress:

To be captains

Distelhorst, Frederick W., DC, O4022419.
Dixon, Leon M., Jr., MC, O968320.
Edwards, Ian K., MC, O2267482.
Ford, George W., MC, O1941874.
Hanson, Merril H., DC, O4050928.
Hanson, Thomas A., MC, O1891967.
Lamson, Thomas H., MC, O975561.
Lipscomb, James Watts, MC.
Mansfield, John O., MC, O4016515.
Monahan, James L., DC, O938692.
Nakagawa, Bunzo, MC, O1923107.
Rose, Lawrence R., MC, O4067286.
Shamburek, Roland H., MC, O4016792.
Turner, Guthrie L., Jr., MC, O2269024.

To be first lieutenants

Adams, Charles R., Jr., JAGC, O2280046.
Bogrette, Ann, AMSC, M2994.
Brown, Eleanor N., ANC, N901344.
Butcher, Anna M., ANC, N901175.
Church, Roy S., MSC, O1918954.
Conley, Paul J., MC.

Cooper, Robbie F., ANC, N900237.
del Valle-Garcia, Rafael A., MC, O2034117.
Doyle, Thomas M., MSC, O1922527.
Fitch, Charles T., MC.
Forest, Philip E., MSC, O1893890.
Futoran, Jack M., MC.
Griffin, Robert E., MSC, O4005204.
Helmann, Eleanor M., ANC, N805421.
Hettinger, Dale A., DC, O4043832.
Hille, Robert A., MSC, O4020823.
Howlett, Byron P., Jr., MSC, O1933640.
Jan, Lloyd V., MSC, O1933746.
Johnson, Merlyn B., DC.
Kellert, Albert J., MC, O4022333.
Kiel, Richard A., MSC, O1893902.
Kirchner, Marvin M., MC, O4056269.
Lau, Bennett M. K., MC, O4051019.
Little, Earle E., Jr., MC.
Marill, Irwin H., MC, O4034538.
Matthews, Nancy L., AMSC, M20006.
Mendez, Enrique, Jr., MC, O4055405.
Middleton, Gordon K., Jr., MC.
Munoz-Noya, Orlando, DC, O2276571.
Nishikawa, Wallace Y., MC, O4051120.
Pelham, Walter L., MC.
Pound, Edwin C., Jr., MC, O4043783.
Pratt, Curtiss R., MC, O4051090.
Radentz, William H., DC, O2274487.
Ross, Don R., MSC, O4007162.
Sadler, Tom H., MSC, O2272296.
Schiele, Raymond J., DC, O2276563.
Smith, Elizabeth R., Jr., WAC, L1010476.
Theodoroff, Mary J., WAC, L1020648.
Vickers, Russell E., JAGC, O2273140.
Waters, Ethel D., WAC, I1010639.
Williams, Dana S., MC, O2274744.
Winfield, Mark E., MC, O1341842.
Wolcott, Jeane M., WAC, L1020060.
Yamamoto, Hiroshi, MSC, O4006713.
Yarbrough, Roy D., MSC, O2206298.
Zone, Robert M., MC, O4087979.

To be second lieutenants

Bullard, John W., MSC, O4030646.
Erickson, Duane G., MSC, O4030113.
Gray, Barbara D., AMSC, M3037.
Latta, Patricia A., AMSC, M3024.
Read, Betty I., WAC, L1010826.
Silvernale, Douglas J., MSC, O4029627.
Stover, James W., MSC, O4019402.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of Public Law 737, 84th Congress:

To be captains

Franklin, Swayne B., O1688769.
Phillips, Eric C., O1181082.
White, Kent B., O404333.

To be first lieutenants

Baker, Theodore A., O1917897.
McDonald, Payton R., Jr., O4023600.
Stenquist, Richard W., O1341054

To be second lieutenants

Kelley, Emmett L., Jr., O4031400.
Komarow, Ronald M., O4040301.
McCuistion, Alan L., O4010737.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3294, as amended by Public Law 497, 84th Congress, subject to completion of internship:

Farbstein, Martin E.
Leonard, John T.
Spees, Everett K., Jr.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of Public Law 737, 84th Congress:

Oswalt, Harris G.
Browning, Robert D.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of Public Law 737, 84th Congress:

Adams, James E.
Baker, Jerry W.
Banner, Thomas A.
Bell, Ross T., Jr.
Berg, George A.
Carpenter, Rodney K.
Cockrell, Allen A., Jr.
Cothran, Paul E.
Coull, James M.
Crawford, Jack F.
Davies, Peter G., O4077302.
Desonier, Richard J.
Echols, Bill D.
Fleming, Jerry L.
Forgy, Jack O.
Gagliardone, John L.
George, Edward H., III.
Gonzales, Richard E., Jr., O4072259.
Grant, Arthur J., Jr.
Grimes, Dan S.
Harris, Chester R., Jr.
Harris, Thomas L., Jr.
Harvard, Thomas P., Jr.
Helpling, Ray D.
Hofer, Kenneth W.
Hutchison, Jack R.
Hyde, Herbert K., Jr., O4048492.
Isbell, James C.
Jones, Walter R.
Kruger, Robert.
Leos, Tommy G.
Logan, Laddie B.
London, William G.
McFarland, Roger E.
McGarvey, Bruce H.
Mettam, Richard E.
Nelson, Clifford R.
Nemeth, Philip K.
Nestle, Eugene C.
Nichols, Charles W.
Noyer, Gary R.
Parrack, Jim M., Jr.
Paulus, Lawrence R.
Philpott, Lawrence D., O4060575.
Pinnell, Aubrey B., Jr.
Plummer, Gerrell V.
Polk, John C.
Pople, Richard A.
Porter, Bobby B.
Rafferty, James E.
Rich, Arthur L., Jr.
Robbins, Grant C.
Rock, Thomas L.
Simpson, William F., Jr.
Sones, Vernon B.
Stoll, Roy M.
Thorne, Gerald B.
Trdla, Joseph R.
Turk, Roy M.
Wharton, Walter N.
Whatley, Howard G., O4062241
Williams, Edward H.
Williams, William J., Jr.
Zimmerman, Robert

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 16, 1957

The House met at 11 o'clock noon.

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

Eternal God, our Father, by Thy grace we have entered upon Holy Week.

We are commemorating events and experiences in the life of our blessed Lord whose solemn and sacred significance our finite minds cannot comprehend.

Grant that with a humble spirit and a contrite heart we may contemplate the redemptive ministry of the Christ, our Saviour.

May this be for all of us not only a time of commemoration but of renewed consecration when we are filled with a fervent desire to see men and nations redeemed from the darkness and bondage of sin and led into the glorious light and liberty of the sons of God.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McBride, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5520. An act to amend the Second Liberty Bond Act to increase the maximum interest rate permitted on United States savings bonds.

SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted me for today be vacated.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

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

FAVORING THE SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

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

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

A-9716766, Alfonso, Jose Fortich.
A-6949986, Alter, Chain.
A-10135642, Alter, Paula.
A-6821652, Chao, Chi-Hsien.
A-7174725, Chillemi, Agatino.
A-5225158, Chor, Lin Yet.
A-9769273, Choy, Yen Chu.
A-9635428, Constantinides, Michael.
A-7485232, Crisci, Chung May Fong.
T-2672020, Cuevas-Fausto, Marciso.
A-2545910, Goumas, Costas Theodore.
A-6662794, Halberstam, Hersch.
A-6463603, Halberstam, Brucha.
A-7858110, Halbrecht, Miriam Baraks.
A-7821864, Huerta, Juana Villanueva De.
A-7821806, Huerta-Villaneuva, Elena.
A-7457147, Iniguez-Gomez, Martin.
0900-55633, Iniguez, Petra Martinez De.
A-6760550, Klein, Leon.
0300-403947, Lem, Bee.
A-2976235, Lam, Tit Hong.
T-2671987, Lopez-Martinez, Fidencio.
A-5319344, Minami, Tom Miyoshi.
A-4802395, Miyashta, Hisano.
0900-63110, Ortiz-Soto, Efrain.
A-5977278, Santos, Marcolino.
A-1985208, Veronis, Gerasimos Nicholaou.
A-4956624, Wallace, Empson Clarkston.
T-1496984, Uyeyama, Miyasumi.
A-4095935, Aguirre-Ruiz, Jose.
A-7354329, Arbutjman, Lejb Bernardo.
A-6612013, Arzrouni, Achoude.

A-4784317, Bakker, Harry Paul Marinus.
1600-97772, Barra-Duarte, Aureliano.
A-2938135, Beker, Leon.
0900-64192, Camarena-Arias, Juan.
A-9669215, Dedo, Styepo.
A-9737095, De Moura, Julio.
A-7898941, Douskos, Carmen Maria.
A-6507735, Douskos, George.
A-9518412, Foo, Nee Ah.
E-89750, Gee, Chin Jun Kim.
0900-64550, Hernandez-Castro, Juan.
A-6048903, Huerta-Santellan, Angel Magdaleno.
E-056666, Joe Kwok Liang.
E-056667, Joe, Paylan Liang.
E-056668, Joe, Lee San.
A-6597759, Legister, Albert John.
T-2760961, Levy, Rene Cisneros.
A-7250484, Lockhart, Baleeka.
V-319235, Long, Haydee Rueda.
A-4954329, Lumas, Joseph.
A-6726819, Madrazo, Elisa Amparo.
A-8876988, O'Donnell, William John.
A-7270220, Palombella, Francesco.
A-9707191, Ramos, Pedro.
A-6711481, Rizk, Alfred Alexander.
T-2760421, Rodriguez-Garcia, Rafael.
A-3822477, Sanchez-Alejandro, Esteban.
A-3038125, Sanchez-Alejandro, Filomeno.
A-4010160, Sanchez-Alejandro, Gregoria.
A-4209497, Sanchez-de, Natividad Bazan.
T-1499169, Si, Wang.
A-5904796, Su'a, Kipeni.
A-4219656, Temita, Tamio.
A-5338975, Traynor, Janet Jessie.
A-9581816, Trojanovic, Pedro.
A-5423889, Tsien, Wei Hwa.
A-923872, Tsien, Wei Nan.
E-44755, Vega, Maria.
A-3610417, Ying, Teresa.
A-10086556, Ying, Yuen.
0966-263, Zamarripa-Barrera, Petra.
0966-264, Zamarripa-Barrera, Enrique.
A-2821296, Cnapich, Joseph.
A-7225061, Di Mambro, Edoardo.
V-1240687, Okana, Takeko.
A-7469332, Nevarez-Meraz, Alberto.
A-7044290, Ramirez-Mata, Carles.
T-2672016, Ramirez, Petra Aida Montes De.
A-7188173, Roden, Adolf.
A-5528068, Todeschini, Isidoro Oreste.
A-6346278, Valkana, Constantinos.
A-6357988, Valkana, Panagiota.
A-6079538, Browne, Candelaria S. M.
A-6078003, Browne, Cynthia.
A-6079549, Browne, Rudolph.
A-8938372, Browne, Albert.
A-6079545, Browne, Leslie.
A-6078002, Browne, Vernon.
A-6870027, Fong, Way Chong.
A-7367898, Chu, Lau Hing.
A-5978605, Engelmann, August Max.
A-5763362, Fong, Liu.
A-4030307, Hee, Yep.
A-5967408, Ikari, Manuel Enrique.
A-5982007, Katsuro, Shuhei.
A-6886810, Lawrence, Genoveva Adelina.
A-5814895, Marshall, John Neil.
A-4080362, Maya-Ybarra, Francisco.
A-4334530, Miki, Tomizo.
A-10416353, Orozco-Estrado, Pedro.
0300-387312, Quintero-Toscano, Candido.
A-5248778, Singh, Channan.
A-6352536, Soltero, Silverio.
A-8039899, Stumbaugh, Giovanna Flammini Di Loreto.
A-8901479, Tang, Lily Cheng-Li.
1600-101488, Toro-Moreno, Manuel Del.
A-10504578, Valles, Luz Gasca De.
1500-42507, Velez, Esteban.
1500-42508, Velez, Eduviges.
1500-42509, Velez, Elvira.
A-7283659, Wah, Leung.
T-1892615, Foo, Wong Ah.
A-9747459, Henderson, Cecil Ashton.
A-6097780, Honda, Katsuki.
A-2573276, Li, I-Ying.
A-4829259, Mischler, Richard Robert.
A-6063644, Nielson, Lindsay Franklin.
A-6930858, Paradissis, Philip John.
A-8883007, Petrizzo, Maria Rosaria.
A-7751743, Pigulewski, Nicholas De Lorence.
A-1657086, Redko, Isay Ivanovich.
A-10086222, Scurvin, Lancelot Seymore.
A-2994820, Alfaro, Lydia Molina De.
A-8021752, Alfaro-Molina, Samuel.
A-6160109, Davis, Guy Henry.
A-7391996, Herrera-Ruiz, Juan.
A-3972563, Kogano, Takashi.
A-9708088, Naum, Lee.
0300-415842, Ong, Min.
A-5186985, Perez-Perez, Ruben.
A-10492500, Perez, Socorro Luna De.
A-10492499, Luna, Maria de Jesus.
A-8082062, Sing, Au.
E-118899, Wong, Ah Liang.
A-2185719, Alie, Alex.
A-5672581, Havlasa, Jan Klecanda.
A-4967880, Korogiannos, Eponinodas.
A-9645741, Lee, De She.
0300-398983, Leong, Mock Fook.
A-8014953, Nardo, Albert Di.
A-6161490, Ozawa, Atsumi Angelica.
A-6354359, Perlaki, Thomas.
A-7764289, Plaushak, Pamela Lysa.
A-7930337, Poy, Ngai Kai.
T-1892169, Sam, Chin You.
A-9513946, Sze, To King.
A-6161489, Yoshimura, Suzuko.
A-7284855, Benn, Hajara Singh.
A-6226075, Carlson, Susan.
A-3497151, Cosgrove, James.
A-8258649, Dominguez, Beatrice Rodriguez De.
A-10474407, Guerra, Maria Tovares De.
A-4352288, Hurtado, Lucia Espinosa De.
A-8832503, Mazer, Carmen Enriqueta De.
A-9501884, Michalakis, George.
A-7772769, Pinedo-Tamayo, Adolfo.
A-2706650, Sato, Kunishige.
A-7295956, Villapudua-Sanchez, Armando.
A-2319483, Zara, Thomas.
A-5997836, Gonzalez, Feliciano.
A-5882765, Gutierrez, Angelina Cuellar.
A-3653450, Lee, Hsin Chin.
A-9747187, Locke, George Frederick.
A-2008973, Maticzuk, Nicolaj.
A-6459301, Paneth, Lea.
A-8851449, Ulrych, Boruch.
A-8851450, Ulrych, Chaia Tauba.
A-3812648, Won, Tom Yon.
A-7439457, Aguirre, Rita Talavera De.
A-6484421, Fischer, Isidor.
T-303675, Garcia-Ramos, Eulalio.
A-9333333, Jit, Boh Tong.
A-3818721, Jung, Wood Dar.
A-8039673, Kenul, Joseph.
A-7290162, Lee, John.
A-5360726, Maldonado-Gonzalez, Fidel.
A-8258739, Pardon-Lizana, Enrique.
A-1196312, Silverman, Ada.
A-5753515, Sutherland, William George.
A-7363001, Vernazza, Gina Letina.
A-8871495, Ybarra-Torres, Eugenio.
A-7276513, Wing, Jew.
A-9151185, Akerberg, Hjalmar Alfons.
A-9684304, Fat, Lam.
A-7361923, Jung, Guey.
A-9538393, Leetmaa, Kaarel.
A-8870247, Martinez-Gutierrez, Alvino.
A-3379867, Naito, Tomio.
A-4784332, Nelson, Minnie.
A-6496278, Oriel, Benjamin Joseph.
A-4234512, Paz, Alicia Herdandez De.
A-3095797, Tsichlis, Vasilios.
A-4381523, Cook, Anthony.
A-5944885, Crowther, Angela Knez.
A-6899161, Dirks, Hendrik.
A-4820438, Frangos, Nicholas Kostantinos.
A-5154701, La Guardia, Francisco Marti.
A-9117178, Legac, George.
A-5966811, Miculinic, Joseph.
A-10499492, Mohamed, John.
A-4906873, Pizarro, Emilio Anastacio.
A-5997834, Prieto, Angel.
A-5997834, Prieto, Jr., Angel.
A-7201762, Scott, George Edward Wisdom.
A-10416355, Atilano, Berta Morales De.
A-9517004, Fong, Foh Hua.
A-10075140, Foo, Mah Hong.
A-5549548, Friedrich, Hans Max.
A-7984748, Gonzalez-Perez, Angel.
A-3573618, Green, Caroline Louise.
A-6549172, Lazaro, Pelagia Javier.
A-6614916, Livas, Gregory Panagiotou.
A-5785564, Merayo, Agustin.
A-74445700, Niewolkiewicz, Mary.
A-10416327, Ramirez, Luis Ortega.
A-7841671, Shew, Gee.
A-1035814, Diamond, Phillip.
A-6476840, Figueroa-Ayuso, Eulalio.
A-10256536, Hung, Wong.
A-7140275, Lopez-Barragon, Nicolas.
A-5372469, Marcev, Samuel Anton.
A-5778460, Naess, Fred.
A-7115379, Scime, Marianne.
A-3747236, Tai, Mook Hoo.
A-8883649, Barbosa-Gomez, Luis Emilio.
A-7251809, Kehoe, Sophie.
A-8190275, Lai, William.
A-1945249, Rumenko, Frank.
A-7028911, Shavulsky, David.
A-5415136, Shavulsky, Goldie.
A-7028913, Shavulsky, Sylvia.
A-9582980, Syrigos, Antonios.
A-6849417, Tung, Ching Chen.
A-6967562, Tung, Lillian Liu.
A-9662775, Van Diepen, John.
A-9260398, Ward, Frank Joseph.
A-10255874, Chow, Fai King.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARLIS STENDER

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 12) withdrawing suspension of deportation of Carlis Stender.

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

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress, in accordance with section 246 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U. S. C. A. 1256 (a)), withdraws the suspension of deportation in the case of Carlis Stender (A-2180275) which was previously granted by the Attorney General and approved by the Congress.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FAVORING THE SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION IN THE CASE OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 17) favoring the suspension of deportation in the case of certain aliens.

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

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation pursuant to the provisions of section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 214; 8 U. S. C. 1254 (c)):

A-1618471, Avis, Solomon.
A-5972321, Barbalat, Robert Samuel.
A-4530872, Caplan, Jacob.
A-8291885, Dreeka, Farres.
A-5982370, Givot, Simon.
A-5341909, Gutierrez-Cantu, Matilde.
A-2069878, Jurado-Portillo, Alberto.
A-4689730, Korkaris, Spiridon Ioanou.
A-10065801, Kratka, Abraham.
A-3843882, Lentzner, Rudolf.
A-3560108, Lopez-Varela, Angel.
A-3791973, Mandlsky, Ceslaw.

E-072770, Olson, Gustav Olov.
A-1285420, Radman, Annie Elizabeth.
A-1917568, Slobodian, Moses.
A-4587587, Burck, Jacob.
A-1407721, Romano, Antonio.
A-4963187, Zaytoun, Eunice Zatone Eunice.
A-4811296, Dagostaro, Sebastiano.
A-5055225, Fishman, Nathan.
A-2144176, Flores-Duran, Jesus.
A-8619031, Goldbogen, Joseph.
E-131756, Hermans, Charles Ferdinand.
A-5006378, Jez, Franciszek.
A-2109682, Lopez, Secundo.
A-3549317, Murphy, George Patrick.
A-5905086, Rintrona, Paul.
A-4306639, Scuteri, Antonino.
A-3787439, Soeldner, William.
A-4167441, Swain-Rios, Raul.
A-1266712, Pozniak, Joseph George.
A-4237764, Rios-Beltran, Francisco.
A-3903054, Bernhardt, Joseph.
A-4390213, Bernhardt, Julia.
A-2854445, Chatlos, Peter Joseph Paul.
A-2663770, Drozda, Steve.
A-2663834, Gallo, Ettore.
A-8891753, Ginsberg, Samuel.
A-8729317, Ierna, Louis.
A-5398485, Kleingeld, Jan Antonie.
A-1667195, Kvederis, George.
A-1805400, Pacuka, William.
A-1953485, Rizzo, Emanuel.
A-3334493, Rozko, Gleb.
A-5920350, Tilinski, Blaise.
A-1832692, Haszaji, Janos.
A-4648788, Splet, Casimer Joseph.
A-6036505, Wojcik, Andrzej.
A-3549327, Acks, Benjamin.
A-3540280, Camarillo-Hernandez, Melescio.
A-5957928, Conforti, John.
A-5283587, Herman, Carl.
A-4699846, Herman, Helen.
A-2331514, Geier, Michael.
A-4451943, Glocher, Louis.
A-3023919, Gomez-Romero, Macario.
A-3927637, Gordon, Sidney Dimitro.
A-2305717, Goris, Modeste.
A-4578869, Kelsik, Karl Charles.
A-3113854, Lichtstrahl, Nathan.
A-3284190, Nagy, Ferencz Fre.
A-10392951, Semrau, Otto.
A-3326451, Stefanich, Robert John.
A-4951722, Baker, Cyril Joseph.
A-1125010, Delgadillo-Bautista, Jose Audon.
A-2884715, Farhat, Assad.
A-5023157, Henry, Nellie.
A-5357355, Maggio, Anthony.
A-8728319, Mai, Felix.
A-1776754, Meldahl, Ludvik Theodore.
A-5282674, Oaxaca-Licon, Miguel.
A-2654872, Palacios, Manuel Antonio.
A-1009799, Pina, Edwin James.
A-5875661, Sowinski, Andrew Michael.
A-1355134, Strand, Emil.
A-10145314, Thomson, George Washington.
A-4827436, Corona, Vidal.
A-4578246, Corona, Maria Mercedes Murillo De.
A-3955408, Fillion, Pierre Joseph.
A-5003117, Steigerwald, Joseph.
A-3960477, Yettra, Max Henry.
A-4538625, Zinkiewicz, Theodore Stanley.
A-7387847, Abogile, Andrew.
A-10238757, Falsbein, Lillie.
A-3559457, Farino, Pasquale.
A-8846019, Januskiewicz, Stella.
A-3872504, Navarro, Antonio.
A-3343832, Pollack, Walter.
A-5556763, Rose, George.
A-5164395, Stagliano, Alexander.
A-3917088, Vitale, Maria Rose Dolores.
A-5608431, Wagman, Anna.
A-5953152, Zuniga-Ayala, Gil.
A-5522981, Angelo, Joseph.
A-1136722, Battista, Domonick.
A-3115920, Cutrona, Paolo.
A-2433364, De Witt, Hendrick Mathilde.
A-2313159, Garza-Martinez, Anastacio.
A-5642228, Ivnitsky, Morris.
A-5055209, Johnson, Eric Gustav Christian.
A-8330014, Jurina, Stephen Martin.
A-5267881, Kaczmarek, Anthony Frank.
A-5578905, Karasiewicz, Bronislaw Daniel.
A-5526604, Karov, Harry.
A-4920268, Murphy, Frances Lavine.
A-3940909, Ferrone, Gasper.
A-4229759, Quong, Mong Lai.
A-4818926, Rivnyak, Michael.
A-5383872, Rosenzweig, Joseph.
A-4935411, Rye, Agil.
A-2837467, Teleshefsky, Harry.
A-4325513, Tkachuk, Peter.
A-1755685, Zajatz, Ivan.
A-8959188, Fajardo, Marcos.
A-4371961, Gum, Tang.
A-5621394, Geoniotes, Demetros Georgi.
A-3455978, Kucharik, John Paul.
A-4753662, Lubrano, Daniel.
A-4613965, Sanchez, Gil Ramirez.
A-4428360, Schwartz, Nathan.
A-3823508, Schwartz, Rebecca.
A-5907730, Abosketes, Nick.
A-3556323, Ciechomski, John.
A-231660, Evtushik, Ulian.
A-5264444, Kahan, Isidore.
A-3149068, La Hood, John Joseph.
A-10165019, Leonard, Joseph Frank.
A-4647042, Maskovic, John Peter.
A-2917332, Mitchell, George Paul Vucenovich.
A-1258853, Strauber, Erwin.
A-3193490, Tresca, Benny.
A-3356111, Trost, Molly.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ASHUN YUNG

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18) withdrawing suspension of deportation of Ashun Yung.

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

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress, in accordance with section 246 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U. S. C. A. 1256 (a)), withdraws the suspension of deportation in the case of Ashun Yung (A-4196469) which was previously granted by the Attorney General and approved by the Congress.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 272) for the relief of certain aliens.

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

Resolved, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Georgette Charalambo Harrison, Bronislaw Matuszczak, Walter Schik, and Solomon Joseph Sadakne, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act in the case of Bronislaw Matuszczak. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this section of this act, if such alien was classified as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Patrick Joseph Blewett, Barbara M. Stamat, and Azzam Issac Rafidi, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees.

SEC. 3. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bonds, which may have issued in the cases of Jose Zavala-Rivera and Mrs. Labibe Salibi. From and after the date of the enactment of this act, the said Jose Zavala-Rivera and Mrs. Labibe Salibi shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 13, after the word "fees" change the period to a colon and add the following: *"Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act in the case of Barbara M. Stamat."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

WAIVING CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 273) to waive the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, in behalf of certain aliens.

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

Resolved, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lucienne Canicio Smith, Lotte Gertrude Augusta Phelan, Mrs. Remaria Avearii a Marama Geronimo, Albina Mesesnel Lombardi, Mrs. Marie B. (Winkler) McClendon, Sylvia Duratti Stithan, and Mrs. Hildegarde Weber Bennett, may be issued visas and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

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

CECELIA VACCARO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1451) for the relief of Cecelia Vaccaro.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 402 (j) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (65 Stat. 191) shall be held to be applicable to Cecelia Vaccaro if she applies for benefits thereunder in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary of State, prior to the

expiration of 6 months immediately following the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That Cecelia Vaccaro, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 401 (e) of the Nationality Act of 1940, may be naturalized by taking, prior to 1 year after the effective date of this act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 337 of the said act. From and after naturalization under this act the said Cecelia Vaccaro shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

ELLEN G. MARINAS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1765) for the relief of Ellen G. Marinas.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act Ellen G. Marinas shall be held and considered to be the minor alien child of Paul A. Marinas, a citizen of the United States.

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

JEFFREY CHARLES MEDWORTH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1454) for the relief of Jeffrey Charles Medworth.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of section 202 (a) (4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jeffrey Charles Medworth shall be held to be chargeable to the quota of Great Britain.

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.

ELDA MONDILLO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1837) for the relief of Elda Mondillo.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Elda Mondillo shall be held and considered to be the minor alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Giovanni Mondillo, a citizen of the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 6, strike out "and Mrs." and strike out "citizens" and insert "a citizen."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

FRANK E. GALLAGHER, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1348) for the relief of Frank E. Gallagher, Jr.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized and directed to pay out of the United States Government life insurance fund to Frank E. Gallagher, Jr., Alexandria, Va., total disability benefits for the period from July 1, 1942, through November 28, 1945, under the terms of his United States Government life insurance policies, and to refund the premiums paid on such insurance through allotments from his active duty pay for the period from August 1, 1942, through November 28, 1945. The said Frank E. Gallagher, Jr., was totally disabled during such period by malnutrition and dysentery incurred as a result of inhumane treatment by the Japanese Government while a prisoner of war: *Provided*, That no part of any benefits or refund received by reason of this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

ANNA L. DE ANGELIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1472) for the relief of Anna L. De Angelis.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money available for the payment of national service life insurance benefits, to Anna L. De Angelis, of Rochester, N. Y., the widow of Aniceto De Angelis, a soldier in the United States Army during World War I, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States, the sum of $5,000 representing the face value of Government insurance policy (K–851424) which was issued to the said Aniceto De Angelis on August 1, 1918, and reinstated on July 1, 1927, and under which the said Anna L. De Angelis was principal beneficiary although she has never received any payments on such policy following the death of the insured: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Western District of New York, notwithstanding any lapse of time or any provision of law to the contrary, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mrs. Anna L. De Angelis, of Rochester, N. Y., arising out of a controversy concerning the payment to her as beneficiary of policy numbered K–851424 issued to her husband, Aniceto De Angelis, on August 1, 1918, and reinstated effective as of July 1, 1927. The said Anna L. De Angelis asserts that after the reinstatement of said policy that Aniceto De Angelis became permanently and totally disabled during the period when the said insurance was in force on a premium-paying basis and that by reason of this the said insurance policy continued in force and effect until the death of the said Aniceto De Angelis, and that she then became entitled to the proceeds of the said insurance policy as his beneficiary: *Provided*, That passage of this act shall not be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States Government: *Provided, further*, That suit shall be filed within one year after the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

HOMER CAZAMIAS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1502) for the relief of Homer Cazamias.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Homer Cazamias, Laredo, Tex., the sum of $3,300. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Homer Cazamias against the United States for reimbursement of excessive customs duties paid by him with respect to certain tin cans (containing frozen strawberries) imported from Mexico during April, May, June, and July 1951. Such cans had been originally manufactured in the United States and would accordingly have been entitled to an exemption from duty if a claim for free entry had been filed at the time of such importation: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

GEORG GAHN AND MARGARETE GAHN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1535) for the relief of Georg Gahn and Margarete Gahn.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Alien Property Custodian be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Georg Gahn $6,537.07 and to Margarete Gahn $6,537.08. Such amounts represent the distributive share of Georg Gahn and Margarete Gahn under the

will of their deceased sister, Lena Steeger, who died in Massachusetts on August 9, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

WESTERN INSTRUMENTS ASSOCIATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1700) for the relief of Western Instruments Associates.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

FRANK J. AND MAE T. W. BURGER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1752) for the relief of Frank J. and Mae T. W. Burger.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the act entitled "An act providing for the barring of claims against the United States," approved October 9, 1940 (31 U. S. C., sec. 71a), are hereby waived in favor of Frank J. and Mae T. W. Burger, of Hamilton, Ohio, if their claims for amounts due them by reason of the death of their son (1st Lt. George B. Burger, Army Air Corps), whose death is presumed to have occurred on May 11, 1944, are filed with the General Accounting Office within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, since such claims are now barred solely by reason of the failure of the responsible governmental agency to forward them to the General Accounting Office within the allowable period of time.

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.

ROBERT D. MILLER, OF JUNEAU, ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2045) for the relief of Robert D. Miller, of Juneau, Alaska.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert D. Miller, of Juneau, Alaska, the sum of $132.45, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States as reimbursement for personal effects lost on December 14, 1954, in the sinking of a United States Coast Guard aircraft near Haines, Alaska, while employed by and on actual duty with the Department of Justice as deputy United States Marshal for the First Judicial Division of Alaska: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

MORRIS B. WALLACH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2674) for the relief of Morris B. Wallach.

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

Mr. HEMPHILL and Mr. ROBERTS objected; and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ALEXEI FRANK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2720) for the relief of Alexei Frank.

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

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Two objections are required under the rule.

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

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

There was no objection.

ESTATE OF WILLIAM V. STEPP, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2973) for the relief of the estate of William V. Stepp, Jr.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of William V. Stepp, Jr., the sum of $1,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of the said William F. Stepp, Jr., who died on or about June 4, 1948, as the result of a bullet wound inflicted by an enlisted member of the United States Army, acting as a sentry at a military base at Anchorage, Alaska, on June 4, 1948. This claim is not cognizable under tort claims procedure as outlined in title 28, United States Code: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

BUNGE CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3126) for the relief of Bunge Corp.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Bunge Corp., New York, N. Y., the sum of $1,087.50. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Bunge Corp. against the United States on account of the erroneous liquidation of New York Consumption Entry No. 702540 of July 7, 1952, which entry incorrectly classified the merchandise involved, resulting in excessive customs duties being charged against such merchandise.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,087.50" and insert "$1,196.25."

Page 2, line 5, insert: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

EDWIN K. FERNANDEZ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3276) for the relief of Edwin K. Fernandez.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,115 to Edwin K. Fernandez, of 1094 South King Street, Honolulu, Oahu, Hawaii, to compensate him for the loss of property loaned to the Department of the Army in August 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$2,115" and insert "$1,910.40."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

ERNEST HAGLER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3558) for the relief of Ernest Hagler.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to settle and adjust the claim of Ernest Hagler on account of the seizure by the Internal Revenue Service of a quantity of ethyl alcohol purchased by Mr. Hagler from the Department of the Army pursuant to an award of a contract made under invitation for bids Nos. 23-207s-56-5, issued November 4, 1955 by the Saint Louis Area Support Center, United States Army, and to allow in full and final settlement of the claim the sum of not to exceed $1,079.72. There is hereby appropriated from any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,079.72 for payment of said claim.

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

GEORGE T. MOORE, CARL D. BERRY, AND DR. HAROLD J. HECK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3559) for the relief of George T. Moore, Carl D. Berry, and Dr. Harold J. Heck.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That George T. Moore, of Glencoe, Ill., an employee of the Department of Commerce, is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $3,051, representing payments of a per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence paid to him for the period from December 21, 1953, through November 30, 1954, as a result of administrative error, in connection with service rendered to the Government as consultant and as expert in Washington, District of Columbia. In the audit and settlement of accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States full credit shall be given for the amounts for which liability is relieved by this act.

SEC. 2. Carl D. Berry, of Winnetka, Ill., a former employee of the Department of Commerce, is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $1,423.66, $1,127.25 of which represents payments of a per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence for the period from March 9, 1955, through July 31, 1955, and $296.41 represents payments for travel incurred between Washington, District of Columbia, and Winnetka, Ill., which payments were made as the result of administrative error, in connection with service rendered to the Government as consultant and as expert in Washington, D. C. In the audit and settlement of accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States full credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this act.

SEC. 3. Dr. Harold J. Heck, of New Orleans, La., a former employee of the Department of Commerce, is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $616.03, representing payments of a per diem allowance and travel expenses paid to him for the period June 1, 1955, through August 31, 1955, as a result of administrative error in connection with services rendered to the Government as consultant and as expert in Washington, D. C. In the audit and settlement of accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States full credit shall be given for the amounts for which liability is relieved by 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.

HELMUTH S. HEYL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3921) for the relief of Helmuth S. Heyl.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Helmuth S. Heyl, 270 Woodcrest Boulevard, Kenmore 23, N. Y., the sum of $1,149.24, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for a refund of income tax for the year 1922 erroneously collected: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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.

OSWALD N. SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4023) for the relief of Oswald N. Smith.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Oswald N. Smith, of 3757 Jay Street NE., Washington, D. C., the sum of $881.50. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Oswald N. Smith against the United States Army out of the loss of clothing, equipment, and personal property sustained by him as a result of a fire in a warehouse in Merryville, La., in January 1944, while the said Oswald N. Smith was serving as a lieutenant with the 92d Infantry Division, United States Army: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$881.50" and insert "$793.35."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

JOY KULIS AND JANET ARLINE KULIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4970) for the relief of Joy Kulis and Janet Arline Kulis.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $4,004.20 to Joy Kulis and to pay the sum of $4,345.90 to Janet Arline Kulis, of Richmond, Calif., in full settlement of all claims against the United States. Such sums represent the amounts due as compensation from the death of their father, Joseph E. Kulis, for a period beginning June 5, 1942, and ending on August 18, 1953 for Joy Kulis, and ending September 17, 1954 for Janet Arline Kulis, the day preceding the 18th birthday of each child: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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.

HARRY V. SHOOP ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5061) for the relief of Harry V. Shoop, Frederick J. Richardson, Joseph D. Rosenlieb, Joseph E. P. McCann, and Junior K. Schoolcraft.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That Harry V. Shoop, Frederick J. Richardson, Joseph D. Rosenlieb, Joseph E. P. McCann, and Junior K. Schoolcraft are hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sums of $1,190.20, $410.40, $636.11, $904.80, and $1,176.80, respectively. Such sums represent the respective amounts of overpayment of compensation made to the above-specified individuals and received by them in good faith covering periods from and after November 9, 1952, through February 14, 1953, during which such individuals were absent from duty as employees of the Department of the Air Force by reason of service which they were performing with the Ohio National Guard. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for such respective amounts of overpayment. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each of the above-specified individuals a sum equal to the aggregate of any amounts which may have been paid by him, or which may have been withheld from amounts otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the claim of the United States for refund of such overpayment.

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.

CAPT. THOMAS C. CURTIS AND CAPT. GEORGE L. LANE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5081) for the relief of Capt. Thomas C. Curtis and Capt. George L. Lane.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That Capt. Thomas C. Curtis, Army service No. O965919, and Capt. George L. Lane, Army service No. O949474, both of The Adjutant General's Corps, United States Army Reserve, are hereby respectively relieved of liability to repay to the United

States the sums of $54, received from April 13, 1949, to July 31, 1949, and $524.50, received from August 1, 1949, to January 31, 1954, which sums represent amounts paid to them for the performance of administrative duties as division pay officers of the 102d Infantry Division, Army Reserve. In the audit and settlement of the account of any disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amounts for which liability is relieved by 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.

JOE KAWAKAMI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5082) for the relief of Joe Kawakami.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Joe Kawakami, 4416 North Racine Avenue, Chicago, Ill., the sum of $106.05, in full reimbursement of the expenses incurred by him personally in paying a judgment obtained against him in a civil action in the municipal court of Chicago, as the result of a vehicular accident which occurred on January 9, 1953, Chicago, Ill., when he was acting within the scope of his employment as the chauffeur of the Army vehicle involved in said accident: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

ROBERT BURNS DeWITT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5083) for the relief of Robert Burns DeWitt.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert Burns DeWitt, 5934 Tremont Street, Dallas, Tex., the sum of $4,100, in full satisfaction and final settlement of all claims against the United States of the said Robert Burns DeWitt arising out of the recruiting, quartering, provisioning, and transportation of troops by him for service with the United States Armed Forces during World War I: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, or attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

WILLIAM HENRY DIMENT ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5168) for the relief of William Henry Diment, Mrs. Mary Ellen Diment, and Mrs. Gladys Everingham.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William Henry Diment and Mrs. Mary Ellen Diment, 242 Grand Avenue, Ely, Cardiff, England, the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of their son, W. H. Diment, as the result of his being shot by a soldier of the United States Army, acting within the scope of his employment as a sentry, at Antwerp, Belgium, on January 22, 1946; and to Mrs. Gladys Everingham, individually and as natural guardian of her two minor children, Michael Ronald Everingham and Maureen Everingham, 1 Montrose Avenue, Seymour Street, city of Kingston upon Hull, England, the sum of $12,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of her husband, Sergeant Ronald Everingham, of the British Army, as the result of his being shot by a soldier of the United States Army acting outside the scope of his employment, at Antwerp, Belgium, on April 27, 1946: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid out of the Treasury until such time as the Government of the United Kingdom has paid to Mrs. Gabrielle Evans, 85 Rue Olivier de Serras, Paris (15), Seine, France, the sum of $12,000, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United Kingdom on account of the personal injury and resulting death of her husband, LeRoy R. Evans, who was a citizen of the United States and a civilian employee of the United States Army when he was severely injured on January 1, 1949, in an accident involving a British Army vehicle, which occurred at Fontainebleau, France: *And provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, or attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

HIGA KENSAI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5220) for the relief of the estate of Higa Kensai.

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

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORITY FOR COURT OF CLAIMS TO DETERMINE AND RENDER JUDGMENT ON CERTAIN CLAIMS OF UNITED FOUNDATION CORPORATION OF UNION, N. J.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5355) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on certain claims of the United Foundation Corporation of Union, N. J.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims, notwithstanding any prior determination by such court on a motion for summary judgment, or any other provision or rule of law to the contrary, to hear de novo, determine, and render judgment upon all claims of the United Foundation Corporation of Union, New Jersey, against the United States, arising out of contract numbered W-49-080-eng-668 entered into between the said corporation and the United States on September 30, 1948, and such claims shall be considered as if they had arisen subsequent to the enactment of the act entitled "An act to permit review of decisions of the heads of departments, or their representatives or boards, involving questions arising under Government contracts," approved May 11, 1954 (41 U. S. C., secs. 321 and 322).

SEC. 2. Suit upon such claims may be instituted at any time within 90 days after the date of enactment of this act.

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

SCOTT BERRY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5441) for the relief of Scott Berry.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Scott Berry, of Huntington, W. Va., the sum of $481.84. Such sum represents the amount of the judgment and costs which the said Scott Berry has been required to pay, arising out of an automobile accident near Huntington, W. Va., on March 25, 1954, in which a truck being operated by him on official business of the United States Post Office Department was struck by a privately owned vehicle: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, lines 2 and 3, strike "in excess of 10 percentum thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

A. C. ISRAEL COMMODITY CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5707) for the relief of the A. C. Israel Commodity Co., Inc.

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

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

WILLIAM FREDERICK WERNER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5714) for the relief of William Frederick Werner.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William Frederick Werner, Pawtucket, R. I. (Veterans' Administration claim No. C-3842760), the sum of $1,449.70. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said William Frederick Werner against the United States for reimbursement of the amounts which he paid for hospitalization for a service-connected disability during the period beginning March 1, 1946, and ending May 9, 1947, both dates inclusive, at a Veterans' Administration contract facility: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

JUANITA GIBSON LEWIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5718) for the relief of Juanita Gibson Lewis.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the national service life insurance, represented by the certificate No. N-195-931-199, issued to Harvey C. Lewis (Veterans' Administration claim No. XC-4-143-457), shall be held and considered to have been in full force and effect at the time of the death of the said Harvey C. Lewis on June 11, 1945, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall pay such insurance (from the national service life-insurance appropriation) to Juanita Gibson Lewis, widow of the said Harvey C. Lewis and designated beneficiary of such insurance: *Provided, however*, That the total amount of the premiums unpaid on such insurance for the period beginning January 23 and ending on June 11, 1945, both dates inclusive, shall be deducted from the amounts payable to the said Juanita Gibson Lewis as principal beneficiary of such insurance.

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.

MANUEL MELLO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5855) for the relief of Manuel Mello.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Manuel Mello, New Bedford, Mass., the sum of $158.21. Such sum represents reimbursement to the said Manuel Mello for paying out of his own funds a judgment rendered against him in the courts in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, arising out of an accident occurring in January 1954, when the said Manuel Mello was operating a Government vehicle in the course of his duties as an employee of the Post Office Department: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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.

THOMAS F. MILTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6172) for the relief of Thomas F. Milton.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Thomas F. Milton, 88 Violet Avenue, Hillingdon, Middlesex, England, the sum of $11,197.60 in full satisfaction of all claims of Thomas F. Milton against the United States for damages resulting from injuries sustained in an incident involving United States Air Force personnel in Uxbridge, Middlesex, England, on May 10, 1952, while exercising his duties as a constable in the London Metropolitan Police: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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.

VIRGINIA HELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6175) for the relief of Virginia Hell.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,495.36, to Virginia Hell, of 2055 38th Street SE., Washington, D. C. Such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of said Virginia Hell against the United States for necessary expenses incurred in returning to the United States from London, England, after serving in Europe as a civilian employee of the American Government for 2 years and 7 months (May 4, 1948, to December 8, 1950) and for property damage sustained as the result of household furnishings being left out in weather at New Orleans, La., by the United States customs officials: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

WAIVING PROVISION OF SECTION 212 (A) (9) OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT IN BEHALF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 274 to waive the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

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

Resolved, etc., That notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Rose Maria Pucillo, Bertha Gabriel Y. Martinez Gomez, Francesco Pizzo, Bronislaw (John) Waz, Mrs. Elizabeth Helene Carter, George Liberatos (Lymperatos), Hildegard Kaufmann, Mrs. Helene Dimitrowa Shiver, Berthilde Vogler Ganno, Herta Friedrichs Rockwood, Luis Torres, Ursula Anna Peterich von Rekowsky, Antonio Contreras, Francesco Di Lorenzo, Beniamino Rocco Giordano, Donato Severino Spensieri, and Mrs. Anna Hoczak Aumueller Cathey may be issued visas and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

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

WAIVING PROVISION OF SECTION 212 (A) OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT IN BEHALF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 288 to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

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

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

There was no objection.

FACILITATING ADMISSION INTO UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIEN CHILDREN

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 289 to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain alien children.

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

Resolved, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, James Kanji Hoskins, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Master Sergeant James Britton Hoskins, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Petros Ioannou Calengas, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Margarita L. Calengas and Leonardos P. Calengas, citizens of the United States.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Efmorphia Nikolaidou, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Wallace Frederic Wolever and Helen Wolever, citizens of the United States.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Choon Sik Kim, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Walter H. Lohans, citizens of the United States.

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

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 290 for the relief of certain aliens.

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

Resolved, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Moosa Ebrahimian, Abdullah Ibrahim Hakim, Margaret Shand (Chanslor), Vasiliki Elefantis Kritselis, Maria Rosa Largaiolli, Hene (Genia) Wasser, Michael Wasser, Poulicos S. Loucacos, Margarete Herzog, Evangelos Demetre Kargiotis, and Hsun-Tiao Yang, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this section of this act, if such alien was classified as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Wayne Edward Cottrell and Jang Ngoon Tom, also known as Doon Wee Tom, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees.

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

ALBERT HYRAPIET

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1574) for the relief of Albert Hyrapiet.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Albert Hyrapiet shall be deemed to be a native of Canada, notwithstanding the provisions of section 202 of that act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Canada" and insert "England."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

SHIGEKO KIMURA AND HER MINOR CHILD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2723) for the relief of Shigeko Kimura.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Shigeko Kimura, the financée of Sfc. Francis J. Luddy, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Shigeko Kimura is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Sfc. Francis J. Luddy and that she is found admissible under all provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act other than section 212 (a) (6) thereof and if she is found inadmissible under this provision of law, she may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as described by section 213 of the said act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Shigeko Kimura, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Shigeko Kimura, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Shigeko Kimura as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Shigeko Kimura, the fiancée of Sfc. Francis J. Luddy, a citizen of the United States, and her minor child, shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Shigeko Kimura is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Sfc. Francis J. Luddy and that they are found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, except that section 212 (a) (6) of the said act shall be inapplicable in the case of Shigeko Kimura, and she may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare may deem necessary to impose: *Provided further*, That if the said Shigeko Kimura is not entitled to medical care under the Dependents' Medical Care Act (70 Stat. 250), a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Shigeko Kimura and her minor child, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Shigeko Kimura and her minor child, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Shigeko Kimura and her minor child as of the date of the payment by them of the required visa fees. The exemption provided herein in the case of the said Shigeko Kimura shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended to read as follows: "A bill for the relief of Shigeko Kimura and her minor child."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAVEL BLAHO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 87) for the relief of Pavel Blaho.

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

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

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

DUK CHANG CHO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 58) for the relief of Duk Chang Cho.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Duk Chang Cho, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of M. Sgt. and Mrs. Francis M. Bradshaw, citizens of the United States.

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

VICTOR CHARLES HUNT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 91) for the relief of Victor Charles Hunt.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of Victor Charles Hunt. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Victor Charles Hunt shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and order have issued.

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

DOMINIC PAUL STEINHAUSER (HIROSHI TSURUDA)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 93) for the relief of Dominic Paul Steinhauser (Hiroshi Tsuruda).

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Dominic Paul Steinhauser (Hiroshi Tsuruda), shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Master Sergeant and Mrs. Paul W. Steinhauser, citizens of the United States.

SEC. 2. That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the alien, Dominic Paul Steinhauser (Hiroshi Tsuruda) may be granted a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act and upon compliance with such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: That, a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 7, after the colon insert: "*Provided*, That, unless the beneficiary is entitled to medical care under the Dependents' Medical Care Act (70 Stat. 250)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

ANNA MARIA COSENTINO AND FRANCESCA MARIA COSENTINO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 127) for the relief of Anna Maria Cosentino and Francesca Maria Cosentino.

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

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

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

HEWEY MALACHI MACKEY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 158) for the relief of Hewey Malachi Mackey.

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

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

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

ESTHER GUAGLIARDO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 288) for the relief of Esther Guagliardo.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of paragraphs (9), (12), (17), and (19) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Esther Guagliardo may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraphs known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this act.

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

NELSON SHU-YUNG CHUANG

The Clerk called the bill (S. 363) for the relief of Nelson Shu-Yung Chuang.

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

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

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

HERBERT JAMES BRAMLEY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 424) for the relief of Herbert James Bramley.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the alien, Herbert James Bramley, may be granted a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act and upon compliance with such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

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

YEE CHUNG FONG MING AND YEE CHUNG NOM MING

The Clerk called the bill (S. 649) for the relief of Yee Chung Fong Ming and Yee Chung Nom Ming.

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

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

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

STYLIANOS LECOMPLES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 687) for the relief of Stylianos Lecomples.

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

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

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Stylianos Lecomples may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

ALECOS MARKOS KARAVASILIS AND HIS WIFE, STELIANI KARAVASILIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 696) for the relief of Alecos Markos Karavasilis and his wife, Steliani Karavasilis.

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

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

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bonds, which may have issued in the cases of Alecos Markos Karavasilis and Steliani Karavasilis. From and after the date of the enactment of this act, the said Alecos Markos Karavasilis and Steliani Karavasilis shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

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

GEORGIANA CHING HSIEN (LIANG) NEW

The Clerk called the bill (S. 753) for the relief of Georgiana Ching Hsien (Liang) New.

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

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

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

JOHN LEARY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 797) for the relief of John Leary.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, John Leary shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bonds, which may have issued in the case of John Leary. From and after the date of the enactment of this act, the said John Leary shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to waive the provisions of section 315 of the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

DOROTHY E. GREEN AND THELMA L. ALLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5186) for the relief of Dorothy E. Green and Thelma L. Alley.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, neither Regular Army W. O. Dorothy E. Green, V–904322, nor Regular Army W. O. Thelma L. Alley, V–904321, may be separated from active duty with the United States Army solely by reason of the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1164 (b), and section 46 of the act of August 10, 1956 (Public Law 1028, 84th Cong.), until she has completed 20 years of active service that could be credited to her under section 511 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (37 U. S. C. 311).

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

PAUL BERNSTEIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1488) for the relief of Paul Bernstein.

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

Mr. VAN PELT and Mr. AVERY objected; and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DONALD F. THOMPSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2264) for the relief of Donald F. Thompson.

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

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

There was no objection.

LEONA C. NASH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2678) for the relief of Leona C. Nash.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of all laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, Leona C. Nash shall be held and considered to have validly married George J. Nash (Veterans' Administration claim No. XC 1342436).

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

MRS. MARY JANE RUSSELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3572) for the relief of Mrs. Mary Jane Russell.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Mary Jane Russell, Casscoe, Ark., the sum of $2,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mary Jane Russell against the United States arising out of the failure of the Department of the Army to forward to the Armed Forces Mutual Life Insurance Co., San Antonio, Tex., premiums under a class E allotment from the pay account of her son, Ernest L. Buchanan, RA17235639, who died while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States in Korea. Such premiums were intended to be applied on a life insurance policy issued by that company to the said Ernest L. Buchanan who designated his mother, Mrs. Mary Jane Russell, as sole beneficiary: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated to this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

VITO MAGISTRALE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6050) for the relief of Vito Magistrale.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Vito Magistrale, the sum of $2,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Vito Magistrale against the United States for refund of the amount which he posted as bond in the case of Fioravante Antonio Magistrale, an alien (file No. 0300–370104 App. B) who was deported: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. McBride, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6870. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND JUSTICE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1958

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6871) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 2½ hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6871, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we won the First and Second World Wars through production. We outfought, outthought, and outgeneraled the rest of the world, but in the last analysis we won because we outproduced them.

In the economic battles ahead, that nation will win which retains the advantage in sources of energy. We must not dissipate our fuels. We must conserve coal, oil, and gas. Every barrel and ton shipped abroad is a loss we cannot afford to sustain. We must buy all fuels abroad and import every unit available.

And especially we must develop as rapidly as possible every potential source of electric and atomic power. A century from now or sooner these potent sources of energy will be decisive in world survival.

The world is now at the threshold of the atomic age. Our status in this iconoclastic era is now being determined by legislation pending in this Congress.

The Atomic Energy Commission has submitted to the House its budget estimates for fiscal year 1958.

Even a cursory examination of the acts of Congress under which the Commission operates indicates that a number of the items in the budget estimates, particularly those purportedly justifying the appropriation of millions of dollars for atomic electric power, are not specifically authorized. Many of these items appear to be in violation of the 1954 Atomic Energy Act, and beyond that, the entire program has been, and is, so vague as not to warrant the appropriation of a single dollar for the Commission's atomic electric-power program unless and until the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the legislative committee, effects the amendment of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, specifically authorizing the Commission's atomic-power program. Beyond that, the joint committee should put to searching scrutiny every program of the Commission.

The amounts of money requested annually for the Commission are necessarily large. As of June 30, 1956, the Congress had appropriated $15.2 billion for the atomic-energy program. For fiscal year 1958 the Commission is asking the Congress to appropriate $2,377,000,000 for operating expenses and $120 million for construction. This would involve an increase over the appropriation for fiscal year 1957 which was $1,898,000,000, or an increase of $600 million. Congress has been exceptionally considerate of the atomic energy appropriations in the past on the theory that its work involves elements of secrecy and urgency and should, therefore, be justified largely by general statements rather than detailed explanations and specific data.

This phase of the subject was discussed by distinguished members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, on both sides of the aisle and in both Houses of Congress, in drafting the Atomic Energy Act which became law on August 30, 1954. The legislative history of the act of 1954 has been compiled in 3 volumes, embodying something like 4,000 pages. The Congress on the basis of this impressive record had a right to feel that the act established adequate guidelines for the Commission. Yet, less than a year later, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] was moved to say to Mr. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission:

> Frankly we have felt that the Atomic Energy Commission is going to have to conform in the future much more closely to the regular procedures of other agencies before congressional committees than they have in the past, and it is felt there is a feeling among the Members of Congress that the time for flexibility has passed to a great extent and it has become now almost a normal procedure, and that in many ways you are going to have to conform in the future to a more rigidly planned schedule than you have in the past.

This quotation is taken from page 151 of the joint committee's hearings on authorizing legislation, May 31, 1955.

This statement of the gentleman from California was not a casual observation. Rather it was obviously the product of long and studied reflection on his part. I say this on the basis of an examination of the joint committee's earlier hearings held in January, February and March of 1955, and of earlier colloquies which occurred in the May 1955 hearings from which I have quoted. Passing to the many hearings held in 1956 by the joint committee, and to the hearings conducted by the Appropriations Committee in 1956, it is evident that the gentleman's statement has even more direct application today.

The 1954 act is inadequate as a framework within which appropriation requests can be adequately considered for atomic electric power because, as interpreted and applied by the Commission, the intent of Congress appears to have been violated in many respects. Having examined the Commission's factual performance, and compared it with the provisions of the 1954 act, we have reached the following conclusions:

First. The Commission's atomic electric power program is in some respects in contravention of the law, and must be specifically authorized in its entirety before further appropriations should be made.

Second. The program from a factual standpoint is practically nonexistent. If it ever had any promise of achievement, the facts as known today establish inescapably that it has collapsed.

Third. Britain, Russia, and now the six nations which have formed Euratom, are forging ahead in this field, to the point that our leadership in application of the atom to peaceful generation of electricity is seriously challenged. The generation of energy is the key to peace, and a first line of defense in war. This country must not delay in constructing atomic electric power plants. We cannot afford to further tolerate the Commission's complacency.

AUTHORIZATION REQUIRED FOR ATOMIC ELECTRIC POWER PROGRAMS

Under section 261 of the act of 1954 Congress retains the right to authorize projects designed to develop and promote atomic electric power. The section provides:

> SEC. 261. Appropriations: There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions and purposes of this act except such as may be necessary for acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion.

When the 1954 act was under consideration by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Commission vigorously opposed inclusion of this provision. Notwithstanding that the section was included in the act, the Commission has effectively evaded the clear language, purpose and intent of the section insofar as atomic electric power is concerned.

The Commission's method of defeating the statutory direction has been to arbitrarily divide the various atomic electric power programs into two fiscal categories. The first category pays lipservice to section 261 and covers physical structures on the theory that a so-called bricks-and-mortar test segregates the major portion of the programs from the requirement of authorization. It is carried in the budget estimates under plant acquisition and construction which is the portion of the budget which must be first and separately authorized by the joint committee. The second category is operating expenses. Budget requests for fiscal years 1956, 1957, and 1958 carried more than 80 percent of the money for the programs under operating expenses. The operating expense budget is not specifically authorized by annual authorizing legislation.

This arbitrary and unreal approach ignores the fact that the atomic electric power programs are indivisible entities. You cannot have what goes into the physical structures without having the physical structures, and you cannot have a program at all without having both the physical structures and their component parts.

The result has been that for fiscal years 1956, 1957, and 1958 the amount appropriated and requested for the civilian power reactor program totals $236.8 million, of which only $40 million was authorized under authorizing legislation reported out by the joint committee and approved by the Congress. Thus it is readily seen that less than 20 percent of this program was authorized and more than 80 percent of this indivisible program was not specifically authorized. This puts the Appropriations Committees of the Congress in an extremely difficult position so far as the entire civilian power reactor program is concerned.

The problem is readily illustrated. In the first hearings held by the joint committee subsequent to the passage of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the joint committee in February 1955 raised the question of how the Commission had segregated its initial request for funds to accelerate the civilian reactor program. The Commission had requested $75 million for this purpose and had arbitrarily placed $50 million in the portion of the budget which does not require annual authorization, namely, the operating budget; and $25 million under plant and equipment which would require authorization. The General Manager of the Commission answered that he had personally pulled this division "out of the hat." He said at page 189 of the Joint Committee hearings the following:

> We felt in justifying that division—I think I was responsible for it and more or less pulled it out of the hat after the staff argued pro and con as to whether it should be bigger or smaller—if we feel we have some of these proposals we can refinance that distribution. And with the consent of the Budget Bureau, we can ask for a change in it when we defend our budget for fiscal 1956.

In May 1955 the joint committee held hearings on authorizing legislation for fiscal year 1956 and on June 14, 1955, reported out a bill recommending authorizations which was subsequently enacted. In its report the joint committee stated that the purpose of the requirement of authorizing legislation is to give the joint committee and the Congress some control over the programs of the Commission. However, the joint committee pointed out the Commission had not included in its request for authorizing legislation items which we now know to constitute over 80 percent of the programs and the joint committee affirmatively stated that it strongly disagreed with the arbitrary Commission interpretation. But there the joint committee stopped and resigned itself to loss of control over more than 80 percent of the program, by saying that it was not including in the authorizing legislation the items which make up the 80 percent because the Commission reported that it did have authority for the appropriation of such funds. The Congress is the judge and not the Commission, and it should not appropriate money on any such basis as this.

THE COMMISSION'S CIVILIAN POWER REACTOR DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM IS IN CONTRAVENTION OF THE 1954 ACT

The civilian power reactor development program is a general heading which actually encompasses three separate and distinct atomic electric power programs. The first is the Government's experimental program, or so-called 5-year program, which was initiated under the basic 1946 Atomic Energy Act, prior to the enactment of the 1954 act. It has been generally regarded that the Government's experimental program does not require authorizing legislation except for plant and equipment. If this were ever so, time, facts and circumstances now demonstrate that the Government's experimental program is part and parcel of the indivisible entity which we have come to know by the generic term "civilian power reactor development program." Just as in the cases of the other two programs about to be described, the Government's experimental program in its entirety must stand on the basis of authorizing legislation, or not at all.

The second part of the civilian power reactor development program is known as the power demonstration program under which, pursuant to Congressional intent, it is provided that Government and industry, both public and private power, may participate in the development of atomic electric power. This program as formulated and put into operation by the Commission is in contravention of section 169 of the act which prohibits subsidy to industry. Every project and item and every phase of every project and item in the power demonstration program should stand on the basis of specific authorizing legislation, or not at all.

The third portion of the indivisible entity entitled "Civilian Power Reactor Development Program" is known as the independent-industrial program. Under this program as formulated and put into operation by the Commission, industry applicants are to be given the benefit of all the technology acquired by the Government at a cost of $229.5 million up to June 30, 1957, with no obligation whatever on the part of industry to return to the Government, for the benefit of all, the technology, know-how, cost, and operating experience which this country needs so vitally. The way in which this entire thing has been put together by the Commission results in the situation that inescapably the industry applicants under the independent-industrial program will receive Government assistance, but the type and form of the Government assistance paid for with taxpayers' dollars cannot be readily identified in the annual Commission budgets. Since the ostensible objective of the independent-industrial program must necessarily be identical with the objective of the other two programs, it is the duty and responsibility of Congress to painstakingly determine to the fullest extent the form and manner in which taxpayers' dollars are being handed to industry under this program as they undoubtedly are. Again, every phase of such assistance should be based upon specific authorizing legislation, or not at all.

In the first hearings held by the joint committee subsequent to enactment of the 1954 act, distinguished members of the joint committee expressed themselves unmistakably as disagreeing with the Commission's formulated programs. Thus, we find that Congressman COLE, who was chairman of the joint committee in 1954, and who piloted the 1954 act through the joint committee and through the House, said at page 173 of the hearings:

> Just for the sake of completing the record, let me express my own viewpoint that I not only disapprove, as an individual, of the Commission's procedure under this power-reactor program, but also disagree with its interpretation. Don't misunderstand me. I thoroughly agree that the Commission has the right under 31 (b) to do everything it seeks to do in its power program. But it is a mistake to tie the authority of 31 (b) into an effort to create or construct a research reactor.
>
> You admit it is tantamount to a subsidy. You must admit that section 169 was intended very definitely to prohibit the use of Commission funds for the purpose of constructing and operating a research reactor.

Senator ANDERSON, who was presiding as chairman of the joint committee in these February 1955 hearings, characterized the Commission's interpretation as a subterfuge, saying, on page 157:

> I think, General Nichols, that it is going to be very important that we try to develop that difference of opinion that seems to exist here as to whether you regard this as the real interpretation of the law, or whether you recognize that what was written in here at the tail end of this was an escape clause to let you go make a research contract.
>
> When you start paying the cost of these plants, you are making a subterfuge of what Mr. Cole and others thought was the purpose of the law. You are not trying to find out if industry is going ahead. You are saying to industry, "Don't put up your own money, because, if you just wait, we will come along and give you part of it."

And then at page 159, Chairman ANDERSON engaged in this colloquy with Mr. Strauss:

Chairman ANDERSON. What would be the trouble of once saying to begin with, we would like to find if anybody wants a license without Government subsidy? This section is headed "No Subsidy." It is not headed, "How To Give Subsidy."

Mr. STRAUSS. Mr. Chairman, would a question be permitted by a witness? I would like to ask what the intent of that last clause in 169 was.

Chairman ANDERSON. It is an escape clause. It is a simple answer. The paragraph is headed "No Subsidy." It does not read "Instructions to the Commission as to how to give subsidy on the development of this program."

These exceptions of two distinguished chairmen of the joint committee graphically pinpoint the problem of the joint committee in its endeavor to understand just what the Commission was about. And the joint committee in its report some months later on June 14, 1955, as stated earlier, told the two Houses of Congress that, although the joint committee had achieved some understanding and "strongly" disagreed with what it had learned, the Commission's interpretation which is contrary to time-honored authorizing and appropriation procedures would be accepted. Congress should not appropriate money on any such basis.

COST OF TECHNOLOGY FOR CIVILIAN NUCLEAR POWER

Up to June 30, 1957, the sum of $229,500,000 will have been spent in the development by the Government of civilian power reactor technology. The breakdown of these funds I have here in the tabulation prepared under date of January 31, 1957, by the Commission, and I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD at this point.

The Commission in its 1958 budget estimates has requested $95 million for this purpose and even this may not be enough to permit the acceleration of development of atomic electric power which is so urgently and vitally needed.

Summary of funds for civilian nuclear power

[As reported on pp. 376 and 377 in hearings on 2d supplemental appropriation bill, 1957, pt. 2, Investigation of Atomic Electric Power, compared with fiscal year 1958 budget

[In millions]

AEC costs	Fiscal year 1957 budget to Congress					Fiscal year 1958 budget to Congress		Total
	Prior to 1954 actual	1954 actual	1955 actual	1956 estimated	1957 estimated	1956 actual	1957 estimated	
Operating costs:								
Pressurized water reactor	0	$7.7	$10.2	$15.2	$14.8	$15.2	$16.3	
Boiling water reactor	$2.8	2.4	4.0	5.1	2.6	4.7	5.0	
Homogeneous reactor	10.8	3.9	7.7	8.2	8.4	10.7	10.4	
Intermediate power breeder reactor	16.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Fast breeder reactor	6.0	3.4	3.5	4.9	6.5	4.7	9.3	
Sodium graphite reactor	1.7	1.5	1.9	3.4	1.4	5.0	7.9	
Liquid metal fuel reactor	0	0	0	2.0	3.5	1.6	4.5	
Organic moderator reactor	0	0	0	.6	.6	.3	3.7	
Water graphite reactor	0	0	0	0	.4	0	1.0	
Pressurized heavy water reactor	0	0	0	0	0	0	.5	
Power reactor acceleration	0	0	0	0	15.0	0	0	
All other	1.8	.1	0	0	0	.1	1.0	
Total operating costs	39.8	19.0	27.3	39.4	53.2	42.3	59.6	[1] $188.0
Construction costs:								
Pressurized water reactor	0	0	1.2	9.5	15.0	7.1	17.9	
Boiling water reactor	0	0	.1	.8	.1	.6	.3	
Homogeneous reactor	.6	0	.1	.7	0	.1	.4	
Fast breeder reactor	2.7	0	1.0	3.0	9.7	1.4	2.4	
Power reactor acceleration	0	0	0	2.0	23.0	.1	5.5	
Total construction costs	3.3	0	2.4	16.0	47.8	9.3	26.5	[1] 41.5
Construction obligations budgeted for fiscal year 1957: Authorized by Public Law 981, 84th Cong., 2d sess., approved Aug. 26, 1956: Project 57-c-10, amended reactor development project, $15.0.								
Grand total								[1] 229.5

[1] Using in addition the last 2 columns covering "1956 actual" and "1957 estimated" and deleting the 4th column headed "1956 estimated" and the 5th column headed "1957 estimated."

Division of Finance, Budget Analysis Branch, Jan. 31, 1957.

DEFICIENCIES AND AMBIGUITIES OF THE 1954 ACT AS APPLIED AND PUT INTO PRACTICE

No less than 11 separate provisions of the 1954 act have been applied and put into practice by the Commission in a manner we find difficult to reconcile with the purpose and intent of the clear language of the act. These provisions are found in sections 261, 169, 104 (b), 11 (q), 31, 32, 33, 53, 105, 152, and 159. Each one of these provisions has definite application to the civilian power reactor development program and there is a definite interplay between them.

The confusion created by the Commission in interpreting section 261 concerning authorizing legislation is effectively illustrated by Mr. TABER's close questioning of the Commission in our hearings of last summer at pages 322 and 323. Finally the Commission's General Counsel stated that the Commission does not have authorization to construct full-scale plants. Earlier in the hearings at page 67, the general counsel had replied to my question the very opposite.

The amount of money authorized to date is only $40 million against a total program of $236.8 million. The first authorization which was for $25 million was justified by the vaguest sort of statements. Congressman DURHAM pressed for a pretty clear definite statement which was never forthcoming. Congressman HOLIFIELD called the $25 million a "floating fund," with complete discretion in the Commission to apply the money as it saw fit.

It is important to consider the effect of granting such discretion to the Commission. At page 50 of the hearings the Commission's general counsel said that in using the money the Commission "might end up with what is called a scrambled facility, where the Commission owns part and the licensee owns part." He then spoke of a mingling of the Commission's property with that of industry. Later at page 56 the general counsel again referred to "a scrambled facility." If there is to be any scrambling or mingling of Government money and property in these atomic electric powerplants, Congress and not the Commission should determine in each individual case just what scrambling and mingling is to be permitted.

The second authorization of $15 million in the 1956 act is just as vague:

This item is to permit the Atomic Energy Commission to carry forward its important research and development of work on reactors and in other related fields.

Looking at the 1958 budget request for $95 million, we find only three items for which there is specific authorization. In the case of one of the three, the authorizing act placed a dollar limit on the project of $14,850,000. Yet we find that the Commission applied $9,300,000 to this project in 1957 and is now asking for $15,100,000 for 1958, or $10 million in excess of the ceiling imposed by the authorizing act.

Another project, $9.2 million, if authorized at all, has been considered by the Commission to be authorized from the vague $25 million floating fund.

A fourth project has not even been authorized. Yet the Commission advises that this project requires a structure that must be authorized under section 261 but for which authorization has not as yet been provided. This is a perfect example of the Appropriations Committees being asked to permit the initiation and funding of a project and to be committing the Congress to something without the benefit of the expert guidance of the joint committee. In other words, once money is applied to this project, which it has been, there is precious little the joint committee can do except to authorize the part of the project which the Commission's erroneous interpretation of section 261 says is the only thing that requires authorization. It is putting the cart before the horse.

The procedure is basically defective. The proper procedure should be that the research and development and the plant and equipment aspects of the civilian reactor program should be tied together and recognized for what they are—an entity, an indivisible program for authorization and appropriation purposes. The joint committee should provide authorization for each project under this program with a monetary limit, project by project. Then the House Appropriations Committee will have the benefit and advantage of the exercise of its expert functions by the authorizing committee. The procedure here outlined is parallel to the authorization and appropriation procedures which have been historically applied to such similar types of development and construction such as NACA projects, Bureau of Reclamation projects and military construction projects. Otherwise the House Appropriations Committee is called upon to appropriate against something but it does not know what. In giving the Commission money in the operating budget, is the House Appropriations Committee appropriating for something which may lead to something else later that will have to be authorized? This must not be done.

Representative DURHAM, the present chairman of the joint committee, clearly foresaw the loss of congressional control if the Commission's erroneous interpretation of section 261 were to be applied. He said in May 1955:

> I am not raising any particular question about it, except I do not see much difference in this and the NACA. Many things they built they did not know whether they were going to work or not, and they had to come for authorization to the Congress. I think that is what we are going to face eventually. I think it is something we can correct if it does not work. I am willing to try it.
>
> I do feel that when you get into these expenditures of millions of dollars, and with the cry and everything we hear about expenditures, that Congress should have the authority to authorize them. I think that was the intent, whatever construction you want to put on the word "facility." But I see very little difference in the NACA and this operation, because it is primarily a research project, where you start out and put one thing in, and add bricks and mortar, and you have a facility.

Noncompliance with section 261 by failure on the Commission's part to get authorization should bar further appropriations until the Commission goes before the joint committee and secures the necessary authorization. However, the Commission's erroneous interpretation and application of other sections likewise warrants further consideration by the joint committee.

Chairmen COLE and ANDERSON in joint committee hearings have repeatedly questioned the Commission's distortion of section 169—the no-subsidy section; section 104 (b)—the research and development license section; section 31 (a) (4)—the basic research and development section; and section 31 (b)—the section permitting noncompliance with advertising and competitive bidding requirements of law. The Commission's basic error has been to ignore seven words in section 169 as though they had never been included in the law. Section 169 provides:

> No funds of the Commission shall be employed in the construction or operation of facilities licensed under section 103 or 104 except under contract or other arrangement entered into pursuant to section 31.

The seven words are "facilities licensed under section 103 or 104."

These words appear to mean that Government funds may not be given to industry for use in research and development unless and until industry has constructed and has in being a reactor. It is only then that industry will be in a position to give the Government the technology for which Government money is authorized by section 169. However, this is not the case in any of the proposals which industry has made. No commercial licenses have been issued under section 103, and it is doubtful that they will be for years to come. It is probable that section 104 (b) licenses will be issued to industry, but they have not been to date.

The Commission's budget estimates disclose that notwithstanding, the Commission in fiscal 1957 committed $1.5 million to the Yankee Atomic group for its proposed project and proposes to commit $2 million to Yankee in fiscal 1958; and further than the Commission in fiscal 1957 committed $100,000 to the Detroit Edison group and proposes to commit $1.5 million in fiscal 1958 to this proposed project. This expenditure of Government money in fiscal 1957 appears to be in contravention of section 169, as are also the proposed expenditures requested for the two utility groups for fiscal 1958.

The joint committee was intensively concerned with this problem in hearings held in January, February, March, and May 1955. So strongly did Congressman COLE feel, he was moved to comment in May 1955:

> I have been impressed with the Commission's interpretation of that section. My conclusion is that the Commission feels that the net effect of 169 is, as a limitation on the Commission's operation, rather nebulous and meaningless. Or, to express it differently, the prohibition of section 169 can be very easily and readily circumvented.

The two former chairmen felt equally as strongly that there should be no interwedding of section 104 (b) with subsections 31 (a) (4) and 31 (b), and expressed themselves repeatedly to this effect. Chairman COLE said emphatically:

> Just for the sake of completing the record, let me express my own viewpoint that I not only disapprove, as an individual, of the Commission's procedure under this power reactor program, but also disagree with its interpretation.

The joint committee in its subsequent report of June 14, 1955, on the first authorizing bill under the 1954 act agreed with Chairmen COLE and ANDERSON, and in doing so rejected the Commission's erroneous interpretation of sections 169, 104 (b), 31 (a) (4), and 31 (b). Yet we find the Commission still persisting today in its erroneous application of these sections because all the proposals under the power demonstration program are predicated on this incorrect basis. Congress should not appropriate money to implement this plain contravention of the law.

Still another important section is being erroneously applied. It is section 53 which permits the use of special nuclear material by industry on the basis of reasonable charges to be established by the Commission. The Commission has failed to establish criteria in writing for determination of whether a charge will be made as required by section 53 (c), but instead has interpreted this subsection as providing for and encouraging waivers of charges in its own unlimited discretion without the standards required by law. But of even greater importance is the fact that, in the only reference in the House and Senate debate to section 53, Chairman COLE was asked the direct question as to whether the bill set up any yardstick whereby the Commission would be controlled in permitting the use of special nuclear material by industry. His response was clear and decisive, as follows:

> That is covered in the bill. The Atomic Energy Commission is required to make a charge for the use of this material.

The same erroneous reasoning is being applied to section 33 which permits the Commission to perform research for industry in its own facilities for which it "is authorized to determine and make such charges as in its discretion may be desirable." The Commission applies this section in a manner diametrically opposite to its plain intent.

The Commission proposes to allocate substantial sums of money to industry with which to pay for research done in Government facilities at the instance of industry. In so doing the Commission ignores section 32 which is the section providing for research in Government facilities at Government expense for the benefit of all.

It is clear that the Commission views the words "is authorized" to make charges as meaning it does not have to do that which is authorized, namely, charge the utility. Instead the Commission interprets this language as authorizing it to charge the taxpayers and not the utility.

The Commission's attitude appears to be that when Congress authorizes it to

do something, it should do just the opposite, as I have just demonstrated in the cases of sections 53 and 33. The same has been true under the no-subsidy section, section 169, to the point that Senator ANDERSON told the Commission that it interpreted section 169 as though it were headed "Instructions to the Commission as to how to give subsidy on the development of this program."

This attitude came to a climax when Mr. Strauss objected to the words "authorized and directed" in the Gore-Holifield bill before the joint committee on June 28, 1956. He wanted the words "and directed" deleted because "that is the kind of an expression you use to your valet." Commissioners Libby and Vance concurred in his suggestion. Obviously, they want to be merely "authorized" and not "authorized and directed" so they can do as they please, regardless of congressional intent.

RAMIFICATIONS OF THE COMMISSION'S CIVILIAN POWER REACTOR PROGRAM

The program, as I stated earlier, is an indivisible entity embodying three component parts which are shown in tables I and II which I wish to insert in the RECORD at this point:

TABLE I.—*Developing civilian atomic power*

	Scheduled for operation
GOVERNMENT'S EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM	
Shippingport, Pa., pressurized water reactor, 60,000 kilowatts, Westinghouse and Duquesne for AEC	1957
Lemont, Ill., experimental boiling water reactor, 5,000 kilowatts, Argonne National Laboratory	1957
National Reactor Testing Station, experimental breeder reactor No. 2, 17,500 kilowatts, Argonne National Laboratory	1959
Santa Susana, Calif., sodium reactor experiment, 7,500 kilowatts, North American Aviation for AEC and Southern California Edison Co.[1]	1957
Oak Ridge, Tenn., homogeneous reactor experiment No. 2, no electricity, Oak Ridge National Laboratory	1956
National Reactor Testing Station, organic moderated reactor experiment, North American Aviation for AEC (no electricity)	1957
Los Alamos, N. Mex., molten plutonium reactor experiment, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory (no electricity)	1959
Los Alamos, N. Mex., power reactor experiment I and II, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory (no electricity)	1956
Liquid metal fuel reactor, the Babcock & Wilcox Co	1959
Gas-cooled reactor (contractor not selected)	[2]
POWER DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM	
First round	
Rowe, Mass., pressurized water reactor, 134,000 kilowatts, Yankee Atomic Electric Co	1960
Monroe, Mich., fast breeder reactor, 100,000 kilowatts, Power Reactor Development Co., Inc. (Detroit Edison Co. and others)	1960
Nebraska, sodium graphite reactor, 75,000 kilowatts, Consumers Public Power District	1959
Second round	
Elk River, Minn., boiling-water reactor, 22,000 kilowatts, Rural Cooperative Power Association	1960
Gainesville, Fla., pressurized water reactor, 500 kilowatts, University of Florida	1959
Piqua, Ohio, organic moderated reactor, 12,500 kilowatts, city of Piqua	1961
Hersey, Mich., aqueous homogeneous reactor, 10,000 kilowatts, Wolverine Electric Cooperative	1959
Anchorage, Alaska, sodium-cooled heavy water moderated, 10,000 kilowatts, Chugach Electric Association, Inc., Nuclear Development Corporation of America	1962
Orlando, Fla., liquid metal fueled reactor, 25,000 to 40,000 kilowatts, city of Orlando	1961
Holyoke, Mass., gas-cooled reactor, 15,000 kilowatts, city of Holyoke	1961
INDEPENDENT INDUSTRIAL PROGRAM	
Indian Point, N. Y., pressurized water reactor, 140,000 kilowatts, Consolidated Edison Co	1960
Dresden, Ill., boiling water reactor, 180,000 kilowatts, Commonwealth Edison Co. and others	1960
Eastern Pennsylvania, aqueous homogeneous reactor, 150,000 kilowatts, Pennsylvania Power & Light Co	1962
Florida (type unspecified), 200,000 kilowatts, Florida Power Corp., Florida Power & Light Co., Tampa Electric Co	1962
Livermore, Calif., boiling water reactor, 3,000 kilowatts, General Electric Co. and Pacific Gas & Electric Co	1957

[1] Turbogenerator and other conventional electric transmission equipment.

[2] Unknown.

TABLE I.—*Developing civilian atomic power*—Continued

ESTIMATED PROGRAM TOTALS	
[In millions]	
Estimated cost of all work from July 1, 1953, through completion of projects listed. Includes cost of core fabrication but excludes cost of special nuclear materials. Excludes EBR–1 HRE–1, and borax–1, 2, and 3:	
Government	$236
Industry	20
Based on proposals submitted to AEC. Excludes cost of core fabrication and of special nuclear material:	
Government	77
Industry	128
Based in part on statements made by sponsoring utilities and in part on AEC estimates:	
Government	0
Industry	210
Kilowatts	
Total electrical capacity	1,182,000
Government's experimental program	90,000
Power demonstration program	419,000
Independent industrial program	673,000
Total estimated cost	$671,000,000
Government	313,000,000
Industry	358,000,000

TABLE II.—*Summary of large prototype power reactor plants proposed, part 1 (power demonstration reactor program projects and others)*

	Westinghouse [1] and Duquesne Light Co.	Yankee Atomic Electric Co.	Consolidated Edison Co.	Commonwealth Edison and others	Consumers Public Power District	Power Reactor Development Co. (Detroit Edison, et al.)	Westinghouse and Pennsylvania Power & Light
Location	Shippingport, Pa.	Rowe, Mass.	Indian Point, N. Y.	Dresden, Ill.	Beatrice, Nebr.	Monroe, Mich.	Pennsylvania Power & Light service area.
Type of reactor	Pressurized water (PWR).	Pressurized water.	Pressurized water.	Boiling water.	Sodium-graphite.	Fast breeder.	Aqueous homogeneous.
Thermal power	236,000 kw.	480,000 kw.	500,000 kw.	630,000 kw.	245,000 kw.	300,000 kw.	Not available.
Gross generating capacity	100,000 kw.	134,000 kw.	250,000 kw [2]	180,000 kw.	75,000 kw.	100,000 kw.	150,000 kw.
Amount of fuel	12 T natural U and 52 kg about 90 percent.	28,800 kg.	275 kg U and 8,275 kg th.	68,000 kg.	22,500 kg.	2,100 kg.	Not available.
Enrichment percent U–235		2.5 percent.	About 90 percent for U.	1.1 percent.	2.3 percent.	27 percent.	Do.
Moderator	H_2O	H_2O	H_2O	H_2O	Graphite.	None.	Do.
Coolant	H_2O	H_2O	H_2O	H_2O	Sodium.	Sodium.	Fuel solution.
Reactor temperature [3]	540° F.	535° F.	510° F.	480° F.	925° F.	800° F.	Not available.
Reactor pressure	2,000 psig.	2,000 psig.	1,500 psig.	1,000 psig.	46 psia.	Atmospheric.	Do.
Steam conditions	585 psig saturated.	600 psig saturated.	370 psia saturated 1,000° F.	970 psia 540° F.	800 psia 825° F.	600 psia 730° F.	600 psia.
Estimated cost of reactor [4]	$37,750,000.	$18,500,000.	Not available.	$34,200,000.	$13,500,000.	$36,000,000.	Not available.
Estimated cost of turbogenerating plant.	$10,000,000.	$16,000,000.	do.	$10,800,000.	$10,800,000.	$9,000,000.	Do.
Total estimated plant cost	$47,750,000.	$34,500,000.	$55,000,000.	$45,000,000.	$24,300,000.	$45,000,000.	Do.
Cost per kw.	$370.	$260.	$230.	$250.	$325.	$450.	Do.
Estimated completion date	1957.	1959–60.	1960.	1960.	1959.	1960.	1962.

[1] This reactor is being built by the AEC; Westinghouse and Duquesne are prime contractors to the AEC.

[2] Includes 110,000 kw of conventional superheating capacity.

[3] Reactor coolant at outlet.

[4] Not including research and development, fabrication of fuel elements for first charge or nuclear materials. Fuel element fabrication and nuclear materials are included in fuel costs.

Summary of small prototype power reactor plants proposed, pt. 2 (power demonstration reactor program)

	Chugach Electric Association	Wolverine Electric Cooperative	University of Florida	City of Orlando, Fla.	Rural Cooperative Power Association	City of Piqua, Ohio	City of Holyoke, Mass.
Location	Anchorage, Alaska	Hersey, Mich	Gainesville, Fla	Orlando, Fla	Elk River, Minn	Piqua, Ohio	Holyoke, Mass.
Type of reactor	Sodium-cooled heavy water moderation.	Aqueous homogeneous.	Pressurized water.	Liquid metal fuel th. br. blanket.	Boiling water	Organic moderated.	Gas-cooled closed cycle.
Thermal power	40,000 kw	31,000 kw.[1]	10,000 kw	Not available	58,000 kw	45,500 kw	44,000 kw.
Gross electrical generating capacity.	10,000 kw	10,000 kw	500 kw	25,000 to 40,000 kw	22,000 kw	12,500 kw	15,000 kw.
Amount of fuel per loading.	10,000 kg. U	12 kg	Not specified	60 kg. U-235, 17,000 lbs. th.	12 kg. enriched, 10,000 kg. normal.	6,000 kg	736 kg.
Enrichment percent U-235.	Approx. 2 percent	Fully enriched	40 percent	Fully enriched	Fully enriched spikes—nat. U core.	3 percent	10 percent.
Moderator	Heavy water	Uranyl sulfate in heavy water.	H_2O	Graphite	H_2O	Terphenyl	Graphite.
Coolant	Liquid sodium		H_2O	U-235 in molten bismuth solution.	H_2O	Terphenyl	Nitrogen gas.
Reactor temperature [2]	950° F	570° F	450° F	Not specified	533° F	617° F	1,292° F.
Reactor pressure	Atmospheric	1,900 psig	1,200 psig	do	900 psig	50 psig	515.7 psia.
Steam conditions	850 psig, 850° F	600 psia [3], 486° F	190 psig, 404° F	1,250 psig, 900° F	600 psig, 825° F	400 psig, 550° F	Not specified.
Estimated cost of reactor [4]	$5,500,000 [5]	$2,486,000	$650,000	$12,500,000	$3,760,000	$3,340,000	$2,400,000.
Estimated cost of turbogenerator plant.	$1,850,000	$1,088,000	$1,200,000 [6]	$11,100,000	$2,425,000	$1,960,000	$1,028,000.
Total estimated plant cost.	$7,350,000	$3,574,000	$1,850,000 [7]	$23,600,000	$6,185,000	$5,300,000	$6,428,000.
Cost per kilowatt	$735	$357	$800	$512–$820	$281	$424	$429.
Estimated completion date.	1962	1960	1959	1960	1960	1960	1960.

[1] Includes superheater=7,000 kilowatts thermal.
[2] Reactor coolant at outlet.
[3] Steam from heat exchanger to gas-fired superheater which delivers steam at 530 psia at 825° F.
[4] Does not include research and development.
[5] Does not include design cost.
[6] Does not include building cost.
[7] Subject to change.

It is to be noted in table I that the Commission breaks down the power demonstration program at the bottom of the second column as costing the Government $77 million and industry $128 million, making a total of $205 million. This $205 million has been broken down project by project, cost to the Commission as compared with cost to industry, and construction costs as compared with research and development costs in table III, which I wish to insert in the RECORD at this point:

TABLE III.—*Costs of power demonstration program proposals*

[In thousands]

Project	Total project cost [1]	Cost to AEC	Cost to industry	Construction costs		Research and development	
				AEC	Industry	AEC	Industry
FIRST ROUND							
Yankee:							
Nuclear	$39,500	$5,000	$34,500		$18,500	$5,000	
Nonnuclear					16,000		
PRDC:							
Nuclear	58,450	4,450	54,000		36,000	4,450	$9,000
Nonnuclear					9,000		
Consumers:							
Nuclear	26,500	10,480	16,020	[2] $8,280	5,220	2,200	
Nonnuclear					10,800		
Total, first round	124,450	19,930	104,520	8,280	95,520	11,650	9,000
SECOND ROUND							
Elk River:							
Nuclear	$9,285	$6,860	$2,425	$3,760		$3,100	
Nonnuclear					[3] $2,425		
University of Florida	2,150	850	1,300	650	1,200	[4] 200	$100
Piqua	7,300	5,340	1,960	3,340	1,960	2,000	
Wolverine	4,876	3,788	1,088	2,486	1,088	1,302	
Chugach	16,850	14,975	1,875	5,500	1,850	9,475	25
Orlando	30,150	19,050	11,100	12,500	11,100	6,500	
Holyoke	10,128	6,100	4,028	[5] 2,400	4,028	3,700	
Total, second round	80,739	56,963	23,776	30,686	23,651	26,277	125
Grand total	205,189	76,893	128,296	38,966	119,171	37,927	9,125

[1] Project costs exclude cost of special nuclear materials, fabrication of cores, and fuel use charges.
[2] Includes some preoperational research and development.
[3] Includes property now owned and allocated to this project.
[4] Proposal contemplates that AEC will also pay for 5 years of operation.
[5] Holyoke proposes to pay for nonnuclear portion not to exceed cost of conventional plant.

These three tables were designed by the Commission to tell the Congress, and through the Congress to tell the American people, that much can be expected of the Commission's program by 1962. The truth of the matter is that the program has fallen apart, and what is left of it gives little hope of fulfillment for many years to come.

The first column of table I identifies projects undertaken wholly with Government money. The only nuclear powerplant of the size even approaching a full-scale plant, is the pressurized water reactor being constructed at Shippingport, Pa. All of the other reactors in this program are experimental only. In short, the Government has no plan or program for construction with Government money and under Government control as to schedule of construction and completion time with the exception of Shippingport which is to go into operation during this year. The vital need for construction of full-scale plants as the next stage beyond the experiments is beyond question. A Commission official has stated in this regard:

> The reactor experiment will supply much of the technical data needed for the design of the prototype reactor. However, the scale up from the experiments presents formidable design problems. The operation and construction of these large-scale plants will thus provide information that can be obtained in no other way.

Implicitly, the construction of the different types of reactors both under the power-demonstration program and the independent industrial program is contingent upon the success achieved in these experimental reactors being constructed under the Government's experimental program. The first type, the pressurized water reactor, has proven itself beyond expectation in the *Nautilus*. The second type, the boiling water reactor, has recently gone into operation at Argonne National Laboratory in Illinois, generating 5,000 kilowatts. This type of reactor dispenses with a heat exchanger and it is my information that a major problem exists in this type of reactor because of the danger of a

fuel element which would result in radioactive water going into the turbine.

The next type of reactor is the sodium reactor experiment, 7,500 kilowatts, being built at Santa Susana, Calif. It is my information that sodium has turned out to be an element which is very difficult to handle when used in a reactor as the coolant to the extent that the Department of Defense has announced that it has abandoned this type of reactor for use in naval vessels. This announcement was followed by a decision of the Commission to shut down and dispose of the sodium power reactor at West Milton, N. Y., which was the land prototype for the *Seawolf* reactor. This reactor at West Milton has been generating power which has been sold to industry. Up until now, the power has not been firm because the prime purpose of operating the reactor has been to experiment. Since the experimentation is over, I wonder why this reactor should not be continued in operation and the power thus generated, generated as firm power and offered to utilities for sale.

The next type of reactor in the Government's experimental program is homogeneous reactor experiment No. 2 at Oak Ridge, Tenn. Great hope had been expressed from time to time by Commission officials that this type of reactor offered promise for economic electric power. The Commission is having trouble with this reactor experiment at Oak Ridge and announced in December 1956 that the experiment would necessarily be delayed due to cracking and damage in the leak detector system ascribed to stress corrosion.

REACTORS PROPOSED UNDER THE POWER DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

Table I states that 10 atomic electric powerplants are to be built under the power demonstration program, with all of them being scheduled for operation commencing in 1959 and extending to 1962. Of the 10, the Commission has recently rejected 3 of the proposals—Holyoke, Orlando, and the University of Florida. That leaves seven projects. Of the 7, there are only 3 full-scale projects. Two of the three propose to use sodium as a coolant. Thus the fast breeder reactor, 100,000 kilowatts, scheduled by the Detroit Edison group for operation in 1960, is dependent upon a solution of the major problem of handling sodium. The same is true of the sodium graphite reactor, 75,000 kilowatts, scheduled by Consumers Public Power District of Nebraska for operation in 1959. That means two more projects for which substantial delay is indicated.

Five projects are left. One of these is the 134,000-kilowatt pressurized water reactor proposed by Yankee Atomic Electric Co. Commissioner Murray of the Atomic Energy Commission last summer told the House Appropriations Committee that the date 1960 in which this reactor is scheduled for operation was very fine but that the Government has no assurance or guaranty whatever that the reactor will be completed by that date. As a matter of fact, he said the same was true of all the projects in both the power demonstration program and the independent industrial program, stating:

> Every one of these projects from this point on has a doubt as to when it will be started and when it will be finished, and whether we have any guaranties that it will ever be finished.

Four projects are left under the power-demonstration program. The one proposed for Alaska will use sodium as a coolant and obviously has no early hope of materializing. It has been stated that the Alaska sodium reactor is as advanced and unproved a concept as the closed-cycle, gas-cooled design which the Commission has rejected for Holyoke. The one in Michigan proposed by a cooperative is the aqueous homogeneous which obviously must wait until Oak Ridge experiment No. 2 is made to operate successfully, which is not the case to date. The boiling-water reactor proposed by a cooperative in Minnesota will obviously have to wait until the problem of radioactive water going into the turbines is solved.

I do not have sufficient information on the 10th and last proposal, the city of Piqua, Ohio, to construct an organic moderated reactor, to comment on it.

The fact of the matter is that under the power-demonstration program only a contract has been signed with the Yankee group, but no construction permit has been issued to Yankee, and only 1 construction permit has been issued, the Detroit Edison permit which is conditional; 3 of the other 8 projects have been rejected outright by the Commission; and in the cases of the remaining 5 no construction permits have been let by the Commission. Although the conditional construction permit was issued to the Detroit Edison group on August 4, 1956, a contract with this group was not signed until just the other day, March 26, 1957. Therefore not one single project in the power-demonstration program, which was initiated in January 1955 and expanded in September 1955, has resulted in a firm commitment by any industry group whatever to build a nuclear powerplant as formally evidenced by both a contract with the Commission and the issuance by the Commission of an unconditional construction permit. The whole power-demonstration program is nothing but paper hopes.

INDEPENDENT INDUSTRIAL PROGRAM

As shown in table I there are five projects listed in the independent industrial program with scheduled-for-operation dates running from 1957 to 1962. The reactor scheduled for operation in 1957 is a boiling water reactor being constructed at Livermore, Calif., by the General Electric Co. for Pacific Gas & Electric Co. Although table I shows the generating capacity of this reactor to be 3,000 kilowatts, this capacity has been increased to 5,000 kilowatts, a generating capacity which still leaves the reactor in the experimental category. General Electric is to construct the 180,000 kilowatt boiling water reactor in Illinois for the Commonwealth Edison group. Until the problem of the possibility of radioactive water getting into the turbine is solved, it is doubted that the Commonwealth Edison group will proceed with the construction of the proposed 180,000 kilowatt boiling water reactor for which a construction permit was issued on May 4, 1956.

Another reactor scheduled for operation in 1962 is a 150,000 kilowatt aqueous homogeneous in eastern Pennsylvania by Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. The significant thing about this project is that the Commission's own homogeneous reactor experiment No. 2 has been delayed due to cracking and damage in the leak detector system. Obviously until the feasibility of this prototype has been demonstrated, the utility company is in no position to commit itself to the investment of the tremendous sums of money involved. This plant is to be built, if built at all, by Westinghouse. Dr. W. E. Shoupp, the top atomic technician at Westinghouse, told the joint committee in February 1957 that the aqueous homogeneous project is being considered by the Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. as eligible under the third round of the power demonstration program, which would mean that the utility now wants Government financial assistance and that the utility wants to remove itself from the independent industrial program. Equally important is the fact that Dr. Shoupp readily conceded that the sponsors will not decide whether to build the plant until completion of engineering and cost studies early in 1958.

Then there is a 200,000 kilowatt reactor scheduled for operation in 1962 in Florida, but the type has not even been specified and obviously no construction permit has been issued.

The only other project under the independent industrial program is the proposal by Consolidated Edison to construct a pressurized water reactor, 140,000 kilowatts in New York, scheduled for operation in 1960. The Commission issued to Consolidated Edison on May 4, 1956, the very first construction permit issued. However, this project, as are all the others, is plagued with uncertainty as to cost of construction, and Consolidated Edison has recently advised the joint committee that the cost estimates have increased 27 percent in total cost which means an increase of 13 percent per kilowatt of electric capacity.

SUBSIDIES UNDER POWER DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM ARE IN CONTRAVENTION OF LAW

To date the Commission has invited proposals from industry in three so-called rounds. The Commission's offers of subsidies under each round contravene the 1954 act in several respects.

First, the offer of waiver of nuclear fuel charges in all three rounds is invalid because the Commission has failed as required by section 53 (c) to establish the written criteria for the determination of whether a charge should be made, and in this failure has failed to give effect to Chairman Cole's statement on the floor of the House that the "Commission is required to make a charge for the use of this material." Beyond that, I am of the view that there is a deficiency in section 53 (d) which should be cured. The third round adds a new offer—the loan of

heavy water for 5 years without charge. I also question the basis for this.

Secondly, all three rounds offer the use of Commission laboratories for research and development work without cost. This is in contravention of the legislative intent of both the "no subsidy" section 169 and the "research" section 33.

Then we come to cash grants of money to industry on the theory that the Government is buying technology to be developed by industry applicants. This is barred unless developed in a privately owned completed facility licensed under sections 103 or 104, as provided in section 169. No such licenses have been issued under either section, and therefore any arrangements which the Commission has made or proposes to make in this regard are invalid.

Curiously enough the Commission limited these cash grants in the first and second rounds to firm amounts fixed definitely in advance of any work by the applicant, and the applicant to receive no further financial assistance. The Commission called this the "closed-end principle." This principle was repudiated in the third round invitation of January 7, 1957, which told industry it could get more money even though it previously had been limited to a fixed amount. There is absolutely no authority in law for this.

This repudiation followed on the heels of agitation by industry to increase the cash subsidies. The chairman of Commonwealth Edison candidly stated in September 1956:

> At one time, questions were raised as to whether or not the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 authorized the making of outright cash contributions toward the cost of a demonstration reactor. If any doubt remains, Congress should remove it.

There is no doubt about the matter at all—section 169 clearly prohibits such cash contributions.

He then proposed that the Federal Government pay the difference between what would be a utility's cost of a conventional powerplant and the cost of a nuclear powerplant. Is any more proof needed of industry's inability to move forward and get these atomic powerplants built?

It is to be noted that the proposed Commonwealth Edison plant was to be built, according to this same chairman "without any governmental subsidy," and, according to Mr. Strauss, "without any financial assistance from the Government."

Then we have learned from a meeting of the Committee on Commercial Uses of Atomic Energy of the United States Chamber of Commerce that the Government should put up as much as one-half the cost of construction, and in any event title to the reactor should remain in private hands.

There is no question about it. Industry cannot undertake the risks involved, and the Government must undertake the task if it is to be done at all.

THE ATOMIC GIVEAWAY UNDER THE INDEPENDENT INDUSTRIAL PROGRAM IS NOT AUTHORIZED BY LAW

Under this program, industry applicants are to be given all of the technology acquired by the Government at a cost of almost $230 million, and industry is not required to return to the Government the technical and economic information which it needs to acquire and apply for the benefit of all.

In subsection (c) of section 31 of the 1954 act it is provided that arrangements made with industry applicants shall "require the reporting and to permit the inspection of work performed thereunder, as the Commission may determine." Then the next sentence contemplates the dissemination of such information by providing:

> No such arrangement shall contain any provisions or conditions which prevent the dissemination of scientific or technical information, except to the extent such dissemination is prohibited by law.

All four major construction permits issued to date relate to section 104 (b), and none of them require the permittee to give the Government anything. This violates section 31 (c).

Turning to the independent industrial program, we find that the Government has invested $75.6 million in the technology to benefit Consolidated Edison, and $19.9 million in the technology to benefit Commonwealth Edison, Pacific Gas & Electric, and General Electric. The failure of the Commission to require in return from each of these companies as a condition of their construction permits all the technical and economic data acquired to be made available to all the American people on a nondiscriminatory basis is in contravention of section 31 (c), and for this reason the construction permits are not authorized by law.

The Commission's failure to comply with the law in this regard is beyond comprehension. Chairman DURHAM wisely and with foresight posed the problem in February 1955, and after considering the Commission's position stated his concern as follows:

> The thing that worries me somewhat in this type of procedure is how much control you are going to have over the basic research and fundamental research of industry in this country.

YANKEE ATOMIC ELECTRIC CO. CONTRACT

The Commission on June 6, 1956, entered into a contract with Yankee Atomic Electric Co. under the power demonstration program whereunder it is proposed that Yankee Atomic will construct a 134,000 kilowatt pressurized water reactor plant in Massachusetts. This plant was estimated to cost $39,500,000 of which the Atomic Energy Commission would invest $5 million for the necessary research and development. It is my understanding that the cost estimate of $39.5 million will have to be revised substantially upward.

This contract is invalid for many reasons, some of which were stated by the Comptroller General in his recent report. He pointed out that:

First. The 12 companies making up Yankee had not executed binding agreements with Yankee and therefore were not committed;

Second. Yankee had not made formal arrangements to obtain permanent financing of $33 million;

Third. AEC had executed the contract without adequate assurance that the Government will receive benefits compensatory with its investment; and

Fourth. AEC agreed to bear extra costs of $1.6 million through an additional waiver of fuel charges, contrary to announced Commission policy.

Not only is the additional waiver of fuel charge invalid, but so also is the basic waiver of fuel charge of $1.7 million in contravention of section 53. The entire grant of $5 million to Yankee is apparently in violation of the no-subsidy section 169 for the reason that Yankee is not licensed under section 103 or 104. As a matter of fact, a construction permit which would refer to section 104 has not yet been issued to Yankee, and the contract was signed 10 months ago. The commitment of $1 million to work performed in AEC facilities for Yankee is in contravention of research section 33. The application by the Commission of $1.5 million in fiscal 1957, and its request for $2 million for the same purpose in fiscal 1958, are both unauthorized by law.

The Commission has sought to justify its policy of handing out cash subsidies to industry in addition to expensive Government technology by stating that the Government is to benefit from the technology, know-how, technical, and economic data acquired in the construction of projects, such as the plant proposed by Yankee Atomic, and to make this data available to everybody.

The plant is made possible at all only because the Government has already spent $75.6 million for the technology of the pressurized-water reactor, and the Commission wants to hand Yankee $5 million in cash on top of that. But the contract fails to require Yankee to return the lessons learned in construction and operation of the plant to be available to everybody. This is well illustrated by the contract provisions relating to patents. Those inventions and discoveries not traceable directly to Government funds in this scrambled project will not be available to everybody. Instead the contract gives the Commission no more than a license restricted to governmental purposes. This violates the Commission's announced policy. These inventions and discoveries should either be dedicated to the public, or at least made available to all the American people on a nondiscriminatory basis.

Then in treating inventions and discoveries resulting from expenditure of the $5 million cash subsidy, the contract gives Yankee "at least a nonexclusive, irrevocable, royalty-free license." Thereby Yankee is being improperly favored since the contract does not provide that all the American people are to receive the same privilege.

Unfortunately the 1954 act places a terminal date of September 1, 1959, on protective patent provisions. In view of the unfortunate and substantial delays which have taken place in getting these atomic electric reactors built, this date is far too early and should be extended.

THE DETROIT EDISON GROUP

The head of this group, Walker Cisler, was reminded by the joint committee in February 1955 that he had in 1953 answered this question: "To what extent do you expect Government participation in

your project?" by saying, "We do not expect any financial appropriation to this project."

Yet, as I said earlier, the Commission has committed $100,000 of Government money to this project this year, and requests $1,500,000 for it in fiscal 1958, all of which is not specifically authorized by law. I am particularly disturbed by the application of the $100,000 to this project in fiscal 1957 for the further reason that in our appropriation hearings on the fiscal 1957 bill Mr. Strauss sought to evade questions about this project by saying:

The Commission is not coming before you requesting any appropriation for the Power Reactor Development Co. We are not asking for any money from you at this time for this particular project.

Under the apprehension that you may have that there is such an item in our budget, I would like to assure you there is not in our current budget any item for this subject.

The Commission signed a contract on March 26, 1957, with this group under which the Government is to give the group further substantial cash and other subsidies which likewise are unauthorized. In my opinion, the contract is invalid.

The type of reactor proposed by this group is a sodium cooled, fast breeder reactor, 100,000 kilowatts, which has been publicized as a reactor which will breed more fuel than it consumes. Under the law, the United States automatically is the owner of all special nuclear material which is produced.

The nature and extent of subsidy by the Government of this project is almost beyond comprehension. The Government guarantees to the group the payment of $48.6 million over a 10-year period for the plutonium which it is expected the breeder will produce. In addition, the Government is making an outright research and development grant to the group of $4,450,000, and further the Government is waiving fuel charges in the amount of $5 million. These three sums total $58,050,000. When compared with the construction cost of the project which is $47 million, these cash subsidies exceed the actual construction cost by $11,050,000.

During the 10 years of plant operation from 1961 to 1970, the group expects to realize $43.5 million for the sale of steam resulting from nuclear fission. This $43.5 million when added to the Government's guaranty of $48.6 million totals $92.1 million. This project is made possible only because the Government has already expended $34.4 million in acquiring the necessary technology. This type of proposal is justified by the Commission on the theory that the Government is a partner with industry. It is a most peculiar partnership.

The contract, in my opinion, is invalid for many reasons. First, it is in contravention of section 169 since a license under section 104 (b) has not been issued. As a matter of fact, the contract specifically says that the Commission makes no representation that any license or approval is granted or will be granted. Therefore, the research and development grant of $4,450,000 is invalid.

The waiver of charge for nuclear fuel in the amount of $5 million is likewise invalid for the reason that the Commission has failed to prescribe the standards required in section 53 (c).

The Government's guaranty to the group to purchase the special nuclear material produced by the reactor is also invalid since it is in contravention of section 52. The last sentence of section 52 provides as follows:

Any person who lawfully produces any special nuclear material, except pursuant to a contract with the Commission under the provisions of section 31 or 41, shall be paid a fair price, determined pursuant to section 56, for producing such material.

The contract between the Commission and the group is a contract pursuant to the provisions of section 31 and, therefore, the group cannot be paid for the special nuclear material which is produced.

There is another curious thing about the Government's commitment to pay $48.6 million to the group for the plutonium. This works out to a price of either $46, $51.20, or $38.60 per gram of plutonium whereas the Commission's established fuel value for plutonium is $12 per gram. The result is that the Commission is proposing to pay the group 3 to 4 times its own established fuel value.

Then we come to the provisions of the contract which relate to patents. These provisions are practically identical with the patent provisions in the Yankee Atomic contract, which I discussed earlier My comments and criticisms apply with equal force to the Detroit Edison contract.

From a standpoint of public interest, there is a saving feature in the contract which provides as follows:

It is expressly recognized that the Commission's undertakings in connection with this contract are subject to the availability of funds appropriated from time to time by the Congress.

Under this circumstance, Congress is in a position to reject the contract in a very simple and effective manner—Congress can exercise its legislative authority by refusing funds for the purpose of this contract and project.

The Commission issued a conditional construction permit to this group on August 4, 1956, notwithstanding a report of its own Reactor Safeguards Committee in the summer of 1956, which said:

It is impossible to say—

and they are referring to this Detroit Edison job—

whether or not an accelerated program would give sufficient information to permit safe operation of this reactor at the Laguna Beach site on the time schedule presently proposed.

This project is in an area of some 2 million people, and is now the subject of formal protests made by labor unions on the ground of safety.

Walter Reuther, who was a member of the McKinney panel, feels very strongly that a large-scale fast breeder reactor should be built at a remote Government site. He said:

Such an experimental fast breeder reactor, built and operated in an area removed from population centers, will minimize the health and safety dangers and thus remove this tremendous restrictive burden from the scientists who are devoting their skill and knowledge to the extension of the frontiers of atomic know-how.

Since the safety factor of the fast breeder reactor which Detroit Edison is building has been challenged, it is appropriate to consider the request of industry and the recommendation of the Commission that the Government indemnify industry against third party liability.

President Eisenhower in his budget message of January 16, 1957, for fiscal year 1958, carried on page M32 his recommendation that legislation be passed authorizing "the Government to supplement commercially available insurance against liability arising from possible nuclear accidents."

The type of legislation contemplated would provide Government indemnity to cover third party liability losses arising out of nuclear incidents up to $500 million per plant over the amount of coverage available from the private insurance industry. The private insurance industry has formed an association comprising 134 capital stock casualty insurance companies, known as the Nuclear Energy Liability Insurance Association. This third party liability insurance will insure against bodily injuries and property damages to others than an owner or operator of an atomic reactor in the event such injury or damage results from a nuclear incident. The limit of such liability is $50 million per reactor and the association which has been formed is the exclusive agency through which its members may provide the new insurance.

In the case of Shippingport, the Federal Government is carrying all the risk, because it is a Government project.

The undertaking by private and public utilities to construct atomic electric powerplants has been predicated on the assumption that the Federal Government will enact a law providing for excess coverage above the amount available from the private insurance industry.

In Europe, three pools of insurance companies, one in Great Britain, one in Sweden, and one in France, have been formed recently for the purpose of insuring against risks arising from the production and use of atomic electric power, including third party liability. A very pertinent question at this point is whether the governments of these countries are offering or plan to offer indemnity above the coverage made available by these private insurance industry pools. It is my information that the three governments do not. Detailed information should be secured promptly in order that Congress will have the benefit of the approach taken in the European countries to this problem of indemnity and insurance.

Then there are serious antitrust implications to this project which should be considered.

The Detroit Edison project is being undertaken by two separate combinations of companies. The first combination is known as Atomic Power Development Associates and it consists of 33 utilities and 12 industrial companies which have banded together for the purpose of developing the technology to

be applied to the specific Detroit Edison project.

The second combination is known as Power Reactor Development Company and it consists of 14 operating utilities, one utility service company, and 9 industrial companies which have banded together for the purpose of owning the reactor and selling the power generated to Detroit Edison.

Unfortunately the teeth in the antitrust provisions of the 1954 Act do not reach these combinations. The teeth are found in section 105 (c) which places the duty on the Commission to consult the Attorney General before issuing a license for an atomic reactor, but only in the case of an application for a commercial license under section 103. Detroit Edison has not been issued any license whatever—merely a conditional construction permit which states that the Commission may at some future date issue a license under section 104 (b). Therefore, the recent statement of Attorney General Brownell on January 24, 1957, is little more than academic. He said:

> Although the companies seeking such licenses jointly may not presently be engaged in the same industries, such activities require considerable careful study, from a competitive point of view, both as to present actions in the experimental stages and in future activities when the commercial stage is reached.

It is true that section 105 (a) reiterates the fact that there are antitrust laws which should be enforced, but the real teeth as far as the Justice Department is concerned are found in section 105 (c).

CONGRESS INITIATED THE SHIPPINGPORT PLANT, NOT THE COMMISSION

As I said before, the pressurized water reactor presently being constructed at Shippingport, Pa., is the only large-scale atomic powerplant under construction in the United States today. It is to commence operation this year, with a generating capacity of 60,000 kilowatts.

I have regretted for some time the reluctance of the Commission, and in particular the reluctance of Mr. Strauss, to recognize the fact that the Shippingport plant was first proposed by Commissioner Murray in the spring of 1953, some time prior to the time Mr. Strauss returned to the Commission in July 1953, and the further fact that Congress should be recognized as having implemented this recommendation even though the executive branch of the Government had failed to join in Commissioner Murray's recommendation.

In the original budget for fiscal year 1954, prepared by the outgoing Truman administration, the Atomic Energy Commission had requested funds to begin the construction of experimental reactors. The incoming Eisenhower administration, however, prepared a new budget which deleted any construction funds for this purpose. The fact that Shippingport was initiated was due entirely to the proposal of Commissioner Murray that it be started and the fact that the House Appropriations Committee, upon representations made by Chairman Cole of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that there was need for international leadership in atomic electric power, put money in the second independent offices appropriation bill for 1954—H. R. 5690, Public Law 149, 83d Congress, 1st session for the purpose of starting construction of the project.

This establishes that the Congress has played a major role in what little progress we have made to date in the field of atomic electric power, and that the United States can get this job done only if the Government, through Congress, undertakes it directly.

THE UNITED STATES MUST MAINTAIN ITS LEADERSHIP

From the very beginning, the United States has been the world's leader in both nuclear power and thermonuclear power. We have led the way, but now our leadership is being challenged by other nations in this one important phase of atomic energy, and that is the field of atomic electric power. The ability and potential ability to generate energy is of paramount importance to all nations of the world. Every nation in Europe and Asia today recognizes this fact. With the realization of the tremendous sources of energy through nuclear fission, it becomes possible for all nations to husband their mineral resources and to apply them constructively in the lubricating and chemical fields instead of destructively by consuming them in the process of burning them up for the purpose of generating energy. Britain and all the free nations of Europe are acutely aware of this, so is Japan, India, and the Philippines, and this is likewise true of Russia.

Chairman DURHAM of the joint committee on March 14, 1957, called for realism in atomic power development and for stepping up this Nation's nuclear power program to insure the maintenance of America's world leadership in atomic energy. He posed the problem very bluntly, when he said:

> Our overriding problem, as I see it, is how to maintain our world leadership in atomic energy. In the field of atomic weapons and military reactors this is necessary for our immediate survival. In the field of civilian atomic power, it is necessary for our world prestige and longtime survival.

He did not share the Commission's complacency about Britain and Russia, going on to say that our leadership is being seriously challenged by the British and Russians.

Almost unbelievably, Commissioner Vance, of the AEC, on the same platform and on the same day perfunctorily dismissed Russia, saying:

> For some time, three nations have been engaged in planning for extensive development of nuclear power—United States, Britain, and Russia. I shall say no more about the Russian effort because our information about it is incomplete.

In our hearings of last year Mr. Strauss repeatedly minimized anything the Russians have been doing or announced they plan to do. On the other hand, Commissioner Murray and Admiral Rickover were not at all complacent about the capability of Russia to develop and build atomic electric plants. Mr. Murray said:

> I think everybody will admit that the Russians have the capability of doing the things that they say they intend to do scientifically. I suppose from a manufacturing standpoint, if they say they will build a 100,000-kilowatt plant, I am willing to make the judgment that they have the capability to do that.

Admiral Rickover had no doubt in his mind that the Russians are making rapid progress in atomic electrical power. He said at page 225 of the hearings the following:

> They are making rapid progress. I think one of the things that drives them is that they want to become the leaders in supplying atomic-energy plants to nations within their own orbit and to other nations that they hope to get within their orbit.
>
> I think this is probably the most compelling reason for them to do it, that is, to be the first, not only from a propaganda standpoint, but also to reap the advantage in this cold war.
>
> * * * * *
>
> If military weapons are to be used as an example, and these are generally the most difficult industrial products to produce, they certainly are producing excellent military weapons. So the major difference between Russia and the United States today, from an industrial standpoint, is volume rather than quality.

In the same hearings, Dr. Libby of the AEC stated on June 26, 1956, that:

> If the world market for atomic reactors were lost to the Soviet Union it would be a catastrophe to the free world.

Russia's program and achievements in this field are a major concern of this country. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on June 29, 1956, in its report on the Gore-Holifield bill stated that Russia "has a more ambitious program, both in terms of variety of reactor concept and total number of plants and kilowatt production," than the British, and the Joint Committee stated that, "there is no reason to believe the Russians cannot achieve their goal provided they give it top priority."

Let us then examine the British atomic power program.

The British are pushing vigorously the development of atomic electric power by the construction of atomic electric powerplants at a rate which has given them, and continues to give them, a lead over the United States not only in generating capacity but more important in operating experience which can only be gained by building the plants and running them. The British had in February 1955 issued a so-called white paper in which it was proposed to construct by 1965 twelve atomic electric powerplants with a total generating capacity of 1 million to 2 million kilowatts. In March 1957, predicated in large part on the successful operation of Britain's first nuclear plant at Calder Hall which went into operation in October 1956 as the first commercial atomic powerplant in the world, the British announced that the program would include approximately 20 power stations involving 30 to 40 reactors for a total of 5–6 million kilowatts at an estimated capital cost of 2½ billion.

These power reactors will begin coming on the line in 1960. The Calder Hall plant has generating capacity of 92,000 kilowatts. The British built this plant by going to work in 1953 on a crash basis, a year before the United States started

our Shippingport plant. It took the British until October 17, 1956, to put Calder Hall on the line. Our Shippingport plant is requiring approximately the same construction time—3 years. The British now believe that additional plants can be built in as little as 12 to 18 months on the basis of technology they have learned in the construction of Calder Hall. They are so confident that early in 1957 they are commencing construction on the largest atomic electric power project yet announced by any country—a 360,000 kilowatt plant for Glasgow, Scotland.

By way of comparison with Russian plans, it is understood, on the basis of information available in the fall of 1956, that the Russians expect to have a nuclear generating capacity of 2.5 million kilowatts by 1960 with a variety of reactors which will be three times the most optimistic estimate for the United States of 800,000 kilowatts. The British, of course, have run rings around this Russian target by revising their own program in March 1957 to almost three times as great as the Russians. The reason is abundantly clear—the British know that national survival is directly dependent on the use of the atom for peace as well as for defense. Undoubtedly the Russians have since the fall of 1956 revised their own plans upward, and America in the meantime continues to suffer from the Commission's numbers game of meaningless charts and tables.

The British type of reactor has three distinct advantages over American types. In the first place, the British gas-cooled reactor is fueled with natural uranium instead of enriched uranium. Second, the British reactors are simpler in design and easier to build. And in the third place the British have been cinching their lead over this country by virtue of benefiting from the construction and operating experience of Calder Hall. And don't think for a moment that the British are not boasting about the lead they have over us.

Sir Christopher Hinton, a top official of the British atomic energy authority, has said that, based on Calder Hall experiences, substantial design improvements have already been developed which make the British confident that "reactors of the Calder Hall type can produce power at a cost comparable with that of modern stations using conventional fuel." He said further that the Calder Hall reactor is "giving us the initial lead in the use of nuclear power and we shall be able to retain that lead for at least a decade by improvements in this type of reactor."

When Sir Christopher speaks of cost of power comparable to that produced using conventional fuel, he, of course, is referring to a comparison in high fuel cost areas such as exist in Britain and all of Western Europe, the Philippines, Japan, and all free Asia. It is well known that there are comparable high fuel cost areas in the United States. New England is a good example. The Commission closes its eyes to this fact and bases its comparisons on the lowest possible cost of conventional power with that of potential nuclear power cost. This is more fallacy.

The United States made a fateful decision in 1953 to develop only single-purpose reactors, instead of using our production plants to generate heat for electricity as well. The British and the Russians chose to follow the dual-purpose road, which means that they combine in a plant or facility the production of weapon material and the generation of heat for electricity. In the production of weapon materials, quantities of heat energy are created by the nuclear fission involved in the process. The United States is wasting this heat energy whereas the British and the Russians are putting it to work in generating electricity. The basic Atomic Energy Act of 1946 clearly contemplated that this heat energy be used in a constructive manner either by the Commission, by other Government agencies, or by public or private utilities under contracts providing for reasonable resale prices. But we have not done it. How wasteful should even this wealthy Nation permit itself to be?

The gravity of the problem was well stated by General Electric's vice president in charge of atomic energy, Francis K. McCune, who told the joint committee on May 24, 1956, the following:

> However, there is this about it: More than 3 years ago I know that I felt, and I know that I said, that there would be grave concern over our situation in electricity generation and that the best thing that this country could do at the time was to concentrate on wedding the electrical production to our plutonium production. That, I think, would have put us in an international situation in which we had a lot of electricity, let us say, and I think that is what is worrying us.
>
> Now, that was debated. There were provisions debated in the 1954 act that could have made it so or not so, but the upshot was that nothing was done, and we have started on the single-purpose road. England went down the dual-purpose road. Russia went down the dual-purpose road. I am convinced totally of that.
>
> Having done that 3 years ago, they are going to get more electricity sooner than we are. Whether that is good or bad is an entirely different situation, but I do not think that is something you redeem at the present time.

The British have learned enough from their dual-purpose reactors to switch them over by improved technology to the single purpose of generating electricity. We know this is the case with the British, and there is little doubt to believe that the Russians can do the same.

What attention, if any, has this country given to the construction of a gas-cooled reactor such as the English are concentrating on? There is no gas-cooled reactor in any program of the Commission; not in the Government's experimental program; not in the Government's power demonstration program; and not in the independent industrial program. The only place where work is being done on the gas-cooled reactor is a study being made under the Army power reactor program. On June 28, 1956, AEC witnesses stated that there is an item in the fiscal 1957 budget under the heading of the army power reactor program for study and development work on a closed cycle gas turbine reactor with the expectation that that effort will be pursued to the point of building a reactor experiment. The budget estimates for fiscal 1958, on page 73, contain the modest amount of $5,600,000 for three general reactor concepts, one of which is the gas-cooled reactor.

This stubborn unwillingness to recognize a good thing is placed in even greater focus by the fact that the British Government has either refused, or in any event has failed, despite requests from the United States to supply this Government with information and data and technology regarding the gas-cooled reactor. This refusal or failure is beyond comprehension in view of the fact that the United States Government in 1956 agreed to give information on the design and operation of the atomic submarine *Nautilus* to the British. Commissioner Murray of the Atomic Energy Commission has been urging the United States to develop and build a gas-cooled reactor that will improve on the successful new British type.

The need for expansion of energy-producing facilities in Europe is beyond question. Whereas in 1938 only 6 percent of Europe's energy requirements were imported, now 25 percent are imported, and it is reliably predicted that this percentage will jump as high as 50 percent in the next 20 years. Six western nations of Europe have just joined together in an international program called Euratom. They hope to discontinue the construction of conventional powerplants after 1961 and to have 3 million kilowatts of nuclear power by 1962 and 15 million kilowatts by 1965. If realized, the Euratom group will be the world's leading center of atomic electric power. These nations do not have the technology to proceed with this program, and must therefore buy from either the United States or Great Britain. The likelihood is that they will buy the only proven reactor in this country, the pressurized water reactor, from us, and the only proven reactor in Britain, the gas-cooled reactor, from them.

Recently American industry has suggested that the United States subsidize the construction of reactors abroad in order to acquire needed technology. There is absolutely no need for subsidy. This country can sell our reactors on a full-cost basis, and should do so only on a full-cost basis. We can experiment here at home on every feasible type of reactor, but in doing so we have absolute control over the technology being developed and also the schedule of construction and operation. This country should benefit from its experiences in constructing military installations in foreign countries and reflect upon the understandable complications which inherently arise when American money is used to construct permanent installations and facilities in other countries. Since Britain is slow in giving us the technology and other valuable data from their own construction and operation of the gas-cooled reactor, what possible firm assurances could this country hope to secure from any other nation?

Japan has as urgent a need for nuclear power as Western Europe. The Japanese need is an historic one since Japan has always been short of fossil fuels. This is true also of the Philippines and all of

free Asia. Japan has determined its need of nuclear power at 3 million kilowatts by 1962 and is on the verge of purchasing atomic reactors from either the United States or from Britain. American representatives have been to Japan for the purpose of selling our pressurized water reactor which is not yet in commercial operation, but a Japanese commission has been to England and has actually seen the Calder Hall plant in operation. The inclination of the Japanese is to buy from Great Britain, but the question of which type they will buy has not been finally determined and, consequently, the United States still has an opportunity, even at this late date, to try to retain its standing internationally by persuading the Japanese to buy from us.

It cannot be overstated that the capacity to generate energy is the key not only to peace but even more so to war. The tremendous consumption of electricity required by the Atomic Energy Commission itself presents ample proof of this premise. Looking at AEC's consumption of electricity nationwide, we find that AEC presently uses 20 percent of all of the industrial power generated in the United States. Looking at the total consumption of electric energy in the United States, AEC consumes 10 percent of the Nation's total, or a kilowatt requirement exceeding the combined capacity of the New England States.

In my opinion this country is at a crossroads and cannot afford to repeat the mistakes which it has made during the last 3 years. Development of atomic electric power must be pushed immediately, and the record clearly shows that the job is so complex that only the Government itself is in a position to get the results which must be achieved at the earliest feasible time. It is my firm conviction that the Federal Government should immediately initiate construction at existing Atomic Energy Commission sites of full-scale atomic electric powerplants.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-two 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. 62]

Anderson, Mont.	Dawson, Ill.	Granahan
Aspinall	Delay	Green, Pa.
Barden	Dies	Gregory
Barrett	Dollinger	Harvey
Blitch	Dorn, N. Y.	Healey
Bowler	Eberharter	Hiestand
Budge	Fallon	Hill
Celler	Farbstein	Hillings
Chudoff	Fino	Holt
Colmer	Frelinghuysen	Holtzman
Curtis, Mo.	Fulton	Hyde
Davis, Ga.	Garmatz	Jenkins
	Gordon	Kean
Kearney	Patterson	Smith, Kans.
Keating	Pelly	Steed
Kelly, N. Y.	Powell	Taylor
Krueger	Prouty	Teague, Tex.
Lipscomb	Radwan	Teller
Loser	Rains	Thomas
McDonough	Reece, Tenn.	Thompson, La.
McGovern	Rhodes, Ariz.	Thompson, N. J.
Magnuson	Riehlman	Utt
Metcalf	Roosevelt	Vinson
Miller, Calif.	Sadlak	Vursell
Miller, N. Y.	St. George	Walter
Morano	Scherer	Widnall
Morrison	Shelley	Willis
Multer	Sieminski	Yates
Patman	Sisk	Zelenko

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, 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. 6871, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called when 337 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.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, which handles the annual supply bill for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year 1958 presents to the membership of the Committee of the Whole and of the House a bill showing reductions from the amount of the 1958 budget estimates to the extent of $101,850,000.

At the outset I should like to thank my fellow members of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the minority members, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT], the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], and my long time friend, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER], for their cooperation and courtesy during the course of the long and extended hearings with regard to this budget. I would be remiss if I did not say a word with regard to the executive secretary of this committee, Mr. Jay B. Howe, without whose untiring assistance the committee could not have gotten into a budget such as this to the extent that it has.

The amount recommended in the bill for the Department of State is $180,382,743, as compared with a budget estimate in the amount of $227,714,552.

With regard to the Department of Justice, the committee was requested $234,655,000 and allowed $227,855,000, or a reduction of $6.8 million.

For the judiciary the committee approved $38,562,050 of a request for $40,780,250.

With regard to the Information Agency, there was a request in the amount of $144 million, $140 million for the program, and $4 million for a new transmitter in the vicinity of the eastern end of the Mediterranean. As to this request, the committee allowed $106.1 million, a reduction of $37.9 million from the budget estimate.

Finally, with regard to the President's so-called cultural fund, a fund appropriated to the President, there was a request in the amount of $18.5 million, and the committee allowed $10.9 million, a reduction to the extent of $7.6 million.

A summary which I have made with regard to these appropriations indicates that the committee recommends in the pending bill for these 5 parts of the Government $563,799,793, or a reduction of $41,665,364 as compared with the current fiscal year and $101,850,009 in the amount of the budget estimates. This reduction, made at the time when we are confronted with the highest peacetime budget in history, amounts to over 15 percent.

At the outset, and as indicated at page 2 of the committee report on this bill, I should like to call your attention to the fact that in the Department of State and the United States Information Agency there were over 950 positions added to the payroll over and above the number that were requested of the Congress a year ago, and this in the face of a cut of $22 million last year in funds for the United States Information Agency. The committee says at page 2 of the report:

> The committee was at a loss to understand how it was that the President's Bureau of the Budget would permit such a thing, until it was discovered that they too had resorted to this same device in their own 1958 budget presentation although on a smaller scale.

Now, what happened, so that each and every one may thoroughly understand this, is the following: The committee was presented with a set of justifications with regard to, let us say, the first item we came across, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations. This page of the justifications presented to the committee this year indicated that for 1958 fiscal year they were asking for 22 positions, $184,935. Alongside that was a column indicating the 1957 figure, which showed 22 positions, $184,935. Alongside that was another column, for 1956, indicating 22 positions, $180,713.

Upon a hurried glance at this summary with regard to the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, one would gain the impression that the work was being carried on on the same basis over the 3-year period. But we asked our committee clerk to get the set of justifications presented to us last year. We were amazed to find that the 1957 figure then being asked of the Congress was 19 positions, and $149,685.

Such procedure is about the nearest to fraud and deceit that I have come across in a long time. I am speaking, mind you, of only 3 positions. This happened with regard to 950 positions.

After unearthing the circumstances which I have just disclosed, we then found the Department of State requesting 1,327 additional positions over and above the ones which without any authorization or notice to the Appropriation Committee of either House of Congress they put on the payroll. Someone may ask, "How many new positions are in this budget?" There were requested 1,327 for the Department of State. None was allowed. For the Department of Justice

there were 126 new positions requested. We allowed 63 in the FBI. Incidentally, we allowed every bit of the requested appropriation for the FBI. For the Judiciary there were 132 additional positions requested. The committee allowed 44, of which 40 are for the Bankruptcy Division and presently required because of the fact that bankruptcies are now at the highest number in the history of the United States Government. And it is expertly predicted that they will be higher in the coming year.

Members will find all this information and details in the committee hearings and I believe we have also mentioned the situation in the committee report.

As to the USIA, after having put 508 additional unauthorized positions on the payroll, they came along and asked for 796 over and above the 508. Needless to say, they were not allowed.

Then we found practices in the Department of State such as the opening of a Passport Office in Los Angeles, Calif., by the Director of the Passport Agency, without any notice to the committees on appropriations of either branch of the Congress. She just went right ahead and opened an office costing the taxpayers $110,601.51. Where does the business for the Los Angeles office come from? Part of it comes from the San Francisco passport office which we opened some years ago. So now the business is decreasing in the San Francisco office, and it is going up in the Los Angeles office. They got along all right in Los Angeles for a long time by having the clerk of the Federal Court handle the passport applications. all of which were handled by him at no cost to the Department of State.

I mention these facts as an indication of the thinking of the Department of State. There seems to be no control whatever with regard to what they can do. Last year in the committee report reference was made to the exorbitant amount of money requested for so-called transfer allowances. These used to be allowances to cover the situation where a Foreign Service officer came from a post in a very hot country and had to go to a post in a very cold country. Allowance was made for his required change in clothing. Why, they ran that up from an all-time high of $75,890 in 1955, to $595,000 last year, after we told them it was wholly exorbitant, and by that expected they would not go ahead with this step-up from $75,000 to $595,000. Lo and behold, they come along this year with a request for $632,594. We have directed that they go back to the $75,890 figure.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has made an excellent statement in amplification of the report, which is one of the most amazing I have read in a long time in connection with an appropriation bill. I believe the gentleman's committee last year gave the State Department $250,000 to buy certain equipment to save manpower in the Department of State. Is that not correct?

Mr. ROONEY. The committee found out this year after having given Mrs. Knight in the Passport Office a quarter of a million dollars to buy new machinery that we were assured was going to save personal services and personnel down there—they asked for the money and got it—that the machinery had not yet been invented.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me what became of the $250,000?

Mr. ROONEY. They used a good part of the $250,000 to establish 55 new positions.

Mr. GROSS. And that again was deception in that they asked for the money for a specific purpose?

Mr. ROONEY. Exactly. We told them they would not get any more money for machinery. They had better find out how to retrieve it.

Mr. GROSS. How can we cure them, to use the expression, of "sucking eggs"?

Mr. ROONEY. You just have to get some sensible thinking down there.

The week before last here in Washington I had a dinner guest who handed to me a clipping from the previous evening's Washington Evening Star. I started to read it. It stated that a new tennis pro would take over at the Sheraton-Park Hotel, that Allie Ritzenberg, noted tennis pro and former tennis star at the University of Maryland, was going to take over the tennis courts at the Sheraton-Park, that they would be open to the public 7 days a week, and that he would be there ready to give lessons. I turned the clipping back. My friend said, "But you miss the point of this thing." I had read it too fast. We all make mistakes sometimes. I had not noticed the last one-sentence paragraph, "Allie is now in Port au Prince, Haiti, on a mission for the Department of State."

I said, "Oh." The next day I gave the committee secretary the clipping to call on the State Department to tell us what sort of a mission Allie was on in Port au Prince, Haiti, knowing exactly the kind of place Port au Prince is, having been there a couple of times. Many of the poor people there are barefooted and lucky to have clothing on their backs. There are a few ritzy hotels up on top of the mountain in back of the city. Why, we found that Allie is down there teaching tennis for the State Department at $6,800 for the 6-month period from November until next May 11th. Fortunately, he has a good job out at the Sheraton Park beginning in May or he might still be down in Port au Prince, Haiti, at a cost to the taxpayers of $6,800 for 6 months.

I do not know whether I need to say much more with regard to this bill. It covers quite a bit across the Government. You have the Federal prison system, the FBI, the Immigration and Naturalization Service. You have all the courts, the State Department, and oh, yes, the Brussels Fair. Yes, we have the Brussels Fair, and I should like to call your attention to the top of page 22 of the committee report.

Mr. ROONEY. For 26 weeks in Brussels in 1958, there is going to be an international fair. We have to put up a building over there. Of course, the State Department did not let out any bids on this. They just went right ahead and hired a Belgian architect and a Belgian contractor. When they complete this building, they are going into a gala theatrical performance. This will be for 26 weeks and, mind you, after they put up the building, they must raze it at the end of the 26 weeks. They propose to have 9 weeks of musicals at a cost of $540,000 or $60,000 a week. What musicals? Well, I hope nobody thinks I am against the theater. I am from Brooklyn in New York City, which is the theatrical center of the world. The State Department proposes to send Annie Get Your Gun, Carousel, which is an adaptation of a Hungarian play by Ferenc Molnar, and Guys and Dolls—as examples of American culture. I do not know who sells these things to the President down at the White House. This is one of his most important programs—Guys and Dolls, Damon Runyon—the Bowery—Nicely Nicely Johnson—and the Great White Way—fine entertainment for the American public but what a great cultural impact—and done in English, incidentally—in Brussels to the people of Europe. Sometimes I wonder.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. HALEY. I notice on page 2 of the committee report where the Department of State and the United States Information Agency proceeded to establish in 1957 over 950 positions more than they had requested in their 1957 budget presentations. These agencies now come along and request funds to "annualize" these positions in the fiscal year 1958. What does the word "annualize" these positions mean?

Mr. ROONEY. Well, you see they put these people on at the end of the fiscal year in May and June and they tell you when they come in this year, "We have so many positions." The committee discovered they had in both agencies 950 more than they were ever authorized or requested to have. So then they want these positions annualized. You see they only pay them in the previous fiscal year for a month or two and then they want money for the full fiscal year following their addition to the payroll.

Mr. HALEY. Did the committee do anything about deannualizing these positions?

Mr. ROONEY. Oh, yes, yes.

Mr. HALEY. That is fine.

Mr. ROONEY. I think we have adequately taken care of that.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I want to ask the gentleman two or three questions.

Mr. ROONEY. I hope I can answer them.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. First, let me say I desire to congratulate the gentleman and his subcommittee on the very fine and meticulous and careful job they have done in screening out the unnecessary expenditures with which this department seems to be loaded. I notice it is intended to create an additional Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs. I believe that has not yet been

authorized. I wonder if it ought to be carried in this bill when it has not been authorized.

Mr. ROONEY. It was the opinion of the committee that there is progress being made in Africa now, and with new countries coming into existence, we must have some representatives there. In this particular instance we are directing that they use the money that I referred to a while ago, transfer allowances, to open up their 10 new consular and reporting posts. The requested increase with regard to the so-called Bureau of African Affairs comes to not more than $150,000.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I understood that the operation of that new department would require about $4 million.

Mr. ROONEY. No. That is not the case. The formation of the Bureau of African Affairs would cost approximately $150,000. We are represented in Africa now in most of the countries.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. We have always been represented, and I was wondering why it was necessary to create a new office.

Mr. ROONEY. It is an administrative decision, I will say. Authorization for a new Assistant Secretary for African Affairs has not yet been approved by this House.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Then I wanted to ask the gentleman about this item of "Acquisition of buildings abroad." They are being paid for entirely out of this counterpart currency?

Mr. ROONEY. No, not entirely. The bulk of the amount with regard to acquisition of buildings is in foreign currencies, not American dollars.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. How much actual money are we going to pay for this $18,500,000 worth of new buildings abroad.

Mr. ROONEY. If the gentleman will bear with me one second, there is included within the bill $18½ million in connection with this item, which is not only for acquisition of buildings but also for the maintenance of our present buildings. The committee allowance is a reduction of 1½ million from the amount which was requested. Of the $18½ million approved they must use not less than $15 million to purchase foreign currencies and credits now owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States.

As I have said on this floor many times—very often I used to have trouble with this problem, but not any more—I would rather have a piece of real estate—it has been a fact that most of our real estate has increased in value over the years—I would rather have a piece of real estate than a credit entered in a book. That is about what this comes to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I was wondering why you did not purchase all of it with this foreign currency.

Mr. ROONEY. The direction of this program is here in Washington, and dollars are required therefor. In some countries we do not have any or sufficient credits. We have 201 office buildings over the world; 120 office residences; 162 residences for senior officers and attachés, and 1,999 staff living units. Some cash is required in order to handle this huge operation.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Contributions to international organizations: There is an item of $35 million of which I understand $16 million is our part of the United Nations expense. That amounts to $19 million that we are expending in these 31 various and sundry international organizations. What portion of that is this Government paying? What proportion of the entire amount?

Mr. ROONEY. With regard to the United Nations, the United States' share is one-third. In the case of UNEF, the police force which is over in Egypt, some of our diplomats thought it well if we paid 50 percent of part of that cost.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. My question is directed at the 31 international organizations to which we are now contributing. I wanted to ask what proportion of it we pay and whether we cannot get rid of some of it.

Mr. ROONEY. We pay in different proportions, I must say to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. What I am getting at is whether there is any way for us to get rid of some of this expense in connection with international organizations.

Mr. ROONEY. They have not been very successful in that regard.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. We should do something about it.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I think we should point out at this time that all this participation and the percentage of participation was authorized by Congress. So if something is going to be done it will have to start in an authorization bill in the Congress. We put ourselves in this position, which I consider as untenable as does the distinguished gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am fully aware of what the gentleman from Florida says, that we put ourselves into this position. What I want to know is how we can get out of it and save part of this $20 million.

Mr. ROONEY. That would be up to the Congress. If we were to presently deny funds we would still be members of these international organizations and our dues would continue. We would be carried on the books as delinquent members.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I promised to yield to the gentleman from Virginia for a series of questions.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have just one more question.

In the item dealing with the Information Agency did the committee cut out the magazine published by this outfit, the one he criticized?

Mr. ROONEY. Which magazine?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think it is called the American magazine.

Mr. ROONEY. Amerika Illustrated? No; we did not cut that out. I think that to cut that out would be a mistake. It looks like Life magazine. It is well done. It is put out in Russia, and they tell us that as soon as it hits the stands in Moscow it is sold out in 10 minutes; that the magazine is passed from hand to hand until each copy reaches a hundred different people, until it is worn out and comes apart in shreds.

I approve the use of this magazine in Russian. The language used at pages 19 and 20 of the report was more to indicate that this agency is directing its propaganda toward the American public, telling them how good they are in order to get bigger and better appropriations.

The USIA told the committee that they gave out 4,000 copies of this magazine to Americans on its first issue. They insisted that these free copies were requested by the recipients. So we asked them to bring up all the written requests. We wanted to look at them. They came up with a shoe box full of form cards which said "Yes, kindly send me a copy of the first issue of the new Amerika Illustrated." Then we asked for a copy of the letter they sent out with the return card. They brought the letter up and it appeared that they notified the people they could have a free copy—sign the card and they would send them a copy of this magazine.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. It occurs to me that might be something we could get rid of.

Mr. ROONEY. I say emphatically to the distinguished gentleman that I would not dare suspend the publication of this magazine in Russian. It happens to be one of the things that the United States Information Agency does that is required.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to take exception to the comments of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], who said that membership in all these organizations abroad for which we are making appropriation was authorized by Congress. I would like to remind the gentleman that the general agreement on trade and tariffs has not been.

Mr. ROONEY. I believe I have heard the gentleman mention that subject once or twice before.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman will agree with me that the item on page 3 of the bill of $93,088,500 and the item of $18,500,000 at the bottom of page 4 must contain money to pay the salaries of the State Department employees working at Geneva, Switzerland, on the general agreements on tariffs. I make the point they are all illegal because they were not authorized by the Congress.

Mr. ROONEY. I am sorry I cannot agree with the gentleman.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. This is a contribution to a temporary international organization. It is carried under contingencies. It has

not been authorized as a permanent contribution; and to that extent, of course, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I shall conclude by paying tribute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] who produced the best piece of evidence that the committee came across with regard to this business of the United States Information Agency and President Eisenhower's cultural program. It appeared they paid Dizzy Gillespie $2,150 a week, then had to pay additionally for 15 musicians and 2 vocalists to go along with him, pay for the rehearsals of these musicians no less, then had to send along a lecturer who did not speak the language of the countries visited, as well as the expenses of Dizzy's baggageman.

During the course of the questioning with regard to this alleged cultural program, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] read from a pamphlet put out abroad by the United States Information Agency. He read a statement from that pamphlet to the witness. The witness did not at that time know from what sort of paper or book Mr. Bow was reading. Mr. Bow asked him if it was as the result of the statement he had just read, that we need a cultural program. The witness in effect replied, "Oh, yes. That is exactly what we use it for. We have to offset that kind of statement." And Mr. Bow was reading from a pamphlet put out abroad by the United States Information Agency.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I note on page 21 of the report that the committee under "Department of State cultural and sports presentations" recommend $2,300,000 and cut $800,000. Could the gentleman briefly tell us what that $2,300,000 is going to be spent for? That is a lot of money.

Mr. ROONEY. If the gentleman will kindly come over to the committee table I shall show him and he will see the alleged justifications. He will see the list of athletic, choral groups, band, and so forth included in the program.

Mr. GAVIN. Would the gentleman put that in the RECORD so that we will be able to see the breakdown of the $3,100,000.

Mr. ROONEY. Very well. The following is the summary:

Department of State, President's special international program, artistic and athletic presentations by areas—Summary, 1958 fiscal year

Activity	American Republics area		Europe, Western		Europe, Eastern		Far East		Near East		Total	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Orchestras	1	$168,895	1	$168,895	1	$147,783	1	$168,895	1	$168,895	5	$823,363
Drama and musical comedy groups			1	161,000							1	161,000
Musical groups	2	100,436	2	100,436	3	131,822	2	100,436	2	100,436	11	533,566
Dance groups	1	132,945	1	132,945			1	132,945	1	132,945	4	531,780
Individual artists	4	84,648			7	129,617	6	126,972	5	105,810	22	447,047
Sports activities	3	66,000			4	77,000	5	110,000	4	88,000	16	341,000
Subtotal	11	552,924	5	563,276	15	486,222	15	639,248	13	596,086	69	2,837,756
Promotion												94,500
Administration												167,744
Total												3,100,000

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset that it has been a pleasure and a gratification to me again this year to serve on this subcommittee. A more capable and agreeable group of gentlemen would be hard to find, a more patient, effective, and hard-hitting chairman would be harder to find, although I do not always agree with his conclusions. A more capable, patient and industrious staff assistant than Jay Howe would be hard to find. It is really a rare privilege to serve on the committee and I have enjoyed every moment of it. I am only sorry that all of the conclusions of the majority of the committee are not mine nor that of one or two other members of the minority members of the subcommittee. The report submitted by the chairman of the subcommittee, and which he has commented upon at some length, suggests rather more of an indictment of a couple of great national agencies than anything else.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Can the gentleman point out one allegation contained in that report which is not factually true?

Mr. COUDERT. The gentleman is quite right. I merely said to my friend, for whom I have the warmest regard and the greatest respect, that it leaves the impression of an indictment, because all it does is point out mistakes or errors or differences of opinion regarding these two agencies involved. I simply submit that the State Department is the first line of defense of the United States today.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Surely the gentleman understands that my thinking in that regard is the same as the gentleman's. The committee report is a criticism of that first line of defense.

Mr. COUDERT. If my good friend from New York will let me finish my statement, I will be delighted to yield to him.

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

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is this not a situation where a collection of mistakes of judgment and excesses and human failures has been put together representing a tiny fraction of the total work being done, in which the individual illustrations given may be accurate, but the total impression given is completely false?

Mr. COUDERT. That is precisely correct.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not a case of picking out all the failures and making no adequate appraisal, in perspective, of the remarkable successes that have been accomplished by both of those agencies in very important and crucial fields?

Mr. COUDERT. The gentleman from Minnesota has taken the words out of my mouth. I thank him.

Anyone who reads the report through can only think ill of the State Department, whereas in truth and in fact we have lived successfully through 4 difficult years. Perhaps there have never been 4 more difficult years in the absence of a great war, and when we are in a great war, the State Department takes second place. Somebody very properly has said—I have forgotten who it was—that when the diplomats fail the generals move in. Now, many of us in this House and on this floor this afternoon will remember that in our time alone there have been three great wars where the diplomats failed and the generals moved in.

Now, my objection and the objection of one or two of my associates on the minority side is that the cuts made in the State Department requests are too deep. I quite agree, there undoubtedly have been mistakes. I do not condone the practice of putting employees and staff members on the payroll contrary to budget justifications without notifying the Appropriations Committees, although there is no legal requirement and there is no violation of the law involved. It is still bad budgetary practice, and I still think that when an agency or a department adds to the payroll more than those requested in its budget justification, they should advise the committee. But there is no justification for punishing the department or the agency and punishing the people of the United States by undermining the prestige, limiting the striking power of a great agency like the State Department.

I object particularly to two item cuts in the State Department budget. First, despite the continuing growth in the burdens, and the responsibilities, and the obligations of the State Department, and the corresponding need for additional manpower, the ablest possible manpower, this subcommittee, with approval of the full committee, is submitting a bill that gives the State Department exactly the same amount for operations that it is now getting in current fiscal 1957. Yet there is not one of us in this hall who does not know that everything has gone up in the last year; every cost has gone up, and as burdens go up and responsibilities go up, obviously the costs of a great Government Department go up, and, in my opinion, we should have allowed at least a part of the requested increase for salaries and expenses for the operation of the Department.

I also regret the fact that a majority of the subcommittee chose to further reduce the already limited representation allowances which alone make it possible for career Foreign Service officers to hold important positions. In the current year State Department was allowed $800,000 for representation allowances.

The Department asked for $1,200,000 in the coming year because of the increase in number of personnel whom they expect to have and probably will have. The subcommittee cut them back $200,000, down to $600,000. That is a small matter, but after all, representation allowances are a weapon of the Department of State in the constant conflict to preserve peace in an ever more troubled world.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I should be happy to yield.

Mr. GROSS. The distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], mentioned an Assistant Secretary for African Affairs. Where in this bill is there an authorization for the creation of an Office of Assistant Secretary for African Affairs? I understand that this bill would create a Bureau of African Affairs, but I do not find in the bill itself any authorization for an Assistant Secretary.

Mr. COUDERT. I do not know whether it is authorized or not.

Mr. GROSS. Is there that kind of authorization?

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. There is no authorization in this bill for an Assistant Secretary. An authorization would be necessary if one were appointed.

Mr. COUDERT. That seems to answer the question.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I understand that a bill creating such a position passed the Senate.

Mr. GROSS. It passed the other body the other day on the unanimous-consent calendar. Not a word was asked about it and no answers were given. But let me say to the gentlemen that when the bill comes over here there will be at least one or two questions asked.

Mr. COUDERT. Of course, if it does not pass the House, there will be no additional Secretary. That is fairly obvious, because an authorization is required.

Let me say in summary about the State Department that in my humble judgment the Secretary of State is one of our great Secretaries. He also happens to be a resident of my district. Also, he is a very old friend of mine. I am very proud of that. He has conducted our foreign policy with success under the greatest difficulties. We are still at peace. That is something not to be laughed off. We are still in trouble because the world is full of trouble and confusion and uncertainty. In my humble judgment it was never so important to maintain a strong, powerful, competent, hard-hitting State Department. And I do not think that can be done unless it has the full backing of Congress, and unless it has more money than is allowed in this bill. I trust that somewhere along the line there will be sober second thought and additional funds will be provided.

There is another agency that came in for a bad trimming at the hands of a majority of this subcommittee. That is the United States Information Agency, which is a handmaiden of the State Department. It is an auxiliary of the State Department created in Democratic administrations, supported, authorized, and appropriated for by Democratic and Republican Congresses and universally recognized as a necessary instrument for the conduct of foreign affairs. We have had it now for 10 or 12 years. I have forgotten exactly how long.

The President in his state of the Union message chose to refer to this Agency, the only agency or department to which he referred in that message, as requiring greater appropriations than in the current year. Said he in his state of the Union message:

> World events have magnified both the responsibilities and the opportunities of the United States Information Agency. Just as, in recent months, the voice of communism has become more shaken and confused, the voice of truth must be more clearly heard. To enable our Information Agency to cope with these responsibilities and opportunities, I am asking the Congress to increase appreciably the appropriations for this program and for legislation establishing a career service for the Agency's overseas Foreign Service officers.

That latter, of course, had nothing to do with this bill, is not in this bill, and does not concern the House at this time.

Then later the President was advised that a substantial cut might be made in the relatively small sum requested for this agency which he considers so important in the conduct of the foreign policy of the United States, so important to the success of the objectives of the United States, the preservation of peace, the reduction of armaments, greater understanding among people. When he discovered that this committee was considering a substantial reduction he wrote a letter to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], to me as ranking member, to the chairman of the full committee, Mr. CANNON, and to Mr. TABER, and I think perhaps to the former Speaker and minority leader and to the Speaker of the House. In that letter, dated April 9, the President said:

> I must express my deep concern over the possibility of a slash in this budget. No doubt you are as sensitive as I am to its critical importance and realize with me that this importance has been magnified by recent world events. Imperatively, in key areas of the world, America's voice of truth must become more clearly heard. There is pressing need for expansion of our informational functions in the Near East, Africa and the Far East, and I cannot over-emphasize the urgency of completing a land-based transmitter in the eastern Mediterranean to make our radio broadcasts more audible in important Near Eastern countries.

Parenthetically, the committee allowed the radio station, which will take a year or two to build, and allowed the entire amount requested to be obligated in 1958, which is $1.1 million.

The President concluded in these words, showing the great importance that he as the director of the foreign policy of the United States attached to this program. We cannot substitute ourselves for him. He alone must be the arbiter of the conduct of our foreign relations.

> This program is a key instrument in our efforts to promote peace, world understanding, and eventual reduction of armaments. It contests with a vastly greater Communist effort. This undertaking I consider so basically important to the vital interests of the United States that I address these views to you. I hope you will do all possible to maintain and strengthen this essential activity of our Government.

What did our subcommittee do and what did the full committee approve? In the current year the Agency was allowed the sum of $113 million to conduct a worldwide information and propaganda agency to carry the word of America to the farthest corners of the earth, into lands in all stages of culture, of all colors and creeds, and in all states of mind, war and peace. This very subcommittee of this House last year allowed $110 million. As the result of action on the other side of the Capitol the final figure was $113 million. So what does this bill carry for this Agency, the importance of which the President goes so far out of his way to emphasize? This bill cuts the 1958 appropriation $10 million below that of the present year.

It is all very well to find mistakes in its operation. Able cross-examiners, experienced lawyers, experienced chairmen of committees like my friend from New York, can always in any great Government agency find mistakes, can find objects for derision, objects for differences of opinion; but the fact still remains that the most vehement and effective critics of this Agency, such as

Eugene Castle, a resident of my district, who has written forcefully upon the subject, admit the necessity for the existence of such an agency.

All the differences are about how to manage it. And so long as there is advertising in this world, so long as there are efforts to reach men's minds, there will be differences of opinion as to how to go about it and as to which medium is better than which other medium. The problem of this agency is that no two men will agree on how the dollars should be spent. Somebody has to decide it and only that agency can decide it. Of course, Congressional committees may differ. Other people may differ. Constructive criticism is helpful. It is an operation of trial and error that will improve as it goes along. I say we should give this agency, at the very least, the amount that it has in the current year of $113 million, to explain to the people of the world why we are spending $8 billion to maintain armed forces all over the world, to maintain bases all over the world, and giving foreign aid all over the world, and to explain what America is and what America's purposes in the world are, and what is its relation to the well-being of other people in the world.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. First, I would like to refer to the gentleman's reading of the letter of President Eisenhower. As he knows, I replied to the President's letter, and I should like to insert that letter and my reply at this point.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 9, 1957.

The Honorable JOHN J. ROONEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROONEY: I understand that subcommittee action on the budget of the United States Information Agency is completed and will soon be considered by the full Committee on Appropriations.

I must express my deep concern over the possibility of a slash in this budget. No doubt you are as sensitive as I am to its critical importance and realize with me that this importance has been magnified by recent world events. Imperatively, in key areas of the world, America's voice of truth must become more clearly heard. There is pressing need for expansion of our informational functions in the Near East, Africa, and the Far East, and I cannot overemphasize the urgency of completing a land-based transmitter in the eastern Mediterranean to make our radio broadcasts more audible in important Near Eastern countries.

At the time of the Hungarian uprising our informational efforts demonstrated great value. The capacity of the Agency to react to future crises should be at the least maintained. My considered judgment is that they need to be substantially increased.

This program is a key instrument in our efforts to promote peace, world understanding, and eventual reduction of armaments. It contests with a vastly greater Communist effort. This undertaking I consider so basically important to the vital interests of the United States that I address these views to you. I hope you will do all possible to maintain and strengthen this essential activity of our Government.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 12, 1957.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

MR. PRESIDENT: I acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 9th instant concerning the pending budget of the United States Information Agency, and I assure you that I share your views concerning the importance of its work and general program. On many occasions over the twelve years I have been connected with this agency's appropriations I have stated that I would be willing to vote the full amount requested for this program if it were managed and operated effectively and I will again make that statement.

Realizing that you receive far more documents and reports than you can possibly have time to read, but inasmuch as we both agree on the importance of this agency's work, I trust you will have time to go through the Committee's hearings and report with regard to the United States Information Agency. These hearings reveal a most amazing situation.

When the 1957 budget request for the United States Information Agency was submitted to Congress a year ago, request was made for a certain number of positions. The Congress subsequently made a reduction of $22 million dollars in that request and you of course signed the bill approving the reduced appropriation. After a reduction such as this, most people would expect that fewer personnel than the number requested would have been employed; but that did not turn out to be the case. We found, this year, that about 500 more positions were added, despite the reduction, than had been stated would be employed had the entire amount been approved. The same situation was found to be true with the Department of State and even the Bureau of the Budget itself.

I have made many trips abroad over the years and on each I have tried to carefully evaluate the program of the United States Information Agency in the areas visited. I cannot in good conscience say that I feel the American taxpayers have been getting the value they should for their money.

The record will indicate that his agency has gone far beyond what it was intended to do. It has used taxpayers' money to try and shape opinion in this country, which is completely contrary to the purposes for which this agency was established. Furthermore, I do not feel that we should appropriate money to try and influence our British friends—such as costly annual subscriptions to American newspapers for 644 members of the British Parliament. The pending Budget includes $702,476 for a "giveaway" of American newspapers and periodicals.

I must most respectfully take exception to your statement with regard to the Hungarian uprising. The efforts of the United States Information Agency in that crisis left much to be desired. In fact, the work of the United States Information Agency in the Hungarian situation was almost a complete failure, as were our diplomatic efforts. This failure is clearly indicated in the fact that we were unable to convince a majority in the United Nations that "enforcement measures" should be taken against Soviet Russia for its brutal and immoral aggression in Hungary. Assistant Secretary of State Robert C. Hill admitted this failure in a letter dated last February 5th and published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, when he wrote that a "requisite majority of the United Nations is not prepared to support such action."

The foregoing is offered purely as honest criticism.

I shall make our correspondence available to the Congress and the press.

Sincerely and respectfully,

JOHN J. ROONEY.

Now it is utterly amazing how circumstances can change viewpoints. I do not know what to say in this regard. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT], my distinguished friend who is now in the well of the House, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] in the full committee last Friday sought to increase the USIA appropriation. They did not get very far. But, the point I want to make is that this change in ideas with regard to agencies just because President Eisenhower happens to be President is amazing. Let me read to you, and this is very brief, what the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has previously said on this subject.

This is what my distinguished friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] had to say about the information agency on the floor of this House on the 4th of April 1952 when we were debating a similar bill:

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, when you get an outfit that is not doing a good job, some people think that the way to improve it is to throw a lot more money into it before it cleans up. My own idea of handling that kind of disease is to cut it down some until it gets straightened out. That is what this cut in the estimate is supposed to do.

It is utterly amazing how 5 years later viewpoints can change as they do.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, may I say to my colleague from New York, in five years the agency has learned something, and it has learned enough to get out of the committee, of which the gentleman is the chairman, $110 million last year. Why did you cut it down to $103 million this time?

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman recalls, I am sure, that for the present year I did not want to give them the $110 million, but the gentleman from New York and others in that markup insisted upon it.

Mr. COUDERT. Did you yield to it? Did you go along with it? Did it come out of your subcommittee?

Mr. ROONEY. That was the amount in the bill which I am supposed to present on the floor of the House as the action of the full committee. I had to go along on giving them $110 million.

Mr. COUDERT. One more point I would like to draw to the attention of the members of the Committee of the Whole. My good friend from New York, Mr. ROONEY, has made much of and has provoked a certain amount of amusement in his references to the cultural program conducted by the State Department. Actors, entertainment, cruises around the world at public expense for the purpose of creating public good will, and yet he and his majority allowed in this bill the exact amount for the cultural program that is carried in the current year. Yet when he comes to the United States Information Agency, for which he went along for $110 million in the current year and ultimately $113 million, he cuts them down by $10 million.

I would like to know what has happened in the last 12 months to make that difference.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has consumed 24 minutes.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I have agreed with the subcommittee on this bill except in one instance, and that was the instance of the United States Information Agency. I reserved on that item because it was my opinion that we should have given to them what they had last year; that is, $113 million, plus their retirement fund and a specific authorization for the building of one new installation. I shall come to my reasons on that later.

There are a few items that I think should be discussed. I admit that this report, although accurate and truthful, is in a sense an indictment. I can well understand perhaps why some of the Members of the House in reading this report may wonder why we are appropriating anything for these agencies, in face of this indictment. It is unfortunate that a report of this kind does not tell some of the good things and some of the constructive items that should be put into a report on these departments and agencies. But of course we have that situation today where, with all due respect to my distinguished chairman [Mr. ROONEY], he is not completely known in this House as being one who does not engage at times in partisanship. In the consideration of these bills may I say to the gentleman I do not think in committee it is particularly partisan, but occasionally the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] will take the floor and he will be just a little partisan at times. All of us who have known him over the years know that to be the fact, and perhaps that is the reason why this report is in the shape that it is. I would rather assume that if the situation reversed in the executive department today, this report would be in glowing terms of the accomplishments of the administration. But we must meet this thing as it is. We must face the facts. That is true. As I said, and I say it in all fairness and all candor, I could not point to a single item in this report that is not based upon fact.

But I would say this, that when you come down to talking about facts I noticed that the press the other day took a great interest and great delight in finding one section of this report which said that requests for funds for 1958 included such niceties abroad as swimming pools, clubhouses, cabin boats, mountain retreats, beach huts, and cabanas.

That makes good reading. That is a matter that would be of interest to the people who would pick up papers and read. But, Mr. Chairman, I will say to you very frankly, and it appears in the hearings, I think there are some places in this world where we owe it to those who make up our first line of defense in those areas to give them some recreational opportunities. We must do so for the morale of the service.

I do not agree with everything for which they ask in this bill, but I want the record to show that I do not believe such facilities are out of line in certain places I could pick out such as Karachi, Saigon, Laos, and other areas which are most important to us in our fight against communism and say they need help of this kind. I would not say that there are not places where it would not be uplifting to the morale of our Foreign Service for the very benefit of our country to see that our people whom we send out there have some form of recreation.

Mr. Chairman, we went into Laos where we found our people living in native huts, where their water supply was brought from the Mekong River in tanks, put in gasoline drums out in front of their houses, where every time they lifted the top off the drum you could see wiggly, crawly things in the water. They had to take that water and boil it for drinking purposes and cooking, and use it also for their sanitation.

Some of the finest American youth are in these services, and I think when they are sent into areas of that kind with their families we owe them something more than they are receiving. I think the question of some recreation and some relief for them is good, and I would support it.

It is not in this bill. I think we could point out many places where these people who have gone there have done a magnificent job for this country.

As the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] has said, these are strenuous times, and times in which the people our State Department sends to these faraway places carry great responsibility not only for this Nation but also for the free world, and I think it is a shame that in a report of this kind there is nothing but castigation of the agency, and that we do not pay tribute to those who are carrying the load of the free world and the load of our own Nation in the preservation of peace and the fight against communism.

So I should like to take this time to pay tribute to them. There has been a little fuss made here about the Passport Office and I would just like to say in passing, that the GSA said they could get some machinery that would speed up the delivery of passports in the Passport Office. This committee gave it to them last year, but Miss Knight did not accept that machinery because she found it would not do the job.

Is she to be criticized for not accepting machinery that would not do the job which GSA said it would do? Are we to criticize her for not spending money for this equipment she knew would not do the work? I think she did what was right. Read the record and you will find that increases were not in her job.

Let me say this, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] in touching this matter complained bitterly that these people did things without telling the Appropriations Committee what they were doing.

You will find in this record that in the case of Miss Knight when they wanted to make some changes in her Division, the Passport Office, she had a paragraph put in which said she would agree to it provided consent was received from the Appropriations Committee of the two bodies of Congress. I think that she has done a magnificent job. We all remember what a fine job Mrs. Shipley used to do in that Department. Miss Knight is carrying on, she has expanded the Department and she has done an excellent job. As far as the Los Angeles office is concerned, the Committee on Foreign Affairs by legislation last year granted permission to open these offices the gentleman from New York now complains about. There is the authority. She had a right to do it. Are we going to continue to complain about operations for the benefit of the American people? That is what your Passport Office is for.

Now, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] on the question of acquisition of buildings abroad. When I was first assigned to the Committee on Appropriations, one of the specific assignments given to me by the chairman of the subcommittee was the matter of acquisition of buildings abroad. I made a study of that matter at that time and I have tried to stay with it as much as possible. If there is any one item in this bill that I do have personal knowledge of it is that particular question. May I say to the gentleman that I believe the program that has been established and that has been carried on for some years, is a good one. I believe that the $15 million we are using in foreign currency is being well used. Because under some of our agreements with foreign nations, we are limited to use some of this foreign currency for acquisition of building or buildings and for educational purposes, it has been a savings to the American taxpayers to use this foreign currency. The Foreign Building Office today under its operation is not attempting to build an empire, in my opinion. The new buildings are constructive and conservative. They are actually doing a good job in that department. I am very pleased to say that I think this particular item is well justified.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, we must appropriate some dollars but those are in cases where we have no foreign currency. We have great investments in our buildings and we must maintain them, we must repair them and assume costs for matters of that kind. It is necessary for us to use dollars in some of these instances. I think the item is one that has been well handled.

Mr. Chairman, may I now address myself to the rest of the bill? There has been no talk here about Justice and the Judiciary, but I would feel remiss if we did not point out in this bill that under the Justice Department the committee has recommended $101,450,000, the full amount of the budget estimate for the FBI. The fact that we have appropriated that full amount for the FBI, it seems to me, indicates the confidence of this committee and of the full Committee on Appropriations, and I am sure of the Members of the House, in the fine

work that has been done by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover. I am sure the House will go along with the idea that that is one agency we have complete confidence in, and we appreciate the fine work that has been done.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to join in the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio with regard to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and point out that, if I am not mistaken, this is his 40th year with the Department of Justice.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would like to touch briefly on the USIA. As I stated previously, I reserved on that because I felt we should have given them what they had last year. I did not feel they should have any more. If you will read the record of the USIA, not only this year but in the past, you will find in the hearings that I, along with the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], have been perhaps one of its most severe critics. I have dug into that Agency as hard as I could to try to show the mistakes which they made, and which I believe they made, and, in my opinion, I believe they have made a good many mistakes. But we are in a war, a cold war, for the battle of the minds of men all over the world. I do not believe, if we had an appropriation bill here for the Department of Defense, that if we found a division commander in one area of the world had wasted ammunition, that he had been extravagant in a particular way in the use of his military might—I do not believe we would have cut down the entire budget, and said, well, because one fellow over here has done that, we will undermine the possibility of complete victory in the end. And that is my feeling here, that we have an overall picture to go into in this terrific fight.

Now, here is what we are up against on this cut. We have a new man, Arthur Larson, as director of this agency, a man of great capability, proven in Government. Now we are bringing him into this Agency, and what are we doing? His first job, if this bill should be passed as it is now, is not to see what a constructive job he can do, but he is going to have to begin to cut down his department, get rid of people, and his time will be taken up in that rather than in a constructive job of realigning these programs and taking advantage of the hearings and the things that have been brought to his attention and correcting them and go forward in the main objective of a United States information agency. And, we are handicapping him. We are taking away from him the opportunity to get the job done. I have heard the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] say that if we had a proper agency, if we were doing the job we ought to do, he would appropriate many hundreds of millions of dollars more than there are in this bill, and so would I. I believe it is one of the most important functions we have.

In closing I would just like to say this, and I have permission from the President to say it. Last Thursday afternoon the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and myself were called to the White House and had a discussion with the President on this subject. The President said that we might quote him on the floor here today, that in his opinion this is one of the most important functions of the executive branch of the Government, and he feels that any substantial cut will endanger not only the free world but this country and our possibility of cutting the defense budget in the future by substantial amounts, and he believed that this amount should have been raised.

Mr. Chairman, let me say further on the USIA, the conspiracy of communism, seeking as it does to dominate the world by propaganda, subversion, and terror, is a threat to the freedom and individual liberties of Americans and all other peoples everywhere. Recognition of this basic fact has caused the United States to maintain an extensive Defense Establishment, to create by treaty and maintain an international defense structure involving many of the free nations of the world, and to maintain a worldwide information service to explain our country's objectives and policies and to counter Communist distortions and lies. These security requirements are costly and the burden upon the American people has therefore been a heavy one.

For almost 10 years the American people have carried a large share of the responsibility for keeping freedom's cause alive in many parts of the world. There have been disappointments and discouragements in meeting the challenge of Communist aggression. The national goal of peace and freedom has at times seemed remote, but recent international events lead us to believe that the long, hard road which has been forced upon our Government and people during these past 10 years is now beginning to bear fruit. There are notable signs that the conspiracy of communism is faltering in its drive toward world conquest, as evidenced by the Hungarian revolution and the steps taken by other nations to escape Moscow's domination.

To cover up these developing weaknesses in the system, the Communists have launched a propaganda offensive to conceal the true meaning of these developments, to confuse and divide the free world, and to facilitate their attempt to take over the Near and Middle East and the continent of Africa. Their free world countries can be conservatively estimated at many hundreds of millions of dollars per year.

In the light of this threat, plus the great responsibilities and opportunities created by recent international events, we believe that the proposed appropriation for the United States Information Agency is completely inadequate. The President has said and I have his permission to quote him:

> Let me add that in my judgment our information program offers one of the best hopes of promoting peace and world understanding with eventual reduction of world armaments, leading in days to come to substantial reductions in world military budgets, including our own.

For the above reasons, I believe the proposed appropriation for operations should have been the same as the last fiscal year.

I also believe that the need for a powerful medium-wave transmitter located in the eastern Mediterranean to improve United States radio broadcasts to Near East countries is critical, and that the full $4 million of no-year funds requested for this purpose should be granted. Existing unobligated funds may not be available for this purpose without canceling out an essential project already underway to construct a high power, short wave transmitter in Africa, needed to overcome Soviet jamming and to improve our broadcasts to Russia and the Iron Curtain countries.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I can readily understand a bill of this magnitude invokes many criticisms and much castigation. I also understand it is the criticisms and the castigations that make the headlines and not the solid work of the individual. I do not think, as we consider this bill, we should forget that there are thousands and thousands of competent, conscientious, honest men and women employed not only in the foreign service but in our services at home. These conscientious employees are working to make this a better country. While we point out the mistakes—and they should be pointed out—let us not forget that we have an obligation to the country to see that the reputations of these men and women employed in Government service are not destroyed without good cause.

Mr. Chairman, my purpose is to speak upon only one item in this particular bill, the Information Service. I want to repeat, it is not my purpose to try to restore the cut, because as much as I believe it should be restored, I am a practical legislator and I know that in all probability that view would not prevail at this time. I am laying the foundation in the hopes that when the legislation goes somewhere else it may be corrected and that then we will have another opportunity to review the funds.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, would the distinguished minority leader yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Is that "somewhere else" an alleged upper body that generally ups the appropriations?

Mr. MARTIN. I would not want to catalog the other branch of the Congress in that way, but that is where the bill will go.

No one wants to see the budget balanced more than I do. I am fully conscious that the heavily taxed American people are demanding a real retrenchment in spending, and I know how helpful that could be for the continuation of prosperity. However, there are some economy cuts that are not real economy. In the end they work in reverse.

That is how I catalog the Information Agency cut. We are living in a world where we are forced to worry about the future. We are faced with a formidable opponent who seeks to spread

his ideology all over the world. We face a foe spending literally billions of dollars in propaganda to deceive and confuse the peoples of the world. He distorts and lies about the real views of our country.

With this situation prevailing, I say it is a poor time to cut down on our propaganda efforts. Rather would I say it should be increased.

I know the severe criticism that has been directed against this agency from is inception. Unfortunately, a good deal of the criticism in the past was fully justified. Our efforts now should be directed toward improving rather than in reducing its efficiency.

Many at the first instance found employment in the agency merely because they were out of a job and sought employment, even if compelled to work abroad. I think we have got beyond that period. There are undoubtedly some who are still inefficient; there undoubtedly are some services that are foolish and services which duplicate those already in existence. I make no defense of these. I say these should be corrected, but let us not take our eye off the real objective of this Service which is to sell America and freedom to the peoples of the free world.

I do not know the Director very well. My acquaintance with him is decidedly casual. But he does appear to me as an aggressive and intelligent official who if given real support can and will make this service a mighty bulwark to the free world. Neither, may I add, do I have any particular friendships in his staff.

If there is any subject in the world I think I can speak with some semblance of an expert it is in the field of publicity and propaganda.

For over 60 years as a newsboy, high school reporter, reporter, editor, business manager and publisher, I have been affiliated with publicity and propaganda. And furthermore, as Chairman of the Republican National Committee for 3 years, when for most of the time the committee was broke and like the small boys in the horse and buggy days you rolled your own I gained further insight into these problems.

So I think I can speak with some authority. I do know that when competition becomes keen it is no time to curtail advertising. It is the concern that increases its advertising, adopts new methods, and gets out and hustles that wins.

This applies just as truly to politics and world policy.

A while ago a distinguished visitor from Ethiopia, a true friend of the United States, was talking with President Eisenhower. Why don't you double the volume of your radio, queried the friend. The big voice of Russia drives your messages off the airways. This is one suggestion why we should increase rather than diminish our efforts.

In the satellite countries of Europe, the Mideast, and the Far East, hundreds of millions of dollars are being poured into the fight against the free world. In this cold war, or as some call it the war of nerves, there can be no lagging. The loss of one or two of these key countries would be a disaster that would ultimately cost us vast sums of money and many lives. As a word of caution, we must not invite this disaster.

The service should be thoroughly scrutinized; only persons whose heart and soul belong to America should be employed. The service is more vital to America than most of our other services, and there can be no question in this agency of anyone's loyalty. If there is duplication, waste, or extravagance these can be corrected.

But my final warning is, let us work together with the agency to improve and make stronger this vital part of America's defense of the free world.

President Eisenhower has expressed deep concern over the cut. He says there is actually a pressing need to expand the work in many parts of the world. The President has stated it is critical that America's voice be more clearly heard in some spots and that the funds are a key part of our struggle for peace.

These are serious words and words, I am sure, will impress upon Congress the need of at least continuing the amount which has been available the past year.

Mr. Chairman, in the past we have spent huge sums for war; money that could be better devoted to making peace in this world. I hope the Senate will review this bill, and that it will be their judgment that we can give the President the money he says is essential for this vital part of America's fight to maintain freedom in this world and to make it possible for people to live peacefully and happily. To the President has been given this responsibility. We should not handicap him as he strives for peace.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to deal first with the exhibit which is set on the table here in the well of the House, a wastepaper basket. I do not know whether that can be construed as an executive type wastepaper basket or just a plain wastepaper basket. You will recall that a year ago, this committee learned the State Department was buying wastepaper baskets at a price of $27 apiece. As I understand from reading the hearings, the State Department may be expected henceforth to buy wastepaper baskets at the rate of $10 apiece.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I should like to say in connection with this subject of wastepaper baskets that the State Department at least listened to the committee in this regard and saved $17 on each of the wastepaper baskets. We are now trying to get them to recline on executive davenports that would not cost $264.50 each.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, that too makes very interesting reading in the hearings. Getting back to the wastepaper basket situation, I went down to our House office supply room and looked over the wastepaper baskets. I use a $1.25 steel wastebasket in my office. I found that this is the best you can buy in the House office supply room—at the rate of $2.25 each and they are guaranteed not to rip, ravel, or run down at the heel. I am sure the Department of State could get along very well with $2.25 wastepaper baskets or something very similar, if not the $1.25 numbers.

I want to commend the chairman of the House committee and those members of the subcommittee who so ably assisted him in developing some of the things that we are able to read in these hearings. If you have not read them, you ought to take a little time and read them even though this appropriation bill may have been disposed of. I want to commend the gentleman from New York. However, I must say I do not think he has gone far enough in cutting the State Department and international organizations. At the proper time, I propose to offer amendments to cut the State Department and the appropriations for the various leaching international organizations.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. When we get to that point, I shall probably be with President Eisenhower.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman can take any position he wants to. The gentleman has not reduced many items in this bill below last year's appropriation. We do not begin to plow fertile ground in this business of trying to reduce spending and help the taxpayers of this country by relieving their burdens—and I am not one of those who comes down here in the well of the House to say to you that I think you can have your cake and eat it too, as some of the preceding speakers have done—to repeat, you do not plow fertile ground here until you cut below last year's appropriations. That is where we are going to have to go if we are going to give the taxpayers of this country any relief.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman says last year's appropriations—does the gentleman refer to this fiscal year of 1957?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I was in error. I meant the present fiscal year.

Mr. ROONEY. If he is referring to that year, I should like to point out that the State Department has been cut $41,317,329.

Mr. GROSS. Let me interrupt the gentleman. In your own report, it says that when the new building funds are excluded from both the 1957 and 1958 figures the amount allowed is $1,102,671 over the appropriation for the current fiscal year.

Mr. ROONEY. That would include the matter of retirement contributions, required by law and over which the Congress has no control.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I understand that, but the State Department can easily absorb a $3 million reduction. I would remind the gentleman from New York that his committee report says the State Department has used deceit and deception in matters of personnel and various other things. What are you going

to do? Just slap them on the wrist and say—"go your way and sin no more." Why not give them a jolt by way of a cut and let them know that Congress—at lease the House of Representatives—refuses to be flimflammed.

Now what about this new Bureau of African Affairs? Of course that is the "foot in the door" to big, new giveaway program for the entire African Continent. We have not done too much in giveaways in that area, so the Bureau of African Affairs is for the purpose of opening up this vast new area in which to shovel out the dollars. The Assistant Secretary, which the other body voted just the other day, will put the capper on the sheaf.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has expired.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise very reluctantly at this point, realizing that no words of mine in the short time allowed me, and the few days given to study the hearings and the fewer still to even read the report, which I believe was only available on Friday, will change the attitude of any Member of this House.

I must make it clear that I have no brief for the Department of State, and I have no brief for the committee. I find myself unable to refrain from making a few comments which I trust will receive the consideration of the House.

I have served 16 years on the Committee on Foreign Affairs of this House. During that time life has changed very materially on this globe of ours. Major countries have lost their power and the United States has become the country to whom the free countries of the world look for advice, guidance, assistance, and above all, for strength.

I regret exceedingly, Mr. Chairman, that the committee report did not give a more balanced view of what the Department stands for and does. I think it is always most unfortunate when only complaints and criticisms are given. There are always two sides to everything. There is never only one side. Never. To me, the tenor of the report in certain places is very unfortunate. To talk about swimming pools, clubhouses, and mountain retreats, as though they were being put into every single foreign service post is surely regrettable and unjust. My colleague from Ohio [Mr. BOW], brought out the fact that in the various places for which such requests have been made, the need for them is vital. Then we come to the representation allowance. I find it difficult to believe that there are still people who no not realize what the reasons for it are—nor how important it is.

Have you ever had to ask for the accounts in a consulate? Once it was my job to do that. Our United States representative at a small post gave a dinner for me and my colleagues, 14 people that same night. The next morning I asked my hostess where the money was coming from, and she did not want to tell me. When I told her I had gone over the accounts, she said, "Well, it is my whole year's dress allowance." Her contribution to saving face for the United States. Can we be proud of that?

Recently while I was out of the country, I found that in a certain spot where a change of personnel has made the most marvelous difference in the whole aspect of our service there. But I found that our representatives there, in order to meet and to entertain the people important to us they were having to put their hands into their own pockets. Again, Mr. Chairman, I could not be proud of the necessity put upon them.

For a moment, Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak of Africa. As you all know, I have been there. I have probably been to more places in Africa than anybody in this House and probably more than any one person in the State Department.

I want to tell you that in spite of some of the comments that have been made since our return from Africa this last time, the Communists are going in there in full force. They have been moving in there for many years; but, believe me, they are pouring in every form of ammunition in their well-equipped arsenals. If you do not realize it I think it would be well for you to open your eyes and your ears, and perhaps take a trip.

We cannot do what the Communists do; we do not want to. But we certainly can give our people out in those areas something to use, something adequate to work with, and I hope immeasurably that we will take a realistic view of the whole situation in Africa. That is the last continent left. Do we want it to go like China, like Asia? I assure you it is going fast unless we do the things we should do to protect our country unless we take a long look ahead and set our feet upon a clear and constructive road and then stay on it.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to quarrel with the committee on any cuts they have made, because obviously they have sat through long hearings. They heard the justifications, and they have much information that I do not; but I have heard some Members make an attack on the item for Africa, particularly the Assistant Secretary for African Affairs. I believe that is the title. I would just like to tell you that the Russians are very frank to admit that they think the struggle for the domination of the world will be decided by who ultimately controls the African Continent, or, rather, who ultimately controls the raw materials and the disposition of the raw materials from the African Continent.

I do not think the Russians are half as interested in the Near East for the sake of the Near East or even for the oil that is there, as they are because the Near East is the land bridge between Russia and the continent of Africa.

America has been rich in raw materials, and we in some cases have been prodigal in our use of them, but the greatest source of undeveloped raw materials in the world today is the continent of Africa. At the moment we are drawing certain strategic materials and raw materials from Africa, and we will need them in ever-increasing amount as time goes on.

I certainly concur in what the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] has said about the importance of Africa, and I know that the Russians are making a tremendous effort to move in there to dominate the thinking of the peoples of Africa and ultimately control those raw materials.

I was glad to hear the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee say that even though legislation had not yet been passed to create the Office of Assistant Secretary for African Affairs, the committee thought it was important and that ultimately it would be created, and that they had included money in this appropriation measure for it.

I do not know how much attention we as individual Members of Congress have paid to this thing. It would be easy after this continent has slipped behind the Iron Curtain, if it should, to point the finger and say "Well, we should have been more alert, we should have done something about it."

Now is the time to be alert, before we lose it, because if the Communists can control the Near East and move in force into Africa the time will come, and it will come within our generation, when they can put a squeeze on us for raw materials that are not only vital to our military machine but which will also be vital if we are to maintain our standard of living and if we are to improve.

So I hope that any amendments that may be offered or adopted, for the sake of economizing on a few dollars this year we will not be doing something which will cost us billions of dollars in years to come, billions that we can ill afford to spend.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN].

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of directing some inquiries to one phase of the USIA program which in my mind needs a little clarification. I understand this program involves the giving away of a large number of subscriptions to two of the New York newspapers printed in Europe. I would like to direct the question to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] just for general purposes: Why are these subscriptions being given away?

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman asks me why they want to give them away?

Mr. SHEEHAN. Yes.

Mr. ROONEY. To 640 or more Members of the British Parliament?

Mr. SHEEHAN. That is right.

Mr. ROONEY. I cannot answer that question. I cannot justify such an expenditure.

Mr. SHEEHAN. May I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] does he have any knowledge of why these particular subscriptions are given away?

Mr. COUDERT. I can only say to the gentleman a great many thousand Americans read those particular newspapers abroad and at home. If they are good enough to give American information to Americans, I suppose the USIA thought them a good source of information for foreigners.

Mr. SHEEHAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COUDERT. It seems to me this is a place where reasonable men may reasonably differ.

Mr. ROONEY. Of course, the gentleman from New York is not talking of one copy of these newspapers being handed to a Member of the British Parliament. These are annual subscriptions to six-hundred and forty-some Members of the House of Lords and the House of Commons. Subscriptions at a cost of $155 a year each send these papers to Pakistan and India. I do not know, maybe it is all right to send a copy or so once in a while or in connection with a particular matter, but I still cannot justify this costly operation.

Mr. SHEEHAN. I thank the gentleman.

Well, now, I believe the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] may have hit the nail on the head for me because he said if those papers are good enough to give the American viewpoint, they ought to be good enough to give our viewpoint to the Europeans. Well, that is where I disagree with him heartily. The purpose of the free subscriptions is to let the European people know how we think. Certainly, from my point of view the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune, with their extreme internationalism, if I may say so, do not represent my viewpoint, nor the viewpoint of the great majority of American people.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEEHAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. Bear in mind that these two particular newspapers, the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune, are distributed abroad by this agency because of the fact they have European publishing bases. That is the only reason. None is distributed in the Far East. They are distributed in the East, in Africa and in the European area where it is far cheaper to distribute them than to get newspapers from the United States.

Mr. SHEEHAN. I thank the gentleman. The hearings on page 263 show that subscriptions are sent to Pakistan and India at $155 and $122 yearly cost. I am sure a great many of the midwestern newspapers, like the Chicago Tribune, and the Chicago Daily News and the Chicago American and a great many other newspapers would be happy to contribute free subscriptions and send them over by airplane so they would reach there the same day or the next day. It would give the European people a viewpoint different from that of the internationalist New York papers.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEEHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Unfortunately, I had to be out of the chamber for a minute or two. Do I understand Members of this House defend this nearly half-million-dollar appropriation for annual subscriptions to these New York papers that are being sent all over Europe?

Mr. SHEEHAN. They will have to answer for themselves. I cannot answer for them.

Mr. GROSS. That is as amazing as some of these other things we see here.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEEHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Is this not the only way that Parliament can be assured they can get their foreign aid every year?

Mr. SHEEHAN. According to the hearings the following amounts will be spent for newspapers during 1958:

New York Times	$255,475
New York Herald Tribune	177,584
Total	433,059

The point I want to make is this: It seems to me we are giving these two newspapers a tremendous amount of money to do a job that could be done in another way so that other viewpoints could be given. For instance, I understand that Mr. John S. Knight, publisher and editor of the Chicago Daily News, stated that our own good President reads mainly only three newspapers. I do not mean he reads only three, but he reads the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, and the Washington Post, as the main source of his news. Well, if you ever had 3 peas in a pod, these 3 newspapers express the same international and political philosophy and certainly the President as well as the people of Europe should read other newspapers to get the real American viewpoints. It seems to me, by spending all this money, that the agencies should do something to see that other viewpoints are given to the people in Europe, and I would certainly advise that the agency check with the Middle West, the Far West, the Far North and the Far South to see to it that other newspapers and viewpoints are distributed which would give an American viewpoint from an overall picture and not strictly an ultra-liberal New York international viewpoint. These two papers, as Mr. John S. Knight of the Chicago Daily News so well stated editorially they plump "for restrained internationalism; they hardly reflect the temper and pulse of the country."

Some point has been made that some of these are given to libraries. According to my figures, of the 6,459 subscriptions to the New York Times, 5,829 are given away free to people and only 630 go to libraries. The New York Herald Tribune, of 5,298 subscriptions, 4,975 are given away to influence people and personnel and only 323 are given to libraries. In other words, the greatest part of these free subscriptions go to individuals.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEEHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Not only is money spent for newspapers, but a good many of the writers on these newspapers get pay-off money from the United States Government.

Mr. SHEEHAN. That has been proven. A gentleman from the New York Times got a lot of money recently when he wrote a sports article going to Tokyo where there was no distribution of the paper. Be that as it may, I intend to propose an amendment to cut some of this out, or to influence the officials of the State Department and the United States Information Agency to get a more rounded viewpoint to the foreigners.

In my opinion the editorial and international opinion of these two New York newspapers do not represent a true picture of American thinking, and if President Eisenhower, as well as our State Department would also read such great midwestern newspapers as the Chicago Tribune, the Chicago Daily News, and the Chicago American the Europeans and the President would certainly have a much better understanding of the American viewpoint.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman on the Republican side in charge of the bill advise me where in this bill this item is carried? The gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT]. Will you advise me where this item in the bill is carried and how much it is?

Mr. COUDERT. It is in the lump sum item for USIA.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is the one where the committee cut from $140 million?

Mr. COUDERT. No. It was cut from $113 million, which is the current year, to $105 million.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thought the budget asked for $140 million.

Mr. COUDERT. One hundred and forty million dollars. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes. That is the one. What is the purpose of that? What is the money to be spent for?

Mr. COUDERT. It is to be spent to pay the expenses of the United States Information Agency which has been operating for many years.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not mean to interrupt. I understand that. But what particular objects are to be purchased? The language is, and I quote from lines 4, 5, and 6 "and purchase of objects for presentation to foreign governments, schools, or organizations."

Mr. COUDERT. It is to purchase the dissemination of information throughout the world relating to American foreign policy and promotion of American interests.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Promotion of American interests?

Mr. COUDERT. I believe so.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, does the gentleman not know? Well, pardon me again. Well, then, if that is it, why is there not some direction as to the kind of information that should be given abroad?

Mr. COUDERT. There is direction under the law. The State Department furnishes the direction.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, yes. I know. But if the State Department is to tell the people abroad what the feeling is in

this country, what the thinking is, why is there not something in the program that prevents information and opinions all coming from New York? From the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune. Those two papers, I understand, have control of the information. They make and release their views—the views of the East. Certainly they do not speak for the rest of the country.

Mr. COUDERT. There is varied dissemination of information including those two newspapers in limited areas.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And they give out what they think. Their opinions as to what policy we are following—should follow—abroad.

Mr. COUDERT. They are a very, very small part of the overall distribution of information through various media: the radio, television, newspaper, periodicals, books, lectures.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is enough. The gentleman has heard of the saying that one rotten apple in a barrel spoils the whole barrel sometimes. Not that either publication can be so characterized but other sections of the country have newspapers.

This is the point. If the gentleman wants the people in other countries, or if the committee or the agency wants. the people in other countries to have accurate information about all of America why pick just these two New York papers? No others? I understand the gentleman lives there, but some of us live west of the mountains. Why is it?

Mr. COUDERT. I can answer that, I am sure, to the gentleman's satisfaction.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I doubt it.

Mr. COUDERT. Those two newspapers bearing the New York name are published, one in Amsterdam and the other in Paris. That is why this agency took them. They were therefore the least expensive American newspapers available.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, nonsense on the cost suggestion—the Agency and the State Department spend millions if not billions. That is no reason for feeding the people we are trying to educate—perhaps they are better educated than are we—just one kind of information and international at that. Cost is no excuse for getting away off base. There are some people on the Pacific side. They tell me that there are some cities and States and some people west of New York. Why should they not have their views expressed to the people to whose welfare they are contributing millions.

Mr. COUDERT. For some reason or other there are no newspapers distributed in this fashion in the Far East. That is probably because there are no American newspapers published there. But we send teachers and propagandists by the hundred into those countries.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In other words, because there are two newspapers from New York that have plants over there, the Agency does not want those people to have anybody's views but those of the New York publishers and writers. The committee does not want to provide money to give the views of the people of all the rest of the country. Just little old New York and its interests.

Has the gentleman ever been out of New York? Surely, he has. The gentleman has been in the Midwest.

Mr. COUDERT. What is the Midwest?

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is that part of the country where sound, sensible, independent, self-reliant people live who pay enough tax to the Federal Government so you New Yorkers can buddy up with the people across the seas.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may give him my definition of the midwesterner?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman's definition of what?

Mr. COUDERT. My definition, a New Yorker's definition of a midwesterner is the fellow who sits in the seats of the show Fair Lady when he would like to get them, because the midwesterner gets them first.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Another definition of the people in the Midwest might be the folks who support New York, who pay the gangsters who operate on the waterfront, although we hope to get out from under those boys pretty soon, by using the St. Lawrence Seaway. The people in New York will miss us when we do not ship everything through New York ports all the time and pay the tariff charged by the bosses of the men on the docks.

Now, there is a serious side to this. There are papers in the Midwest which are just as apt to have a correct slant at the news, as, for example, the E. Herbert Norman case, as do the eastern and international press. I should like to read, if I may, a small part of what the Chicago Tribune says. That is one of the papers that gives some Midwest views. While the press of the East belabors a Senate committee, Edwards of the Tribune wrote and I read:

CLASH OVER ENVOY SUICIDE—SENATE GROUP RIPS CLAIMS OF STATE DEPARTMENT—CANADA CENSORS DEATH NOTE

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, April 11.—The mysterious suicide of a Canadian ambassador in Cairo, Egypt, a week ago continued today to provoke international repercussions.

The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, target of angry attacks by the Canadian Government for having "hounded" the diplomat to his death, issued a statement explaining its position and then withdrew it—too late to prevent its publication.

The United States Government began study of a threat by Canada to hold back "security information" from American intelligence agencies unless Congressional committees are barred in the future from access to such reports.

DETAILS KEPT SECRET

The story hidden under these surface events is one of potentially grave proportions. The details are known to the intelligence agencies of three nations—Great Britain, Canada, and the United States. They may be held back for years or never disclosed because, in the customary diplomatic phrase, they might "jeopardize relations with friendly nations."

There are reports in high circles here that a "security leak" of top-secret information in the Middle East was under investigation when Ambassador E. Herbert Norman leaped to his death from a high Cairo building, April 4.

Norman left two suicide notes, couched in hysterical vein. Two brief excerpts were made public but the major portion of one note has been withheld. It may contain the motive for the tragic decision to end his life.

BLAME SENATE REPORT

The published portions of Norman's suicide notes give no clue to his motive. To his wife, he wrote, begging her forgiveness. To a friend, Swedish Minister Carl Eng, he wrote: "I have no option. I must kill myself for I live without hope."

But Canadian officials, led by Lester B. Pearson, Secretary of State for External Affairs, have repeatedly asserted that Norman's motive was mental grief occasioned by the "slanders and unsupported insinuations" of the Senate subcommittee.

This was a reference to publication by the subcommittee on March 14 of a security report naming Norman as a past Communist Party member and disclosing that he had been questioned in the Canadian spy case of 1946 concerning his connections with one of its principal figures.

WITHDRAWAL EXPLAINED

These charges, Pearson said, were "old and discredited" and Norman had been "cleared" of them by his government in 1951. Pearson thus questioned the authenticity of the security report in the subcommittee's record which was introduced by Chief Counsel Robert Morris.

It was to this point that Chairman EASTLAND, Democrat, Mississippi, and Senator JENNER, Republican, Indiana, ranking minority member, addressed themselves in the statement issued today which was later withdrawn. There was no question of White House or Government pressure in this withdrawal, EASTLAND said.

The statement was given to press associations by a staff member not acquainted with a decision to hold it back after it had been prepared.

REFUSES TO KILL DISPATCH

President Eisenhower, EASTLAND noted, had said at his press conference yesterday that he hoped "this thing will now be dropped." The President had voiced his "great sorrow" over the decline in Canadian-American relations caused by the incident but pointed out that the Senate had independent authority to investigate and publish the results of its investigations.

Under these circumstances, EASTLAND said, the subcommittee was prepared to remain silent although many of its members are highly resentful of what they regard as unjustified attacks from Canada.

The statement was already on press wires when the staff member's error in releasing it was discovered 20 minutes later. One press association refused to "kill" its dispatch and the rival press associations then decided not to observe EASTLAND'S request.

TOLD OF CORROBORATION

EASTLAND and JENNER asserted the State Department had been asked by the subcommittee to verify from the Federal Bureau of Investigation "the truth and accuracy of the subcommittee information and evidence concerning Norman."

"The State Department informed the subcommittee that it had already checked with the FBI and had corroborated the truth and accuracy of the subcommittee's information and evidence," the statement continued.

A trace of the subcommittee's indignation was glimpsed in the next paragraph:

"The internal security subcommittee is conscious of its duties and obligations to the Senate and the American people. The subcommittee shall at all times conduct its responsibilities in this light."

CLEARED FOR PUBLICATION

Concerning the State Department's disclaimer that it was not responsible for re-

lease of the information on Norman, the statement said:

"The State Department did not and could not disclaim the action. The truth is that before the testimony, which contained reference to Ambassador Norman was released, the transcript was cleared for publication by the State Department. The release was then approved by every member of the subcommittee [4 Democrats and 4 Republicans] except 1, Senator NEELY, Democrat of West Virginia, who was ill."

The State Department, through a press spokesman, Lincoln White, promptly reported that the subcommittee had "misinterpreted" a "clearance" by Robert Cartwright, Acting Chief of Security. White said that Cartwright only had authority to say whether publication would jeopardize security or relations with Canada.

SENATORS JOIN FIGHT

Meanwhile, debate continued to rage over the incident with such subcommittee foes as Chairman GREEN, Democrat, of Rhode Island, Senators NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon, and HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, seizing the opportunity to fulminate against "attempts to destroy relations" with Canada.

Amid the uproar of charges and countercharges, the average American and Canadian could not be blamed for confusion. Uppermost in many minds is the question: "How did a United States Senate subcommittee get into an inquiry into the Communist connections of a Canadian diplomat and how do they justify it?"

CHRONOLOGICAL ACCOUNT

Here is a chronological account of the Norman affair which may supply the answer.

On August 7, 1951, Counsel Morris was questioning Prof. Karl Wittfogel, a distinguished historian on the faculty of Columbia University. The inquiry concerned the Institute of Pacific Relations [IPR] which, the subcommittee eventually was to find, was "an instrument of Communist policy, propaganda, and intelligence" which exercised great influence upon the State Department.

Wittfogel was an admitted former Communist who ran a Communist study group in 1938. He named a number of students who were members of the group. One of them, he said, "was a talented and pleasant young man who was studying in the Japanese department at Columbia. His name is Herbert Norman." It was "obvious," Wittfogel said, that Norman was a Communist.

The name of Norman was unknown to the subcommittee. But subsequent hearings developed that he was deep in the affairs of the IPR.

Norman, it developed, was born September 1, 1909, in Japan, the son of missionary parents. He received his early education in Japan and became fluent in the language. He studied at Harvard and Columbia and entered the Canadian Foreign Service in 1939.

In 1940, Norman was sent to Tokyo as language officer in the Canadian Legation. He subsequently became the Canadian Minister.

The records of the IPR hearings are replete with references to Norman. One note, sent by the head of the IPR in the United States to a subordinate in Japan, said: "Any very secret messages might be sent care of Herbert Norman at the Canadian Legation."

DEMANDS JAP'S PAPERS OF FBI

In 1942, Norman was repatriated because of the war. His first act, upon returning to the United States, was to visit the FBI in Washington. Declaring himself a representative of the Canadian Government on "confidential" business, he demanded the personal papers of Tsuru Shigeto, a Japanese student at Harvard and a close friend, who had been sent back to Japan.

According to the security report put into the record, Norman was unsuccessful. He admitted to the FBI that he was not representing his government. The papers he sought were placed in the record. They revealed a detailed program for Communist indoctrination of American students in the 1930's.

When World War II ended, Norman went back to Japan. He became the chief of the Canadian diplomatic mission attached to the supreme commander of allied forces in the Pacific, General MacArthur.

In 1946, the Canadian spy case broke as a result of revelations by Igor Gouzenko, a code clerk in the Russian Embassy at Ottawa, Norman was called back to Canada for questioning concerning his relations with Israel Halperin, one of the principal figures in the case.

PROPOSED FOR TOP POST

Apparently exonerated of any blame for this relationship, Norman went back to Japan, where he served until 1950. After a year of service at the United Nations headquarters in New York, he was sent to New Zealand as chief of the Canadian mission. Late in October 1956, he arrived in Cairo, as Ambassador to Egypt and Minister to Lebanon.

The subcommittee's records on the IPR hearings mentioned Norman's Canadian legation connections and referred to his "identification as a Communist." The Canadian Government in 1951 issued a press release declaring that Norman had been "cleared." But there was no international excitement at that time about the Senate subcommittee's investigation of a Canadian official.

Meanwhile, the subcommittee's interest in Norman had been intensified by discovery of a State Department memorandum in which Norman was proposed for the post of intelligence liaison between the United States and Canada, a post in which he would have access to top-secret information of both countries.

DEEMED PROPER SUBJECT

Norman's relations with American diplomats thus were deemed a proper subject of inquiry by the subcommittee despite his status as a foreign diplomat. It was in the light of this background record that the subcommittee last March 12 summoned John K. Emmerson, Deputy Chief of Mission in the American Embassy in Lebanon, for questioning.

Senator JENNER had noted in a Senate floor speech the curious fact that many of the American diplomats who had adopted a pro-Communist attitude in the postwar period in China and Japan were now stationed in the troubled Middle East area.

After lengthy questioning in executive session about his recommendations concerning the use of Japanese Communists in the Far East, Emmerson was quizzed about his relations with Norman.

IDENTIFICATION RECORDED

He disclosed that he and the Canadian were friends of 17 years standing. Reluctantly, he disclosed that he and Norman had met briefly in Beirut, Lebanon, last October 27. His sworn testimony indicated that this meeting was largely accidental and certainly not by arrangement.

Counsel Morris then placed the security report on Norman in the record. This report was partly based on information provided to the FBI by the Canadian Royal Mounted Police. It identified Norman as a past Communist Party member and a member of a well known Communist front.

Counsel Morris obtained the approval of all subcommittee members, except the ailing Senator NEELY, got the consent of the State Department's security section, and then released this executive record on March 14. The storm broke.

CHANGES MEETING STORY

The next development was unusual. Emmerson asked permission to come back and change his testimony. He gave a new version of his meeting with Norman. It had been prearranged, lasted two hours, and the two diplomats had discussed their respective clearances of disloyalty charges [Norman in 1951 and Emmerson in 1952]. Norman, it transpired, had helped Emmerson at his loyalty hearing with an affidavit.

This second transcript was released also, this time over State Department protests that it would "damage" relations with Canada. The record also disclosed that the FBI had corroborated the authenticity of the security report concerning Norman.

From the Tribune of April 13:

NORMAN ONCE A PAL OF REDS, SAYS PEARSON

(By Eugene Griffin)

OTTAWA, April 12.—Lester B. Pearson, Minister for External Affairs, told the House of Commons today he knew that E. Herbert Norman, Canadian Ambassador to Egypt, who took his own life, had "certain Communist associations."

Pearson did not deny any of the United States Senate subcommittee charges against Norman.

John Diefenbaker, the leader of the Progressive Conservative opposition, confronted Pearson with this question:

"Will the Minister say that the allegations and the statements before the subcommittee of the United States Senate on March 13 and 21, specifically were untrue, unjustified, and had no basis in fact?"

BARED RED CONNECTIONS

The subcommittee has alleged that Norman had belonged to a Communist cell at Columbia University in 1939; had been identified as a member of the Communist Party in 1940 by a United States security agency, and had tried to obtain Communist data from Federal Bureau of Investigation files on false pretenses during World War II.

Pearson dealt with only part of the allegations, which concerned Norman's Communist associations at the university.

"Mr. Norman as a university student was known to have associated with Communists, or persons thought to have been Communists, and he made no secret of it," Pearson said.

KNEW OF ASSOCIATION

"These associations were of course known to us. We examined Mr. Norman's record on the basis of confidential information. I examined this information more than once myself."

Pearson said that as a result of a security checkup on Norman the Government was left with no doubt that Norman was a loyal Canadian, suitable for important posts.

Diefenbaker challenged Pearson to answer his question, which he repeated, as to whether the subcommittee's charges were "untrue, unjustified and had no basis in fact."

FACE GROWS RED

Pearson, whose face grew pink as crowds in the public galleries stared down at him, fidgeted, and refused to make a flat denial of any of the subcommittee's allegations.

"I've made my statement," he said. "I will stand on that."

"The answer is an equivocal one," Diefenbaker said in a loud, prosecutor's voice, pointing his finger at the Minister across the aisle.

"He equivocates. He has the statements released by the subcommittee in connection with its hearings of March 13 and March 21.

"He knows what charges and allegations were made. He has come into this House with a prepared statement, but he has not denied those charges."

HITS MINISTER'S THREAT

Diefenbaker then attacked Pearson's threat to the United States State Department 2 days ago to stop the exchange of security data across the border. Pearson demanded that the United States Government guarantee that information involving Canadian suspects shall not be given to investigating committees.

Diefenbaker pointed out that the threat was "meaningless" if information from Canadian security sources had not provided the basis for the subcommittee's charges against Norman.

Pearson raced 120 miles back to Ottawa from Kingston, Ont., to handle Diefenbaker's question. He was on an election campaign speaking tour, which Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent and other ministers put off until Pearson could be brought in.

PREMIER ALOOF FROM CASE

St. Laurent has been noticeably aloof from the case of Norman, who leaped to death from a high building in Cairo on April 4. In this country the suicide has been blamed on "persecution" and "false" charges by the American Senate subcommittee.

When Pearson and opposition party leaders paid their respects to Norman in Parliament on the day of his death, St. Laurent uttered only one sentence, in which he did not even use Norman's name or refer to him directly.

Diefenbaker at that time proposed that the parliamentary flag be lowered to half staff, a suggestion which pleased Pearson and others, but the flag was not lowered. This has been attributed to a direct negation by St. Laurent of Diefenbaker's idea.

COMMITTEE DENOUNCED

Papers and broadcasts have been denouncing the subcommittee's statements as false, and Pearson has appeared to have described them as untrue, although actually he has said only that they have been "dealt with" or "disposed of" by this Government.

M. J. Coldwell, leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Association, a Socialist group which has been extremely critical of the Senate subcommittee, also requested the Government to explain away the Communist allegations against Norman. "I think this should be cleared up immediately, specifically, and categorically," he said.

ELECTION JUNE 10

Parliament was expected to be dissolved late today for a general election on June 10, and the Liberal administration's handling of questions about Norman could have important bearing on the results.

Canadian suspicious outside the Government that there might be truth in the subcommittee's allegations have been increasing. A growing number of Canadians have asked just how the Department of External Affairs came to give Norman what Pearson called a "clean bill of health" in 1951.

At that time, Pearson said that Norman had been investigated, but he did not specify by whom, and the Government never has revealed what particular charges were investigated, or whether they had been found factual or false.

An editorial columnist in the Toronto Globe and Mail noted today that the Government has been excessively secret concerning the Norman affair.

"The Canadian Government has within its power to lay out, point by point, the facts upon which it decided in 1951 that Mr. Norman's loyalty and integrity were in all respects beyond doubt, and it has not only failed to do so, but it has refused to do so," the paper's Ottawa correspondent wrote.

"I have been trying for a week to get from the Department of External Affairs the answers to the specific allegations which were made against Mr. Norman by the United States investigators. This has produced nothing except reasons why it is impossible to do so, none of them particularly convincing."

Let me read from the Brooklyn Tablet published April 13:

NORMAN SUICIDE STARTS SMEARS BY THE LEFTISTS—ROBERT MORRIS, COUNSEL FOR SENATE INVESTIGATORS, IS SINGLED OUT FOR ATTACK—MERELY CITED EVIDENCE—RECALLED SWORN TESTIMONY ON COMMUNIST AFFILIATIONS OF CANADIAN OFFICIAL

(By Francis Carroll)

WASHINGTON.—Fourteen months ago Robert Morris relinquished his judgeship in the New York City Municipal Court to become chief counsel for the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

The financial sacrifice was public knowledge. It was in the thousands of dollars. But the potential personal sacrifice was even greater. He was inviting the treatment given to Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY of Wisconsin, who dared go beyond grandiloquent condemnation of the Communist conspiracy and expose the conspirators themselves.

The Communists, pro-Communists and anti-anti-Communists realized that the persecution of Senator MCCARTHY had not fazed Mr. Morris and they decided he also must be destroyed. Only a plausible occasion was needed—an occasion, that is, which could be perverted to smear him with the facts being submerged so deep they would not distract attention from the smear.

SUICIDE PROVIDES OCCASION

The occasion offered itself last week. E. Herbert Norman, Canadian Ambassador to Egypt, committed suicide. This week the body was brought to Rome for cremation and the ashes were flown to Canada for final disposal.

Mr. Norman's name had been brought into hearings by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on March 12 and March 21. The witness was John K. Emmerson, Deputy Chief of Mission and Counselor of the United States Embassy at Beirut, Lebanon, and a friend for many years of Mr. Norman.

Mr. Emmerson was queried at length on his knowledge of activities of Mr. Norman that had caused the latter to be closely tied to the Communist Party by witnesses before the subcommittee over the past few years.

This testimony had to be recounted at the hearings, of course, so that Mr. Emmerson could comment upon it. His repeated protestations of his inability to recognize any evidences of procommunism in Mr. Norman made his testimony favorable to the latter. But the earlier testimony stood by itself, unchallenged and unrefuted.

Senator MCCARTHY was attacked because of his methods. The same charge could not be brought against Mr. Morris. The March 21 hearing was held to permit Mr. Emmerson to correct, revise, or amplify his testimony of March 12. Mr. Emmerson was appreciative of the opportunity and even added further enhancement to the prestige of Mr. Norman.

FEW WILL READ TRANSCRIPT

But few Americans will read the transcript of the testimony, as few read the transcript of Senator MCCARTHY's patient questioning of Gen. Ralph W. Zwicker, at that time commanding officer at Fort Monmouth. Those who do read transcripts of such testimony are not sufficiently influential in number or properly organized to interfere with a smear campaign formulated by the Communists, pro-Communists, and anti-anti-Communists.

The press and the supporting element which calls itself "liberal" were prepared for Mr. Morris, as they had been prepared for Senator MCCARTHY.

They raised the cry of, as one paper expressed it, "assassination by insinuation." The roles of the Senators on the subcommittee who released the earlier testimony of Mr. Norman and that of the acting State Department security chief, Robert Cartwright, who cleared it for release, were glossed over or completely ignored. Mr. Morris is the object to be destroyed.

Although he performed only his routine duty, Mr. Morris' dismissal for mischievous bungling has been demanded by the Americans for Democratic Action through its national chairman, Robert R. Nathan.

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon, lent a helping hand to the cause of the Communists, pro-Communists and anti-anti-Communists by calling for a Senate investigation of "the staff." The staff is composed of Mr. Morris, Associate Counsels J. G. Sourwine and William A. Rusher, Research Director Benjamin Mandel, and Investigations Analyst Robert McManus—of the subcommittee.

In the spirit of Christian charity, one may assume Senator NEUBERGER only knew what he had read in the newspapers, which in this instance, as in 1954, concealed more than they printed.

PEARSON DEPLORES "SLANDERS"

Lester B. Pearson, Canadian Prime Minister for External Affairs, reacted immediately to the resurrection of the earlier testimony against Mr. Norman. He termed the testimony "slanders and unsupported insinuations." He reminded the world the Canadian Government had absolved Mr. Norman of all Communist leanings in 1951.

Incidentally, one of the witnesses who stated unequivocally that he knew Mr. Norman to be a Communist was Prof. Karl August Wittfogel, who was a party member from 1920 to 1933.

Professor Wittfogel testified before the subcommittee August 7, 1951. He was never called upon to testify by the Canadian Government that exculpated Mr. Norman. Nor did the latter ever ask for his "day in court" to challenge the professor's charges. Nor, again, did Mr. Pearson specify the charges that were the "slanders and unsupported insinuations" to which he referred.

Mr. Pearson protested to the United States State Department—which he should know is part of the executive branch and not the legislative. He said Mr. Norman had his "wholehearted admiration."

Space forbids a detailed account of all the sworn testimony concerning Mr. Norman's activities of which Senator THEODORE GREEN, of Rhode Island, did not indicate that he was aware when he wrote to the Canadian Ambassador, A. D. P. Heeney:

"Judications that his (Mr. Norman's) death may have been attributable to unfortunate publicity arising from activities in connection with the work of the Senate lead me to express my deep regret to the Canadian Government and to the Norman family."

QUOTES PROFESSOR WITTFOGEL

As mentioned above, Professor Wittfogel made the most direct—and unchallenged—charge that Mr. Norman was a Communist. He told the subcommittee of a Communist study group conducted by one Moses Finkelstein in 1938. The professor's testimony is brief enough to be quoted. Questioned concerning the members of the study group, here is an excerpt from his testimony under oath:

"Mr. MORRIS. Who were some of the other students at this study group?

"Dr. WITTFOGEL. There was a talented and a pleasant young man who was studying in the Japanese Department at Columbia. His name is Herbert Norman.

"Mr. MORRIS. Was he a member of this study group?

"Dr. WITTFOGEL. Yes.

"Mr. MORRIS. To your knowledge, did he know it was a Communist study group?

"Dr. WITTFOGEL. Yes, it was obvious.

"Mr. MORRIS. To you?

"Dr. WITTFOGEL. I think it was obvious, in general.

"Mr. MORRIS. Was it obvious therefore that he was a Communist?

"Dr. WITTFOGEL. Yes."

At the March 21 hearing, Mr. Morris made this significant comment:

"I also think it is appropriate at this time to mention that I have spoken to Professor Wittfogel since last week and he said that to this day no official of the Canadian Government has ever called him up or asked him whether or not any of his testimony was in fact accurate."

CANADA BANNED QUESTIONING

Mr. Morris read from a United States Government executive agency security report which indicated that Dr. E. Herbert Norman had been recalled from Japan when his Government discovered certain Communist connections, specifically with Israel Halpern, a Canadian citizen of Russian parentage, who was one of the principals implicated in the exposed Soviet military intelligence operation in Canada.

He reminded Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER, of Indiana, that when he, the Senator, tried to have Gouzenko, one of those involved in the spy plot, testify, the Canadian authorities would not let him ask any questions whatever about anyone who was a Canadian personality.

"When Shigeto Tsuru, Japanese instructor at Harvard, was apprehended for repatriation purposes in 1942," Mr. Morris read from the report, "the FBI was approached by Norman who represented himself as an official on highly confidential business of the Canadian Government in an effort to take custody of Tsuru's belongings.

"One main item of these belongings was a complete record of the Nye munitions investigations, largely prepared by Alger Hiss.

"Norman later admitted to the FBI agents in charge that his was only a personal interest and that he was not representing the Canadian Government as stated.

"Another item among these belongings, as reported by the FBI, was a letter dated May 9, 1937, which related to a series of studies being promoted at Harvard by Tsuru which provided for the study of American capitalists from a Marxist viewpoint. The studies were conducted by a group of young instructors and graduate students which had met five times. They discussed certain papers which included American Imperialism by E. H. Norman."

The report further indicated, Mr. Morris added, that Norman was identified in February of 1940 as a member of the Communist Party.

One of the witnesses at the marriage of Norman to Laura Irene Clark on August 31, 1935, he noted, was one C. P. H. Holmes who has been identified as Charles P. H. Holmes, born in Japan in 1910 and known as a Communist and active in the Communist underground in Ottawa.

MR. TSURU TESTIFIES

Last month Mr. Tsuru testified that he had never actually been a Communist Party member or a Communist, but that he had knowingly associated with Communists.

He also admitted having been a leader in a study group of which Mr. Norman was also a member.

Mr. Morris quoted the following from a letter written by Mr. Tsuru in 1936: "To be a member of a study group may be a step toward enrolling in the Workers' School; it may be a step toward joining the American League Against War and Fascism; it may be a step toward becoming a member of the Young Communist League of the Party."

These facts and others were considered by the Senators on the subcommittee. They were submitted to the security division of the State Department and they received clearance for release. Mr. Morris' role was merely that of counsel, and in that role he read from testimony already received by the subcommittee and from official security reports. By so doing he is now charged with assassination by insinuation.

Then on April 15 the Herald Tribune carried a story as follows by David Lawrence:

CANADIANS REPORTED IN DOUBT ABOUT CASE OF ENVOY NORMAN

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, April 14.—Many Canadians are having second thoughts about the case of E. Herbert Norman, Canadian Minister to Cairo, who committed suicide recently. At first the charges that Norman had Communist connections were vehemently denounced as slander and it was announced at Ottawa that the Canadian Government had cleared Norman in 1951. Indeed, a note of protest was sent to the United States Government a few days ago deprecating the hearings of the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security which had revealed some derogatory information about Norman.

Now it turns out that there is a great deal of doubt as to what was really covered by the Canadian Government's denial as uttered by Lester Pearson, Secretary of State for External Affairs, and the mystery is as big as ever.

Last Friday certain questions were put to Mr. Pearson in the House of Commons at Ottawa, but for some unexplained reason what was said there was not transmitted very fully by most of the press services or else it was ignored on Saturday by those Eastern newspapers hereabouts which have been denouncing the State Department and the Senate subcommittee.

For it develops that despite the early dispatches saying the Canadian Government had found the charges against Norman to be baseless, and despite the later revelation by Mr. Pearson that Norman had had certain Communist associations, the Canadian Secretary of State refused to answer last Friday a direct question on this point by John Diefenbaker, the leader of the Progressive-Conservative opposition. Here was the question:

"Will the Minister say that the allegations before the subcommittee of the United States Senate on March 12 and 21 specifically were untrue, unjustified and had no basis in fact?"

Mr. Pearson in his speech dealt only with Norman's associations with Communists in his student days at Columbia. But he added that as a result of a security checkup on Norman and a personal examination of the reports the Canadian Government was left in 1951 with no doubt as to the loyalty of Norman and his suitability for important posts.

Notwithstanding this, Mr. Diefenbaker challenged Mr. Pearson to answer the question he had propounded and repeated it, demanding to know if the Senate subcommittee's charges were "untrue, unjustified, and had no basis in fact."

Mr. Pearson, however, said he had made his statement and would stand upon it. Mr. Diefenbaker retorted that "the answer is an equivocal one" and went on to say that Mr. Pearson had not denied the charges of the Senate subcommittee.

What were those charges? In a report from a secret agent of an important Government security service—it is not specified whether American or Canadian—the FBI learned in February 1940 that Norman was a member of the Communist Party of Canada.

Also in February 1942 Norman approached the FBI in Boston on behalf of his close friend, Tsuru Shigeto, Japanese instructor at Harvard, who had been interned. Norman wanted to get custody of some of Shigeto's papers and told the FBI he was on official and highly confidential business for the Canadian Government. Not long afterward, Norman changed his story and told the FBI it was only a personal interest on his part and that he was not representing the Canadian Government. Tsuru Shigeto admitted recently in testimony before the Senate subcommittee that he had Communist associations but said he was not a member of the Communist Party. His papers, however, convinced the authorities here that he was strongly sympathetic at the time to the Communist cause. He now says he is ashamed of those Communist associations.

Norman, in 1946, was in the counter-intelligence corps at MacArthur's headquarters in Tokyo representing the Canadian Government. The FBI was informed that he was recalled from Japan on the advice of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police who discovered certain Communist connections on the part of Norman. He was linked with Israel Halperin, a Canadian of Russian parentage who was one of the principals implicated in the exposed Soviet military intelligence operations in Canada as disclosed through the defection of Igor Gouzenko.

There were other factors in the background and Counsel Robert Morris read to the Senate subcommittee on March 12 last a paraphrase of one of the reports of a United States security agency dealing with those aspects. Mr. Morris then added to the record this very significant remark:

"This is all in connection with an inquiry that there was an effort being made to have Norman given the assignment of being a liaison between Canada and the United States intelligence."

This raised some interesting questions for the Senate subcommittee:

1. Who inside the American Government was sponsoring such a setup in 1950 just after the Korean war began?

2. What blocked it and what part did a letter from the FBI to the United States Army Intelligence play in preventing Norman from getting into such a key post in the United States?

3. Isn't it the duty of a Congressional committee to investigate administrative weaknesses which occur inside our Government here and with which suspected persons from abroad make contact?

4. Wasn't Klaus Fuchs cleared by the British Government before he went to work in the secret atomic laboratory in New Mexico?

5. Wasn't Burgess of the Maclean-Burgess scandal—who is now in Moscow advising the Soviets—cleared by the British Government when he became secretary of the British-Canadian-American Committee on Atomic Problems and thereby was given night and day access to the building of the Atomic Energy Commission in Washington?

6. Since Norman was identified as a Communist by information furnished directly to the Senate committee by important witnesses did he cease to be a Communist and in what year?

7. In his recent mission to Cairo what were Norman's contacts with American officials in the Middle East and what did they know of his background?

The proceedings of the Senate Internal Security Committee on March 21, 1957, show a significant passage in which Counsel Robert Morris, addressing Senator WATKINS, said:

"Senator, in that connection, we asked the State Department if the communication from the Canadian Government ever was to the effect that they discovered that Norman had been a Communist and that he is no longer one. The Department has informed us that that has never been the effect of any advice given them by the Canadian Government."

So the main question to which the Senate subcommittee still has not found the

answer is this: how long was Norman a Communist and what was the nature of his contacts with American officials in the Far East and in the Middle East?

Solon Low, national leader of the Socialists Credit Party in the Canadian Parliament, is quoted now as saying that the Pearson government, knowing of Norman's Communist associations, should never have sent him to Cairo last November and was responsible for the tragedy. Mr. Diefenbaker said he too couldn't understand the reasoning of the Pearson government in giving delicate posts to a man with a background of Communist associations. Norman presided over the all-important desk on Far Eastern affairs in the Canadian Government at Ottawa during the critical months of the Korean war and was later acting head of the Canadian delegation to the United Nations in New York.

Since other members of the British Commonwealth openly sided with England and France in the attack on Suez the Canadian Minister to Cairo became a key figure in Egypt. Prominent members of the Canadian Parliament now are saying if Norman hadn't been sent to a post in Cairo—where he was naturally in possession of vital information concerning diplomatic moves of the Western powers—the whole episode would never have arisen.

The Times gets around to a little different slant:

PEARSON SCORED ON NORMAN CASE—CANADIAN PRESS CRITICIZES DELAY IN CONCEDING ENVOY ONCE HAD COMMUNIST TIES

(By Raymond Daniell)

OTTAWA, April 15.—Popular indignation toward the United States over a Senate subcommittee's charge of disloyalty against one of Canada's leading diplomats changed today to criticism of the Canadian Government over its handling of the case.

Tirades of bitter denunciation of the Senate subcommittee were set off April 4 by the suicide in Cairo of E. Herbert Norman, Canadian Ambassador to Egypt. He jumped to his death from the roof of an apartment house after charges of Communist affiliation by the United States Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, first leveled at him in 1951, had been revived.

His suicide under the circumstances prompted the Canadian Government to threaten to halt the exchange of security information unless the administration in Washington could give a pledge that such information, involving Canadians, would not be divulged to Congressional committees, over which the executive branch had no control.

Until last Friday, statements by Lester B. Pearson, Secretary of State for External Affairs, had led the Canadian people to believe there was not a word of truth in the charges that Mr. Norman once had been an associate of Communists.

COMMUNIST LINKS REVEALED

Then, under opposition pressure, Mr. Pearson revealed that in his student days Mr. Norman had associated openly with Communists in his university student days, but that ultimately he had "learned that he had had mistaken beliefs and had been following a false ideology."

This belated revelation came as a shock to many Canadians, who felt their Government had been less than frank with Parliament. John Diefenbaker, leader of the Conservative opposition, made it clear at once that the issue would play an important part in the election campaign just getting under way.

He took the line that if Mr. Pearson had been completely candid with Parliament when the charges were first made in 1951 they would not have been revived in 1957 and Mr. Norman might be alive today.

However, in 1951 Mr. Pearson said that charges of Mr. Norman's "alleged previous association with the Communist Party" had been fully investigated and that he had received a clean bill of health after a security check in Canada. Again when the charges were revived last March Mr. Pearson said they should "be treated with the contempt they deserve."

PAPER CRITICIZES GOVERNMENT

"This left the matter still in doubt and permitted the miasma of suspicion to remain," the Toronto Globe and Mail said in an editorial today. This newspaper has been the most outspoken and bitterest critic of the methods of the Senate subcommittee headed by Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, Democrat of Mississippi. But today it said the Canadian case would have been stronger if there had been a little honest confession coupled with a statement of faith in the present loyalty of the late ambassador.

"It is quite possible that it was this lack of forthright report by his own Government, far more than irresponsible slanders in a foreign capital, which finally broke Herbert Norman's spirit," the editorial continued. "It is only now that Mr. Pearson says what he should have said 6 years ago."

The Montreal Gazette, another of Canada's influential newspapers, took the same editorial line—that a little more frankness earlier about Mr. Norman's campus indiscretions in the 1930's might have stifled the accusations of 1957.

In a lead editorial headed "Not a Wise Defense," the Montreal newspaper noted that it was now known that Mr. Norman's "previous association with the Communist Party was not only alleged; it had existed." "The clean bill of health related not to ideological illness of the past but to subsequent recovery," the editorial said.

"The tragedy is that Mr. Pearson by giving Mr. Norman this kind of defense in 1951 was not settling the matter; rather he may have increased the probability that it would again be renewed," the editorial went on. "The old charges whose revival Mr. Norman (in his letter to Mr. Pearson found so 'vexing and discouraging') had been left to smolder."

The editorial said that little had been done to dampen them "by the official pretense, however gracious, that there was no truth in them at all."

"In the end Mr. Pearson found it necessary to make a fuller disclosure," the editorial continued. "Perhaps it might have been better since it was made in the end that it had been made earlier. The consequences surely could not have been more calamitous."

Seriously, now, is it fair, is it just? Here is the Cleveland Plain Dealer in Ohio. The Chicago Daily News. Why should not the views of a hundred other papers be sent abroad—or better—at least—a fair example of the thinking of America? Every section of the country is entitled to its day in court. Is there any reason on earth why the country which lies west of the mountains north-south of New York City should not have its views made known. I am sure the gentleman agrees?

Mr. Chairman, it just is not fair to spend the money of all the people, of people from all over this country of ours, to tell the people abroad just what New York and Brooklyn think.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, these probably are the most realistic cuts on an appropriation bill that have been brought to the floor of the House during this year. I refer you to page 2 of the committee report. The Department of State is cut $41 million below its 1957 appropriations and $47 million below the proposed 1958 appropriations. The Department of Justice is to have $11 million above the 1957 appropriations and $6,800,000 below the 1958 estimates. The Judiciary is $2 million above the 1957 appropriation and $2 million below the current request. The United States Information Agency is $6,900,000 below the 1957 appropriation and $37,900,000 below the amount requested for this fiscal year. The funds appropriated to the President are $7,500,000 below the 1957 appropriations and $7,600,000 below the fiscal 1958 estimates.

I hope the House recognizes and gives proper credit for these reductions to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], the chairman of the subcommittee. He worked hour after hour, day after day, digging out the places where it appeared proper cuts could be made. His has been an example of tireless devotion to duty.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. The gentleman says these are realistic cuts. I agree that they are realistic cuts. But undoubtedly we will be told that they are irrational and fatuous, and a lot of other things. I will say this, however: As far as I can see, they are realistic cuts and should be sustained.

Mr. SIKES. I must go one step further. While these cuts are realistic they are not crippling cuts. Despite some of the statements that have been made and some of the questions that have been made, these departments will not be crippled by the budget estimates that are before us. A careful reappraisal and reexamination to determine the necessary elements of the programs will suffice.

I realize and fully agree that the State Department is America's first line of defense. The State Department must fight communism every hour of every day. In the State Department and in the other agencies to which we are referring there are a great many fine and capable people who give of the very best they possess while doing a difficult job. Undoubtedly our greatest need is for a strong foreign policy. I think every person here will have to admit that America does not today have a dynamic, electrifying, positive foreign policy which leads our allies and our friends in a determined and successful search for peace. Unfortunately, money is not going to make it so. Additional money in this bill would not necessarily mean that we would have a better State Department. We have done about everything that can be done moneywise in the way of making this the best Foreign Service we could have. We allow hardship differentials that amount to as much as 25 percent additional for a great many people because of the type of post in which they live. We give home leave for 2 years with costs paid by the Government. There are many other emoluments. As a matter of fact, the State Department now has the largest appropriation it has had for several years. It has had a strong buildup moneywise and personnelwise over the last 3 years.

But, very disappointingly, we are in more trouble diplomatically worldwide today than we have been for many, many years. Look around you. I do not have to point out the many places where American diplomacy barely holds its head above water. You know where they are and you see that our allies, one after the other are shifting their burdens of taxation and of defense to us—the American people. Does that sound like a strong State Department which would benefit from more money? You have to go deeper than monetary considerations in this all important matter. You have got to have the spirit and the leadership to do the job.

I know, my friends, that USIA should be the strong right arm of the State Department and I hope that it will be. But, no one says today that it actually is. Unfortunately, it has been shown to be riddled with weaknesses. I think it is a part of our responsibility as Congressmen to ferret out, to seek to find these weaknesses wherever they may be, to expose them and to see that they are eliminated. If the agencies will not eliminate them, then we, in Congress, must exercise our authority and see that they are eliminated.

I know the job before us is now bigger. America's world responsibilities are ever greater. I know that adequate money should be provided for all the things we have to do, but, gentlemen, money alone will never be the answer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, we have no requests for time on this side.

Mr. ROONEY. Then, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman be kind enough to yield the 1 minute to me?

Mr. COUDERT. I am glad to yield the 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to reply to the distinguished and kindly gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] who said the committee was utterly unrealistic when it cut the amount requested for representation allowances. The fact is that the amount of money presently contained in the bill is higher than the amount for this purpose in fiscal years 1954, 1955, and 1956. There should be some limit to the spending of money for entertainment. The United States Information Agency produced a witness who was going to overwhelm us. He had been the public-affairs officer in Baghdad for 2 years. He testified that it was deplorable that he had to spend $650 for cocktail parties and dinners and that $275 of this $650 came out of his own pocket. What were the facts developed? This young gentleman was put on the payroll in 1949 at a salary of $3,950 a year. Six years later, when the poor fellow had to put his hand in his own pocket for $275 for his cocktail parties and dinners with his associates in the Embassy or Legation and visitors, he was costing the taxpayers over $16,000 a year. His salary had been increased from $3,950 to $10,180. He had a hardship-post allowance of $1,500. He had $2,000 for quarters allowance. He had $800 for cost-of-living differential and $300 for education allowance.

He was costing the taxpayers when you include travel about $18,000 a year. I do not know what we are coming to. I realize the necessity for diplomatic entertainment. I have long been a friend of the State Department and the Foreign Service in this regard, but when they come up to Congress and ask for $1,200,000, when they got along with $500,000 on 1954, $475,000 on 1955, and $575,000 in 1956, I think it is time that we had a reckoning in this regard. I am not going to agree with my distinguished friend from Kansas whose philosophy on the subject is entirely different from mine. I sometimes sip a Martini. My distinguished friend from Kansas [Mr. REES] does not indulge. So in this regard I can testify as a far better expert than he and I am going to oppose any attempt that he may make to cut these allowances any further than the amount contained in the bill.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. COUDERT. Is it not a fact that in 1957 the representation allowance is $800,000?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes, and the gentleman knows the answer to that. Plans went awry. The committee had agreed to a lesser figure last year than the $700,000, contained in the bill. But somebody was not fast enough on his feet in rising to offer an amendment which the committee could accept, so the plans went awry.

Mr. COUDERT. It came out of committee at $800,000.

Mr. ROONEY. It came out of committee at $700,000, with the agreement, to which you subscribed as did every member of the subcommittee, to cut the amount further on the floor of the House to agree to an amendment expected to be offered by either the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], or the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has expired.

All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Administration of Foreign Affairs

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Department of State, not otherwise provided for, including the cost of transporting to and from a place of storage and the cost of storing the furniture and household and personal effects of an employee of the Foreign Service who is assigned to a post at which he is unable to use his furniture and effects, under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe; expenses authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801–1158), not otherwise provided for; expenses necessary to meet the responsibilities and obligations of the United States in Germany (including those arising under the supreme authority assumed by the United States on June 5, 1945, and under contractual arrangements with the Federal Republic of Germany); salary of the United States member of the Board for the Validation of German Bonds in the United States at the rate of $17,100 per annum; expenses of the National Commission on Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Cooperation as authorized by sections 3, 5, and 6 of the act of July 30, 1946 (22 U. S. C. 287o, 287q, 287r); expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with activities provided for under this appropriation; purchase (not to exceed 10, of which 3 shall be for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding outside the continental United States without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); purchase of uniforms; payment of tort claims, in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of section 2672, as amended, of title 28 of the United States Code when such claims arise in foreign countries; dues for library membership in organizations which issue publications to members only, or to members at a price lower than the others; employment of aliens, by contract for services abroad; refund of fees erroneously charged and paid for passports; radio communications; payment in advance for subscriptions to commercial information, telephone and similar services abroad; rent and expenses of maintaining in Morocco institutions for American convicts and persons declared insane by any consular court, and care and transportation of prisoners and persons declared insane; expenses, as authorized by law (18 U. S. C. 3192), of bringing to the United States from foreign countries persons charged with crime; and procurement by contract or otherwise, of services, supplies, and facilities, as follows: (1) translating, (2) analysis and tabulation of technical information, and (3) preparation of special maps, globes, and geographic aids; $93,088,500, of which not less than $9,000,000 shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States: *Provided*, That passenger motor vehicles in possession of the Foreign Service abroad may be replaced in accordance with section 7 of the Act of August 1, 1956 (70 Stat. 891) and the cost, including the exchange allowance, of each such replacement shall not exceed $3,000 in the case of the chief of mission automobile at each diplomatic mission (except that 11 such vehicles may be purchased at not to exceed $5,000 each) and $1,500 in the case of all other such vehicles except station wagons.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand an Italian translation of the Federalist papers. This is the first time that the Federalist papers have ever been translated into Italian. The publication resulted from the so-called Classics of American Democracy program that 2 years ago, on the initiation of a small but most distinguished group of Chicagoans, I had the privilege of submitting to this body and which just 1 year ago by your approval was brought into operation.

This, I repeat, was the first time the Federalist papers were translated into Italian. The public reception was tremendous. Within the first month the Italian translation of the Federalist papers was the best seller in Italy of all nonfiction works.

There followed the printing and distribution through local booksellers and bookstalls translated into native tongues, some 15 or 20 different tongues, in inexpensive paperbacks the classics of our democracy that had inspired our own forefathers. They were offered for sale at 10, 15, and 20 cents a copy. This was the first time that these Classics of American Democracy

had ever been translated into these languages. It was the first time in history that the peoples of many foreign lands ever had available for their reading such American classics as the Federalist, Franklin's autobiography, the political writings of Thomas Jefferson, Tom Paine's Common Sense, John C. Calhoun's Disquisition on Government, John Adams' political writing, Thoreau's Nature and Liberty, and others of similar character.

The sales in every land where these American classics were made available to the people at grassroots level broke all records. Soon it was found, as might have been expected, that what had reached the hearts and the minds of our forefathers and had fixed their political philosophy was moving the hearts and minds of peoples in the areas of the world where great changes have come and there is hunger for the fundamental truths of government.

I wish to commend the USIA for inaugurating this program and the vigorous and effective manner in which it has pushed and expanded its operation. It is to me, and I know it is to all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, a source of great satisfaction. The success of the program has outrun all expectations. I trust there will be no curtailment on the part of the USIA of a program that has accomplished so much, that holds the brightest promise we have in a troubled world and which I feel safe in saying has the devout support of every Member of this body.

I desire, too, to commend the book publishers of the United States who, with no profit to themselves and solely as an unselfish, patriotic service, have given their cooperation. The Chicago Daily News, too, is entitled to a great share of the credit. It was the on-the-spot reports from the foreign correspondents of the Chicago Daily News all over the world that pinpointed the need of getting the classics of our democracy to peoples at grassroots level if America was to win the fight for the hearts and minds of men.

The success of the program is heartening indeed to the little group of Chicagoans who were its real originators. To Dr. Harold Fey, editor of the Christian Century; Drs. Richard McKeon and Jerome Kerwin of the University of Chicago; Emery T. Filbey, vice president emeritus at the university; John McGinnis, president of Pennsylvania Lodge No. 225 of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen; Thomas B. Stauffer, instructor in the humanities at Wilson Junior College, and Leland G. Stauber, an undergraduate student at the university, go our thanks and the gratitude of the American people.

The USIA makes mistakes, of course, because to err is human. Its batting average, nevertheless, is pretty high. In the matter of current writings, the books and the newspapers of today, it is in a domain of controversy since among the liberals and conservatives of no living generation is their common acceptance of ideas and expressions. But with the classics of our democracy there is no controversy. They are the writings, not of persons now living, that form the basis of our democratic faith and our political philosophy.

I might remark to the committee that some year or so ago I mailed to some 5,000 leading Americans in all lines of activity a questionnaire seeking agreement as to the American classics that should be included. The replies to this questionnaire fill some 50 or 60 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The replies came from leaders in the field of industry, labor, women's clubs, veteran organizations, editors and publishers, educators. They reflected a tremendous interest. I am happy to report that in its selection of the classics by the USIA the conclusions of this jury of American thought have been followed. There is no controversy here.

In this program every encouragement should be given to the USIA. I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman from New York, who has done such a terrifically good job in cutting out waste, I would like to ask what he thinks about the Classics of American Democracy program. Does he wish to comment?

Mr. ROONEY. I do not have time to act as USIA censor to select and reject books; $2,267,000 was requested for subscriptions and books to be given away free of charge, many of them hard-covered books that retail at $3.50 each. I am not in a position to say which books should be chosen.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. O'HARA of Illinois was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am glad the gentleman from New York mentioned the $3.50 books. The trouble with the book program, heretofore, and the reason we were losing out to the Soviets was because the program centered on expensive books which were distributed to a relatively few individuals and were placed in libraries not easily accessible to the common people. This was brought out convincingly by the on-the-spot reports from the foreign correspondents of the Chicago Daily News.

The books in the Classics of American Democracy program are being put out in inexpensive translated editions that sell at from 10 cents to not higher than 20 cents a volume. These inexpensive books are read where the expensive books were not. They are actually reaching people at grassroots, where the soil is most fertile for democratic thought.

We will win only when we win the hearts and minds of the little and big people the world over. This was the fight we were losing. Now we are changing the tide of the battle. There must be no lessening of the Classics of American Democracy program. These classics constitute the bible of our democracy. They are selected books written at different times by people of different countries but expressing a political faith as the Christian Bible is a collection of books written at different times but collectively giving expression to a religious faith.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I want to associate myself wholeheartedly with the gentleman in what he has said. Perhaps the chairman of the subcommittee cannot properly express views for or against a particular volume selected and distributed by USIA. But I can. I believe that sometimes in our library and book programs overseas, those in charge have tended to assume that people there want the same literary diet that Americans generally ask for ourselves. The folks over there who read are interested in solid stuff more than in fiction, for example. They know that the survival of their country and the preservation of their newly won independence depend on their understanding the fundamentals of democratic self-government and our country is certainly one of the world's most successful demonstrations of it. They do not ask for easy stuff, they do not ask for comic books; they want the kind of material such as appears in the classics the gentleman has spoken of.

The first target of the Communists is the student mind. They do not bother much with the peasants, they do not bother with labor until they have won the students' minds and have the intellectuals in their camp. They accomplish that largely by the use of the printed word. That was how it happened in China; it is happening today in Japan. You see it happening in the bookstalls and bookstores all over the world, especially in those countries that have recently come to national independence. There is no place where we can get more for our money than in putting out good translations of our very best books on whose merit all agree, and making them widely available, not necessarily free, but at small cost. Those people who can read at all come in and study such books from cover to cover. They are trying to determine what to believe themselves and what course to adopt for their nation. They are not dismayed at the writings of Karl Marx and Lenin; and anyone who has read them knows they are not light reading. The intellectuals of the world are hungry for solid meat setting forth our philosophy of government and of life in general This is the kind of books we ought to give them more of, and not bother too much with the latest novels that may tickle our fancy but in which they are not interested.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am most grateful to the gentleman from Minnesota, who indeed was among the first to interest me in a subject in which he is recognized by all his colleagues as an authority. He called my attention at one time to the fact that the Federalist had been translated only into 1 or 2 languages and when I obtained a list from the Library of Congress I was amazed to learn that the Federalist and other fundamental papers of our democracy were practically without translation in foreign languages.

In the global struggle for the minds of men every possible information medium is being used by the Russian Communists. They have been engaged in intensive propaganda work directed at

freemen for the past 35 years. In some respects the Communists give their propaganda program a priority over economic and military considerations. They believe ideas are the most powerful weapons available for their unrelenting warfare against all humanity. Events of the past 20 years show that the Russians have great skill in presenting an appealing and disarming front to the real terror, which in fact is life under Communist rule. They have demonstrated skill in twisting the truth about the United States, her people, and our hopes for all the people of the world. As a consequence of many years of Communist propaganda, appreciable numbers of people in far-distant lands do not understand us or our policies and some even continue to regard us as imperialists and colonizers. To attain those evil ends required constant and skillful use of all the means of mass communication. This the Communists have done and continue to do.

But the Russians have shown unusual skill in the utilization of books to put across their story. They maintain, in Moscow, what is called the Foreign Languages Publishing House, and boast about their ability to produce a given book in nearly every language of the world. They also maintain book publishing fronts in many key cities of the free world. They far outstrip the total effort of the free world in both the number of books produced each year, the total number of copies of each volume published, the number of different languages used in their publication program, and the variety of books produced. Moreover, they price their books in a price range which makes them available to everyone. For those who cannot afford to buy their books, particularly students, very convenient credit terms are available for the asking. Communist propaganda tracts in the form of books are thus infiltrated into all levels of society in every country of the world.

It was knowledge of this situation which led me to join with a group of distinguished Americans living in Chicago, for the purpose of challenging the Russian Communists in the book field. We were immediately joined in our work by the able and distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN]. We were all convinced that the great ideals which stand as the basis of our free institutions would hold great appeal and inspiration for millions and millions of people throughout the world. We were especially concerned with those who have been often called the newly awakened people of the world—those people who after a long, hard struggle had emerged from colonies and possessions into sovereign and free nations enjoying the stimulation of national independence. All of us were convinced that large segments of humanity were starved for more knowledge of those great political principles and institutions without which all men are quickly stripped of their dignity and individual worth.

In order to test our plan we canvassed the opinion of several thousand Americans who we believed represented a fair cross section of public opinion. Among them were newspaper publishers, heads of civic organizations, political scientists and columnists. There was an immediate response to our proposal; many fine suggestions and recommendations came from people all over the United States. We were encouraged to go forward with our plan. After careful study of these several thousand respenses and the many editorials appearing in newspapers throughout the country, we appealed to the USIA to adopt our plan, which had by then become known as the "Classics of American Democracy." The classics of our democracy were, in brief, a selection of books which reflected the social and political philosophy of the United States from the time of the Revolutionary War.

The USIA adopted the plan and then set a pilot project in motion to test the reaction of people in several areas of the world. Low cost paperback volumes in the English language were used for the pilot project. The response exceeded the hopes of our most optimistic supporters. The Classics of American Democracy quickly proved their value and popular appeal. The USIA then decided to go ahead with arrangements for the printing of the Classics of American Democracy in 10 major languages of the world. Each printing was to be produced at a cost within the reach of the working people and students of each of the countries concerned. All this took time and advance planning because of the novelty of the program. However, all the major problems in connection with this project have now been worked out by USIA and they are prepared to go ahead with a program which gives hope that we and our social, political, and economic system will be better known to all the people of the world. This will be a real accomplishment because it will stand as a firm contribution to the cause of peace and world understanding.

It is my hope that the chairman [Mr. ROONEY] and members of his committee continue to look with favor upon this phase of the USIA program—as they did last year. It would be a setback to a most necessary and indeed essential work if at this stage the inexpensive book program of USIA; which features the Classics of American Democracy, had to be reduced or was slowed down. I hope and pray that this will not be the case. In that hope and prayer I feel that I am joined by all my colleagues.

Mr. Chairman, I hope there will be no curtailment of this program, but that the contrary will be true and that the program will be expanded so that in the next year we will have in all the languages and tongues of the world some of the classics of our own democracy. I remember some years ago I was shown a book of gospel hymns. I was informed that this book of gospel hymns had been translated into 80 different languages and tongues. Certainly we ought to do as much for the classics of our democracy. We owe that to the world and I think we owe it to our own survival because we do not survive as we were, and with our way of life unchanged, when we win a cold war or win a hot war. Survival is not in killing men. You can kill men and conquer countries physically, but you have to conquer the minds and hearts of people before you are in fact conquerors.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Illinois on his very forceful and well-reasoned statement.

I am sure that he will agree with me that the House must weigh carefully any further cuts in the United States Information Agency budget. I know that there are many who believe that the Appropriations Subcommittee did not go far enough when it approved only 74 percent of the President's request for funds for this Agency. Certainly, there has been considerable criticism of many of the Agency's programs and of the efficiency with which these programs are being carried out.

As far as I can tell, Mr. Chairman, these criticisms come mainly from Members who simply do not believe in the soundness of the basic purposes and objectives of the Information Agency.

Perhaps there is room for an honest difference of opinion on this point. But there can be no difference of opinion on whether or not we are engaged in a cold war for our very survival. Is there anyone in this Chamber, Mr. Chairman, who questions whether the aggressive ambitions of the Soviet Union extend to political and economic control of the entire world? Perhaps those who are most eager to scuttle the United States information program will be interested in the wide variety and effectiveness of similar efforts in which the Soviet Union is engaged.

There was a marked stepup of Communist propaganda efforts directed at the free world in 1956. In some cases the Sino-Soviet bloc doubled and tripled its output.

Radio, printed words, and films were major instrumentalities used by the Communists.

Radio broadcasting—one of the oldest means used by the Communists to reach the free world population—for the first time passed the 2,000 hours per week mark last year. While the overall increase amounted only to 10 percent, special consideration was given to politically vulnerable areas of the world. Thus the U. S. S. R. doubled its Arabic-language programs to the Near East, and Moscow increased by 50 percent its Spanish program to Latin America. At the same time all Communist radios increased or initiated broadcasts in their native languages aimed at their compatriots in all areas of the world. The purpose of these programs was to support the worldwide redefection campaign staged by the Communists. While in 1955 satellites had only 20 minutes weekly on the air beamed to Latin America in satellite languages, in 1956 the total weekly time amounted to 19:30 hours.

Africa is another example. In 1955 there was only one station beaming in Arabic. That was Moscow with 14

weekly hours on the air. By the end of 1956 Moscow had 24:30 hours per week in Arabic, while satellites added another 3:30 hours per week. Thus from 14 hours per week in 1955 the Arabic broadcasts jumped to 28 hours per week by the end of 1956.

Communist China registered her interest in Africa by starting in September 1956 a 3½ hours per week program in English for Egypt and central Africa. Furthermore, antiwestern views—particularly anti-British and anti-French—are mirrored in the output of the Egyptian station Voice of the Arabs, representing ultranationalistic Egyptian circles. The station, located in Cairo, was partly out of commission after the Abu Zabal transmitters were bombed last November. As of the end of the year it was broadcasting 35 hours per week to the entire Arab world, and within the first 3 months of 1957 it increased its broadcasting to 53:05 hours per week. It also beamed to the Sudan in Arabic 21 hours per week as of the end of March 1957—14 hours at the end of 1956—and resumed its broadcasts to Ethiopia—in Amharic 3:30 hours per week—to Somaliland—in Somali 5:15 hours per week—and to East Africa—in Swahili 5:15 hours per week. These latter broadcasts had been interrupted after the Abu Zabal bombing.

International broadcasting by the Communists to all areas of the world at the end of 1956 amounted to 2,077:45 hours per week. That included 242:25 hours per week to North America—the U. S. S. R. doubled its English language output to North America in 1956. This compares with 1,139:15 hours per week broadcast by the Voice of America, which includes 133 hours per week of Music—USA, a purely musical program.

Area by area comparisons indicate that the Communists have a lead over the Voice of America in all of them. To Europe the Communists broadcast 961:10 hours per week while the Voice had 556:30 hours per week. Since Europe is taken here as one unit, VOA's principal targets—U. S. S. R. and satellites—are included in the overall figure.

Broadcasts to the Near East, South Asia, Africa from the bloc increased from 228:50 hours per week in 1955 to 241:30 hours per week in 1956. That figure compares with 192:30 hours per week broadcast by the Voice. Far East comparative figures include 414:40 by the bloc and 252:00 by the Voice of America. Furthermore, the Voice is on the air only 5:15 hours per week to Latin America while Communist broadcast 72 hours per week.

The year 1956 was one of the most successful years in the history of the Communist film industry; 192 feature films were produced, which was about 30 percent in excess of 1955's total. Russia's 85 feature films were a 30-percent upswing over 1955, and Red China's features reflected a 135-percent jump. It is interesting to note that within the Soviet sixth 5 year plan film production is included and a high goal set. No fewer than 120 full length films, according to the plan, are to be produced annually by the Soviet Union alone.

In June 1956 the Moscow Documentary Studios initiated a monthly newsreel, U. S. S. R. Today, in 30 languages. Altogether during 1956 an estimated 500 documentaries and newsreels were produced by the bloc, which was not a very large increase over 1955. A big jump, however, is expected in 1957 which is the 40th anniversary of the October revolution. According to the Film Daily, a New York trade paper, the U. S. S. R. set aside 500 million rubles—$125 million at the official rate of exchange—to produce primarily documentaries in 1957.

The bloc countries participated during the year in almost every international film festival held in the free world. At the Venice Film Festival held last August, the bloc captured 13 out of the total of 22 awards. At the Edinburgh Film Festival the bloc won 36 out of the total of 179 awards.

The Communists have made also a full use of the printed word to get their message across; 613 new book titles—100 pages and more—in 27,836,000 copies in free world languages were produced by the Soviet Union. Twelve principal languages were used including Arabic—7 titles and 27,250 copies; Urdu—5 titles and 59,500 copies; English—240 titles, 7,743,250 copies; French—118 titles, 2,260,500 copies; and German—151 titles, 16,990,100 copies.

In addition to publication of books in free world languages, the Communists also put out a large number of translations. While final figures for 1956 are not available, comparative statistics related to 1955 and 1954 give a clear indication of the scope of Communist efforts in this field. The total number of titles translated into non-Soviet languages was 29.7 percent higher in 1955 than in 1954. There was an increase of 300 percent of titles translated into Arabic, 150 percent into Urdu, and 82 percent into English.

In addition to books, the Communists publish a large number of pamphlets. There is no way of estimating how many propaganda pamphlets and leaflets were put out by the bloc but the magnitude of the Communist effort in that field was illustrated recently in Indonesia. Twenty thousand copies of a specially prepared pamphlet on President Sukarno's visit to the U. S. S. R. were distributed free of charge all over the country.

Communist wire and news agencies—which are integral parts of the party machinery—increased their activities in a number of places. The New China News Agency opened an office in Cairo and increased its staff in Damascus and Kabul. TASS expanded its offices in New Delhi, Karachi, Bangkok, Djakarta, Beirut, Cairo, Copenhagen, Kabul, and Helsinki. In July 1956 TASS doubled the size of its fortnightly magazine Soviet Land published in India.

Soviet preoccupation with the Near East—reflected in other media operations—was also evident in the activities of various press services. In Beirut alone the estimated cost of TASS, VOKS center and the Najah Press—a local Communist outfit—amounted in 1956 to $410,000. The Najah Press issues a weekly Arabic language magazine.

Communist exchange of persons activities rose almost 40 percent in 1956 over the previous year as governmental, cultural, and sports delegations traveling to and from the Orbit jumped from 1,317 to 1,810. Especially revealing are figures for travel of cultural delegations between the Orbit and Near East-South Asia-Africa, with 216 such groups representing an increase over 1955 of more than 100 percent.

Participation by Communist countries in international fairs in free world countries during 1956 cost them about $100 million, compared with $38 million in 1955 and $10 million in 1954. The 93 international fairs in which they took part during 1956 stood for an increase of 36 percent over 1955.

Another important instrument used by the Communists in the free world are front organizations. During 1956 two significant events occurred in this field. The World Federation of Trade Union, according to Radio Moscow, has gained 3 million members—if accurate it may mean an increase in Communist China and possibly in the Near and Middle East. The other event was creation of a new Asian-front group called the Asian Solidarity Committee. The organization, set up last April at the World Peace Council Asian Conference in New Delhi, included Communist China, North Korea, India, Ceylon, North Vietnam, and Japan.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the potency of the Soviet propaganda weapon will not be underestimated when Members of this House are called upon to vote appropriations for the continued operations of the United States Information Agency.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 3, line 24, strike out the figure "$93,088,500" and insert "$91,088,500."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, in considering this bill we are left with scarcely any alternative but to meat-ax it. Appropriation bills, I regret to say, are coming to us increasingly in lump-sum appropriations by which very few items are segregated so that Members can get at them. I hope that some day that situation will be changed. But, we are left with practically no recourse when a chunk of meat like this is thrown at us but to throw the meat cleaver at it.

Now, I think that the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has made a very good case for cutting the State Department appropriation bill. My amendment would take into consideration the appropriation for retirement and cut out approximately $2.7 million. Certainly that is not too much to cut a department of Government which, as the gentleman has well pointed out, has indulged in deception and deceit with respect to additions of personnel and various other things.

I would call your attention to an item on page 137 of the hearings in further support of my amendment to cut something off this bill where it shows that the cost of gardening service for the Department of State runs to the tune of $255,239

a year. I had not realized that we were in that business to the extent of a quarter of a million dollars.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot believe, in view of the fact that a cut was applied to the Post Office Department not so long ago when that appropriation bill was before the House, a cut of some $58 million in a department of Government that is ever expanding its service to the people of this country—I cannot believe that a cut of $2.7 million, approximately, in this bill can hurt anyone, and that it cannot be absorbed. I hope that my amendment will be adopted.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Is there any arrangement that the gentleman has with the committee about this amendment like they had on the one last year, or are you just offering this on your own?

Mr. GROSS. Of course, I do not know that there was any arrangement, and I intend to speak to that later when an amendment is offered to the representation allowances. I did not understand that there was any agreement as between the gentleman from Iowa and the Committee on Appropriations. There was an agreement between the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Kansas that the gentleman from Kansas would introduce the amendment last year, but I regret very much that he did not get the amendment offered. But, I have no arrangement, let me say to the gentleman, with the appropriations subcommittee. Had I happened to be putting in the amendment, it would have been offered last year.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I first want to congratulate the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], for the splendid job he has done on this bill. In fact, I want to be frank in stating that he has done too good a job on certain items. All of us are interested in cutting the budget and reducing taxes; however, there has been one item disallowed from the budget request that I do not believe is good economy. I refer to the request of the United States Bureau of Prisons for $1,300,000 with which to start construction on a much needed maximum security Federal penitentiary. As I explained to the Subcommittee on Appropriations on March 12 when I appeared before them, prisoners in Federal penitentiaries who are committed for more than 5 years have increased 26 percent since 1952. This fact points out one thing—the Federal prison system is critically overcrowded. When I make the statement that it is not good economy to disallow these funds I refer specifically to the danger we are running into of having a major riot in one of our present antiquated, overcrowded institutions. Such a riot could cause millions of dollars' damage.

All we need to do is stop and look at some of the riots that have taken place in Ohio, Nevada, and my own State of Illinois. A few years ago, we had a riot in a penitentiary in my State resulting in several hundred thousand dollars' damage. I have the utmost confidence in the long term director of the United States Bureau of Prisons, Mr. James V. Bennett. He came before the Appropriations Committee and pointed out that it was a "must" for this country to have a new maximum security Federal penitentiary in which to house the most hardened criminals.

The Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate has just issued report No. 118. This report was made after a personal inspection of the Federal prison system by a subcommittee of the Judiciary. I would like to quote a portion of their recommendations:

> The need for additional maximum custody prison facilities to care for this continually increasing number of repeaters and serious offenders is beyond question. In the first place, more and more responsibilities for law enforcement are coming under the jurisdiction of Federal agencies with a consequent effect on Federal prisons. The continually mounting population of the country and the general increase in crime point to the imperative necessity for an orderly program of developing Federal prison facilities. It should not be necessary to wait until a major catastrophe occurs in the Federal Penal System to give attention to this problem.

Mr. Chairman, I have no idea what the other body will do concerning the restoration of funds; however, I would like to say that I hope the House will go along with whatever action they see fit to take. At the very latest, I hope these funds can be allowed no later than next year so the United States Bureau of Prisons can proceed to build this much needed institution.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 7 minutes, with 5 minutes reserved to the committee.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] advise how a Member might proceed to cut any one of the services referred to on page 2 of the bill? There seem to be 6 or 7 objectives there. And then on page 3 you have the same situation. That is all before you get to the $93 million. Just take this one above "unable to use his furniture and effects, under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe." Now, if somebody wanted to cut that item, how would he go about it?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, in reply, I should like to say that this language is a money saver.

The Foreign Service Act gives them the authority to transport their furniture at Government expense and this permits it to be stored and saves transportation costs.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Here is another instance, in line 22, "expenses of attendance at meetings" and so on. There is no way by which an amendment can be drawn to cut that particular item, is there?

Mr. ROONEY. I do not know of any way other than by a limitation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. A limitation would not reduce or cut the item. So that if the amendment is agreed to, cutting the $93 million, the State Department would then be at liberty to apply what was left to any part of the service it chooses; is not that so?

Mr. ROONEY. That is correct, if no indication was made.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And if some Member on the floor wants to cut the amount for any particular service, or to cut the amount out entirely, he just cannot get at it, can he? That is, that particular item?

Mr. ROONEY. I do not think that is so. I think if an amendment is adopted and is directed to a particular part of the appropriation, the Department is supposed to carry out the will of Congress and the committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know; but what I mean is this: Here is another illustration, "Salary of the United States Member." Let us assume that a Member of the House wanted to cut that particular item out, cut out that salary. How could he draw the amendment? If the amendment is offered in the way the amendment was offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] to cut the $93 million, that does not mean that that particular item would be taken out even if the amendment were approved, does it?

Mr. ROONEY. That would be a question of parliamentary procedure.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No. The agency could state the salary—leave out some other item.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment. Many here have said that the members of this subcommittee have done a good job in unearthing the facts. We worked for practically 2 months on this bill, every day from 10 o'clock in the morning until 4 or 4:30 in the afternoon 5 days a week. We think we have cut the fat out of it. We think we have taken away as much as we can safely take away. Now along comes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] who wants to reduce it further by $2 million. The gentleman has the printed committee hearings. I know he has carefully studied them. He has had these hearings for over a week. Now he appears to be qualifying as a better expert than any of the members of the subcommittee. The gentleman is now in a dangerous area when he proposes to further cut salaries and expenses of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. Honestly, this is a very, very dangerous area. I think the

House will accept the judgment of the committee in preference to the judgment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Each year the gentleman from Iowa offers these kinds of amendments and he bases them on the very facts developed by the committee and which the committee used to make the committee cut. I respectfully suggest to the membership of the House that this amendment be rejected.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I do not think the chairman of the subcommittee should be so wrought up about anybody offering amendments. My good friend, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and his committee spent weeks and weeks in hearings on the appropriation bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The economy bloc, that is not here today, was on the floor in full force that day offering all kinds of amendments to cut appropriations on the health, education, and welfare bill.

Mr. ROONEY. I did not yield to the gentleman for a speech; I yielded for a question.

Mr. GAVIN. I know, but I just say the gentleman should not be concerned——

Mr. ROONEY. Let the gentleman obtain his own speech time. If I have another breath or two left later, I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman, but I want to finish this thought first.

The committee was asked for $112 million for this item of salaries and expenses. It covers the actual running of the State Department personnel, all their equipment, transportation, and other necessary expenses. The committee cut this request to $93,088,500. The committee allowed the exact amount they have at the present time plus $2,588,500, which is for retirement-fund contributions.

Mr. GAVIN. Now will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ROONEY. For a brief question; not a speech.

Mr. GAVIN. I am just weeping——

Mr. ROONEY. What is the distinguished gentleman weeping about?

Mr. GAVIN. I am weeping for that $16,000-a-year executive, the gentleman brought to our attention very dramatically a few moments ago.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentleman mean the publicity man who had to spend a little money out of his own pocket?

Mr. GAVIN. Yes; that gentleman from Baghdad, who got his salary increased from $3,900 to $16,000. I just feel quite bad about it.

Mr. ROONEY. I will lend the gentleman my handkerchief if he saturates his. But let us not laugh about this pending amendment. This is the most important item in the bill. This is just as important as the Federal Bureau of Investigation money contained in this bill. Do not ruin the American Foreign Service.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania should save his tears, because the fellow he is talking about is not in this part of the bill.

Mr. ROONEY. That is correct.

Mr. VORYS. If this amendment is carried, you would have to dismiss people who are at present serving in the State Department.

Mr. ROONEY. It would create utter chaos in the State Department. The action I say would be irresponsible.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY I yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman will agree, I am sure, that there are some of those people in this part of the bill, too?

Mr. ROONEY. No; I do not think so. I am being utterly honest with the House. I am afraid of the consequences of this amendment. I think it would be irresponsible to cut this any further than the committee did.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. All time has expired on the pending amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS), there were—ayes 31, noes 76

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Representation allowances: For representation allowances as authorized by section 901 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C. 1131), $600,000.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 4, line 13, strike out "$600,000" and insert "$400,000."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment, and all amendments thereto, do close in 15 minutes with the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the best and most forceful statement in favor of this amendment has been made by the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from New York. He described the situation rather clearly, I think, a while ago. He said he differs in the point of view in respect to the subject matter. He did tell you quite plainly, as I see it, why the proposed amount in this bill should be reduced. I want to commend him, for having reduced the request as much as he did. This thing had gone wild. The request was $1,200,000 and he secured approval of his committee in the sum of $600,000. I want to remind you, too, that this is not the only item of so-called representation in this legislation. This is one of the items. So if you only support this amendment, you will then be cutting it back to where it was in 1956, 1954, 1953, and 1952. I am asking for a reduction in line, where it was 2 and 4 years ago. I believe that is fair and reasonable, and I think you ought to support it. Now there are other items of so-called representation in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, about the only reason for this legislation is described in the hearings on the bill.

The witness says, and I quote:

In order to do their work properly, they have got to establish friendly personal relations with a broad range of people in political, business, scientific, and cultural life, with the leaders in government in power and the representatives of political groups which may themselves come to power.

Mr. Chairman, if we have to use this method in our attempt to get along with the heads of other nations, then we are using cheap methods in trying to make agreements with people of foreign nations.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is only to cut $200,000. But it is at least some reduction. The fact of the matter is that I would strike it all out, if I could. The gentleman from New York understands that. But nevertheless I think he ought to go along with us on this rather moderate reduction and save $200,000. In my opinion it would be good for our country. I do not see how in the world or why you have to get people to drink intoxicating liquors in order to try to become friendly with them. It is not the best way, as I see it, to try to get an understanding with people wherever they are—in America or anywhere else.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to the able chairman of this subcommittee.

Mr. ROONEY. Under the provisions of the gentleman's amendment, which would cut these allowances back to $400,000, there would not be a cookie left in the State Department.

Mr. REES of Kansas. There would not be what?

Mr. ROONEY. A cookie.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not know what the gentleman refers to.

Mr. Chairman, in all seriousness, let us not let this thing get out of hand. Let us just cut this $200,000. It is a comparatively small amount. Let us reduce it down to $400,000. I hope the members of this committee will see fit to support my amendment. I think it is only fair that we save $200,000 of the taxpayers' money. They will appreciate our saving at least that much especially when it is not for a necessary cause. So vote to save $200,000 for the taxpayers of America.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, 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. 6871) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, directed him to report that it had come to no resolution thereon.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 6870, making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, with the intention of asking that the House agree to the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill and the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

(1) Page 5, after line 9, insert: "Senate."

(2) Page 5, after line 9, insert: "Salaries, officers and employees."

(3) Page 5, after line 9, insert:

"Office of the Vice President: For an additional amount for clerical assistance to the Vice President, $5,000."

(4) Page 5, after line 9, insert:

"Administrative and clerical assistants to Senators: For an additional amount for administrative and clerical assistants for Senators, to provide additional clerical assistants for each Senator from the States of Louisiana and Ohio so that the allowance for each Senator from the State of Louisiana will be equal to that allowed Senators from States having a population of over 3 million, the population of said State having exceeded 3 million inhabitants, and so that the allowance for each Senator from the State of Ohio will be equal to that allowed Senators from States having a population of over 9 million, the population of said State having exceeded 9 million inhabitants, $8,000."

(5) Page 5, after line 9, insert:

"Administrative and clerical assistants to Senators: For an additional amount for administrative and clerical assistants for Senators, to provide additional clerical assistants for each Senator from the State of Texas so that the allowance for each Senator from said State will be equal to that allowed Senators from States having a population of over 9 million, the population of said State having exceeded 9 million inhabitants, $2,000."

(6) Page 5, after line 9, insert: "Contingent expenses of the Senate."

(7) Page 5, after line 9, insert:

"Inquiries and investigations: For an additional amount for expenses of inquiries and investigations, fiscal year 1956, $25,000."

(8) Page 5, after line 9, insert:

"Inquiries and investigations: For an additional amount for expenses of inquiries and investigations, $820,000."

(9) Page 5, after line 9, insert:

"Automobile for the President pro tempore: For an additional amount for purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of an automobile for the President pro tempore of the Senate, $2,000."

(10) Page 5, after line 9, insert:

"Automobiles for the majority and minority leaders: For an additional amount for purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of two automobiles, one for the majority leader of the Senate, and one for the minority leader of the Senate, $4,000."

(11) Page 5, after line 9, insert:

"Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration: For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration, $5,000, to remain available during the existence of the committee."

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is the same bill that we passed in the House yesterday, with the addition of $871,000, which the other body has added for their own housekeeping items, and those are the items that were first put in by the Senate in the urgent deficiency bill which is still in conference. Is that correct?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is correct. It is the bill we passed yesterday, with the addition of some housekeeping items by the Senate. Of course, between the two Houses, we do not interfere with housekeeping items of the other body.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 310) making additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1957 and for other purposes, which is a resolution reported by the Committee on Appropriations in lieu of the first urgent deficiency appropriation bill which has been in conference for some time and on which the House and Senate conferees have not agreed.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this proposition contains everything in difference between the two Houses with three exceptions. One is the strategic minerals amendment. Another is the cotton seed feed amendment. In addition it divides equally between the House and Senate the limitation on funds that can be used for local and State administration in connection with grants to States for public assistance under the Social Security Administration. Of course, we have taken out of it the Senate housekeeping items to which the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], just referred, and which were carried in the bill just agreed to by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, the following sums:

CHAPTER I—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural conservation program service

Emergency Conservation Measures

For an additional amount to enable the Secretary to make payments to farmers who carry out emergency measures to control wind erosion on farmlands or to rehabilitate farmlands damaged by wind erosion, floods, hurricanes, or other natural disasters when, as a result of the foregoing, new conservation problems have been created which, (1) if not treated, will impair or endanger the land, (2) materially affect the productive capacity of the land, (3) represent damage which is unusual in character and, except for wind erosion, is not the type which would recur frequently in the same area, and (4) will be so costly to rehabilitate that Federal assistance is or will be required to return the land to productive agricultural use, and for reimbursement to the appropriation to the President for "Disaster relief," for allocations to the Secretary of Agriculture for such purposes, $15 million: *Provided,* That this appropriation may be expended without regard to the adjustments required under section 8 (e) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590h), and may be distributed among States and individual farmers without regard to other provisions of law.

Farmers' Home Administration

Disaster Loan Revolving Fund

Not to exceed $15 million of the disaster loan revolving fund established under the act of April 6, 1949, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1148a–1 to 1148a–3), may be used for emergency feed and seed assistance under section 2 (d) of said act in addition to, and under the same conditions as, the amount made available under this head in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1954 (68 Stat. 81, 88).

Loan Authorizations

For an additional amount for loans under title I and section 43 of title IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, $26 million: *Provided,* That not to exceed the foregoing amount shall be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the provisions set forth under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1952.

CHAPTER II—SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," $1,100,000, to be transferred from the "Revolving Fund, Small Business Administration."

Revolving fund

For additional capital for the revolving fund, authorized by the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended, to be available without fiscal year limitation, $45 million.

CHAPTER III—AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

Construction of Memorials and Cemeteries

To the extent that the Commission may find necessary or desirable, the appropriation granted under this head in the General Government Matters Appropriation Act, 1957, shall be available for the purposes of the act of April 2, 1956 (70 Stat. 84).

CHAPTER IV—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Public Health Service

Foreign Quarantine Service

Section 364, part G, title III, of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding thereto the following subsections:

"(c) Employees of the United States Public Health Service, Foreign Quarantine Division, performing overtime duties including the operation of vessels, in connection with the inspection or quarantine treatment of persons (passengers and crews), conveyances, or goods arriving by land, water, or air in the United States or any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof, hereinafter referred to as 'employees of the Public Health Service', when required to be on duty to perform such duties between the hours of 6 o'clock postmeridian and 6 o'clock antemeridian (or between the hours of 7 o'clock postmeridian and 7 o'clock antemeridian at stations which have a declared workday of from 7 o'clock

antemeridian to 7 o'clock postmeridian), or on Sundays or holidays, shall be paid, in lieu of compensation under any other provision of law, at the rate of 1½ times the basic hourly rate for each hour that the overtime extends beyond 6 o'clock (or 7 o'clock as the case may be) postmeridian, and 2 times the basic hourly rate for each overtime hour worked on Sundays or holidays. As used in this subsection, the term 'basic hourly rate' shall mean the regular basic rate of pay which is applicable to such employees for work performed within their regularly scheduled tour of duty."

"(d) (1) The said extra compensation shall be paid to the United States by the owner, agent, consignee, operator, or master or other person in charge of any conveyance, for whom, at his request, services as described in this subsection (hereinafter referred to as overtime service) are performed. If such employees have been ordered to report for duty and have so reported, and the requested services are not performed by reason of circumstances beyond the control of the employees concerned, such extra compensation shall be paid on the same basis as though the overtime services had actually been performed during the period between the time the employees were ordered to report for duty and did so report, and the time they were notified that their services would not be required, and in any case as though their services had continued for not less than 1 hour. The Surgeon General with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may prescribe regulations requiring the owner, agent, consignee, operator, or master or other person for whom the overtime services are performed to file a bond in such amounts and containing such conditions and with such sureties, or in lieu of a bond, to deposit money or obligations of the United States in such amount, as will assure the payment of charges under this subsection, which bond or deposit may cover one or more transactions or all transactions during a specified period: *Provided*, That no charges shall be made for services performed in connection with the inspection of (1) persons arriving by international highways, ferries, bridges, or tunnels, or the conveyances in which they arrive, or (2) persons arriving by aircraft or railroad trains, the operations of which are covered by published schedules, or the aircraft or trains in which they arrived, or (3) persons arriving by vessels operated between Canadian ports and ports on Puget Sound or operated on the Great Lakes and connecting waterways, the operations of which are covered by published schedules, or the vessels in which they arrive.

"(2) Moneys collected under this subsection shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the appropriation charged with the expense of the services, and the appropriations so credited shall be available for the payment of such compensation to the said employees for services so rendered."

Social Security Administration

Grants to States for Public Assistance

For an additional amount for "Grants to States for public assistance," $275 million: *Provided*, That not more than $16,728,000 of this amount may be used for State and local administration.

CHAPTER V—PUBLIC WORKS—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL FUNCTIONS

Department of the Army—Rivers and harbors and flood control

Construction, General

That portion of title III of the act of July 2, 1956 (Public Law 641, 84th Cong., 70 stat. 474, 480), that pertains to the purchase of lands and improvements in the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District in lieu of protecting said Buford-Trenton Irrigation District in connection with development, construction, and operation of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River, is amended to read as follows:

"That in lieu of protecting the East Bottom of Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, the sum of $1,621,791 of the funds herein or hereafter appropriated for the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River shall be available for the purchase of lands and improvements in and contiguous to the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, exclusive of tracts numbered H. H. 3170 and H. H. 3168, and not to exceed $2 million shall be available to the Corps of Engineers for protection of the intake structure of the pumping plant in Zero Bottom and for the construction of bank protection to prevent erosion in the Missouri River adjacent to the Buford-Trenton irrigation project. The substitution of land acquisition for production shall be made and the Secretary of the Army shall acquire such land and improvements if all of the land owners, except Lester G. Larson, the heirs of Louis Morin, Jr., and the heirs of A. Desjarlais, on or before June 30, 1957, have offered to sell their property on the terms agreeable to said landowners, and within the amount provided for such land acquisition: *Provided*, That the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, is authorized to acquire by condemnation proceedings, in the appropriate United States district court, tract 208C of the Buford-Trenton project, Williams County, N. Dak., according to the recorded plat thereof which tract is owned by Lester G. Larson, the public domain allotment of A. Desjarlais, now deceased, described as Government lots 5 and 8 in section 19 in Government lot 1 in section 30, township 153 north of range 102 west of the fifth principal meridian, North Dakota, and the public domain allotment of Louis Morin, Jr., now deceased, described as the west half southwest quarter, section 16, and the north half southeast quarter, section 17, township 153 north, range 102 west, fifth principal meridian, North Dakota, in connection with the construction and operation of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir: *Provided further*, That in the event land acquisition is undertaken in lieu of protection of the East Bottom, that in recognition of the increased per acre annual operation and maintenance cost of the remaining lands in the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, the construction charge obligation assignable to the remaining lands of said district pursuant to the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 119), as amended, and the proposed contract between the United States and Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, approved as to form February 23, 1955, shall be nonreimbursable, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to enter into a contract with the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District to transfer operation and maintenance responsibility for project works constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation for the benefit of the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District to such district."

CHAPTER VI—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH—HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

For payment to Cleo C. Fernandez, widow of Antonio M. Fernandez, late a Representative from the State of New Mexico, $22,500.

For payment to Elizabeth F. Hand, widow of T. Millet Hand, late a Representative from the State of New Jersey, $22,500.

For payment to Wilberta R. Hinshaw, widow of Carl Hinshaw, late a Representative from the State of California, $22,500.

For payment to Mildred N. Priest, widow of J. Percy Priest, late a Representative from the State of Tennessee, $22,500.

CHAPTER VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Appropriations, funds, and authorizations made available by this joint resolution shall be charged against any corresponding appropriations, funds or authorizations made available by H. R. 4249, 85th Congress (Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1957) whenever said H. R. 4249 is enacted into law.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word that I may ask a question. So that the RECORD will show, what amount was included in the resolution for social-security payments?

Mr. CANNON. Two hundred and seventy-five million dollars is provided for payments to States—which in turn goes to the individual recipients. As for the limitation on the amount that can be used for administrative expenses, the resolution carries a compromise between the two Houses. It is halfway between the Senate figure and the House figure, and amounts to $16,728,000.

Mr. McCORMACK. And the chairman of the committee assures the House that that is plenty of appropriations at this time to last until after the Easter recess and further consideration can be given?

Mr. CANNON. Unquestionably; and I might say to the majority leader, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, that this disposes finally and completely of all appropriation matters that are to be considered before the Easter recess. With the disposition of this joint resolution Members can go home for the holidays with a clean slate and a clear conscience.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, the immediate situation is met by this, and there will be no hardships; that additional requests for appropriations can be given further consideration after the Easter recess.

Mr. CANNON. It disposes of all pending questions, and is satisfactory to everybody concerned on this side of the Capitol.

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

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES, APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1958

Mr. ROONEY. 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. 6871) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies 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. 6871 with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized for 3⅓ minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas, and I would like to say at the outset in trying to fix responsibility for failure to cut this item last year when the appropriation bill was before the House, I recall that the gentleman from Kansas asked the gentleman

from New York [Mr. ROONEY], if he would permit the return to the item so that he could offer his amendment, and the gentleman from New York informed the gentleman from Kansas that he would not give him unanimous consent to go back to it so he could offer the amendment to cut down spending for liquor for the State Department.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from New York mentioned my name just a few minutes ago and refused to yield to me. Now, wait a minute and I will yield to you. The gentleman, therefore, must assume his share of responsibility for the liquor allowance not being cut in the last session of Congress.

Now I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I would like to say to the gentleman from Iowa that I am not in the custom of trying to commit harakiri when I am here on the floor in charge of a complicated appropriation bill. If one permits a portion of the bill which has been read and passed to be reopened we would have nothing but parliamentary chaos.

Mr. GROSS. I quite agree with the gentleman, but let the RECORD show that the gentleman refused to give consent to the gentleman from Kansas to return to that item.

Mr. ROONEY. I do not recall one way or the other. Is the gentleman sure of that? Where is that found in the RECORD?

Mr. GROSS. In this bill, in addition to the $600,000 to the State Department for liquor, let me say to the Members of the House, there is approximately $200,000 additional for other agencies for representation allowance—for liquor—call it whatever you will. Incidentally, a new name has been adopted by some of these agencies of the Government; I found in at least one of the hearings that the money for liquor is called a ceremonial fund.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman a question on another subject. On page 4, line 9, there is this language:

> Each such replacement shall not exceed $3,000 in the case of the chief of mission automobile at each diplomatic mission, except that 11 such vehicles may be purchased at not to exceed $5,000 each—

And so forth. Does that mean that the State Department is permitted to spend $5,000, plus the trade-in's, on 11 automobiles they would be authorized to buy?

Mr. ROONEY. No.

Mr. GROSS. They can spend $5,000?

Mr. ROONEY. These $5,000 automobiles are for our ambassadors and chiefs of missions and they cost more than the average car for the reason they have a glass partition between the driver and whoever happens to be in the rear seat.

Mr. GROSS. That intrigues me. Why do they have to have that partition?

Mr. ROONEY. Because there are local employees who drive our automobiles at foreign posts and conversations take place that the Ambassador would not want heard by that local driver.

Mr. GROSS. Could not the Ambassador just reserve that conversation for some few minutes and take care of it at a little later time and save the Government this additional cost?

Mr. ROONEY. There might be an important crisis going on at that particular time in that particular area of the world and it might be very, very important that our Ambassador have the conversation at that exact moment.

Mr. GROSS. Do all of these drivers wear caps, livery, and so forth?

Mr. ROONEY. Those who drive our Ambassadors do.

Mr. GROSS. That gives them a gilt-edge appearance when they wear a cap, uniform, and so forth.

Mr. ROONEY. Yes; but your Mr. Dulles wants the best.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to speak to my good friend, the gentleman from New York. I cannot understand why he is so anxious to expedite this legislation today. The gentleman just said a moment ago that we should discuss this legislation if it takes a week. What difference does it make if it takes a week or more? Let us not be too hasty. The Nation is $275 billion in debt. Two hundred and seventy-five billion dollars. We are paying $7½ billion a year interest on the debt. No small sum of money I think you will agree. This appropriation bill concerns the debt and any reductions that are made I would say are in the interest of the American taxpayer. Regrettable they, the taxpayers, are unable to be heard here today.

The other week on the health and welfare bill which concerns our own backyard and the activities of millions of American people, the economy bloc was out in force. The Members heard from the folks back home. Everybody was offering amendments to cut the health and welfare appropriations; anxious to get on record so the folks back home would note their activity, interest, and efforts to effect economies and reduce the budget. There are some here today who are seldom around except when matters pertaining to foreign affairs are being considered. Then they suddenly become active and alerted to present you all of the definite information on all of these respective items. They do a good job and many succumb to their pronouncements. Some of us who are economy minded are seemingly unable to make much of an impression or inroad on any appropriation reductions on these bills that concern spending all over the world. When the health and welfare appropriations bill was before the House many were up on their feet to cut appropriations in your own backyards. You just seem to lack courage to offer any amendments to reduce this bill today. Frankly, I cannot understand it. Very little response to these proposed cuts on matters that concern foreign affairs appropriations.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Let us have the courage to save $200,000 now.

Mr. GAVIN. I do not know whether they will or not; I doubt it very much. When these foreign affairs appropriations are before them there is a great hesitancy. There is no remedy for it. They cannot bring themselves around to cutting on these appropriations, but when it concerns the welfare of the American people, many amendments are offered to reduce these appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who offered this amendment makes the argument that the thing has gone wild. He said it went wild last year. If it went wild last year from what we have heard divulged on the floor here today, it went wild because the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] was asleep at the switch. I do not know the purpose of the amendment this year; it is not an election year. Last year apparently we had an arrangement whereby the gentleman from Kansas was going to offer the amendment and it would have been accepted. I do not know, but it was kind of a startling revelation to me that the thing was all cut and dried. Now, the truth of the matter is this: These representation allowances are in there so that some people can be ambassadors who are not millionaires. That is just about what it boils down to. The newspapers have carried several articles lately that ambassadors in certain posts have to be picked from the ranks of the wealthy, the campaign contributors, because that shows they have enough to be an ambassador.

But, there are a lot of people who come in before the Foreign Affairs Committee and testify and say that we are trying to make it possible for any person who shows that he has what it takes, the necessary abilities to handle a crucial situation, to be an ambassador in any post. If you really mean that, if you want it, then some people who have what it takes except the cash are going to have to have a little bit of help to be an ambassador. Look up your figures on some of our big embassies where some of the people come in the millionaire class, such as London, and you will find that they got $80,000 to run the Embassy last year, and the record shows that they spent another $80,000 out of their own pocket. Maybe that is too much. I do not know. But certainly if you are going to have to spend $80,000 out of your own pocket, it is going to severely limit the number of people from whom you can choose an ambassador to that post. Now, I am not in favor of anything unreasonable, but the chairman of the committee has already told you that they have cut this item, I believe, by more than 50 percent. Is that not right?

Mr. ROONEY. Exactly.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Exactly 50 percent. And you are going to have to leave some things in there for some necessary functions which ambassadors must hold if they are going to remain and do any job for the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Fifty percent with respect to the budget estimate but not 50 percent over what they spent last year.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I explained to you why the item got so big last year, and it has been explained half a dozen times, because the amendment was not offered at the proper time, or it would have been accepted. The committee made a cut of 50 percent, over the budget request and if you ask me, I think that is a very healthy cut.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, in opposing this amendment I should first like to point out, as appears at page 5 of the printed committee hearings, Secretary Dulles had the following to say on this subject:

I have spoken before about the importance of the representation allowances, Mr. Chairman, and we are requesting that they should be increased by about $300,000 this year.

That is a tremendously important factor. It very much affects our ability to staff properly these posts. We still would not be in a position to appoint career officers except in very exceptional circumstances of happening to find a wealthy person to appoint to some of the posts which carry the high expenditures.

He said further:

I do not think that is a sound situation.

The committee thereupon, having considered this testimony and the fact that there was a substantial requested increase, decided that it should be realistic about this and cut it back to size. I believe the subcommittee was in unanimous agreement on this action. The distinguished advocates of economy, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN], and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] have their figures wrong. In 1953 fiscal year the amount for this purpose was $50,000 more than is contained in the bill today, to wit: $650,000. In 1952 these allowances were $675,000. In 1951 they were $675,000.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] puts this on the basis of wets against drys. I am willing to meet him on that ground. I am not a dry. I am one who thinks that if we are going to have a ceremonial diplomat bedecked in his striped pants, the least we can do is to furnish him with a cocktail shaker and a few martinis. It is just done. Every other nation in the world does it. So if Mr. Dulles wants it and President Eisenhower wants to handle it that way, I am for it.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make one final point. To be serious, this money is not only for cocktails. This money is for food. This money is for many other things, as pointed out on page 5 of the committee report:

The purpose of this appropriation is to reimburse officers of the Foreign Service for expenses incurred at their posts of duty for such items as entertainment offered on American holidays or on occasion of visits by prominent citizens or American vessels or aircraft; entertainment necessary in the conduct of official duties; and the purchase of flowers, wreaths, and similar tokens for presentation in accordance with local custom on appropriate occasions.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Is it not necessary that we get both sides real good and drunk so that they can squander this $4 billion?

Mr. ROONEY. I do not know whether that is necessary. I have seen some strange things happen in the State Department when they were perfectly sober.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the pending amendment be rejected and that once again the Committee of the Whole accept the unanimous judgment of the subcommittee.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. We may be assured, regardless which way we vote on this amendment, that there was no deal made this year?

Mr. ROONEY. No deal this year.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, let me say that I am completely in accord with the gentleman in opposing this amendment. I seem to remember that I reserved on this point in the committee; but that is wholly irrelevant at this time.

Mr. ROONEY. I asked the gentleman just 5 minutes ago if it was not the fact that the Members were unanimous?

Mr. COUDERT. It is irrelevant. I thought the gentleman was referring to our unanimity in opposing this amendment. I am opposed to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. All time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Extension and remodeling, State Department Building: For expenses necessary for planning, and the extension and remodeling, under the supervision of the General Services Administration, of the State Department Building, Washington, D. C., and for expenses necessary for providing temporary office space, including payment of rent in the District of Columbia, alteration, purchase, and installation of air-conditioning equipment, to remain available until expended, $2,500,000, to be transferred to the General Services Administration.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not sure the statement made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] a few minutes ago with respect to my position in regard to the proposed legislation is really worth answering, but I dislike very much, having been a Member of this body for a number of years, to have the RECORD even indicate that there was any political color to the subject matter under discussion only a few minutes ago. It is a new experience to me. I have no feeling whatever just because he or any other Member disagrees or takes issue with my views. That is understood.

I just want to say that I resent statements made by the gentleman from Ohio wherein he alleges political motives and slipshod methods or deals having been made in respect to legislation considered a year or 2 years ago. I just want him to know that I regret he saw fit to make such statement.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I should like to say to this House that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is one of its most lovable Members. I have been his close friend, and he my close friend, for many years. I have always respected the gentleman. He is a man of the highest integrity and ability. I say here and now that there is a misunderstanding and the gentleman from Kansas had nothing whatever to do with the matter that was discussed on the floor a while ago, nothing whatever. I had no conversation with him at the time and no member of this Committee had any conversation with him last year on the subject.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in view of what the gentleman from New York has just said, may I say when I owe someone an apology I will make it, and it is possible I owe an apology to the gentleman from Kansas. I do not know what the RECORD is going to show but I know what was said here on the floor. Certainly I do not think I was stupid in inferring from that that there was some kind of arrangement made that the Committee was going to accept an amendment which was going to be offered either by the gentleman from Iowa or the gentleman from Kansas. But since the gentleman from New York has stated that there was a misunderstanding it is possible that I misunderstood with whom the deal on the amendment had been made.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. No, I will not yield to the gentleman from New York. It was his statement that caused the confusion, so I am going to try to clear up the confusion.

If that is the case, and if there was no agreement made, and if the gentleman from Kansas had not had prior arrangements, and if it were not stated here that there were prior arrangements made for the Committee to accept the amendment, then certainly I apologize to him because I do not want to imply that anybody has done anything that he did not do. In other words this is an "iffy" apology.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, would it be in order to ask unanimous consent

that all debate on this subject close in 5 minutes?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have a motion for you.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York submit a request?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Michigan moved to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan has not been recognized and the Chair has recognized the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York, if he seeks recognition.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be recognized and yield my 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized.

Mr. ROONEY. Now I will have to stand for that length of time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I surely appreciate that.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentleman appreciate the fact that he would not have the 5 minutes if I did not stand while he is speaking, as required under the rules of the House?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Either that or a motion I have to strike out the enacting clause would have to be made. So I do thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, there may be some misapprehension of what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] said. My understanding of his statement was that he referred to a Mr. Hoffa and not to HOFFMAN the Member from the Fourth District of Michigan. I ask the gentleman if I am correct on that?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Oh, definitely, I would not think of my dear friend, Mr. HOFFMAN, in the same breath or in the same terms as the teamsters' official, Mr. Hoffa.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now that is a wave of consideration and affection which almost overwhelms me.

Mr. Chairman, it was my purpose to say when I was speaking about New York and the gangsters that the reference was to one of the unions which for years has levied a tribute on everything coming into the port. That is what I was referring to.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with reference to Mr. James Hoffa, Mr. Hoffa will go on trial at the proper time. We all reserve judgment until that decision has been finally reached.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

Contributions to international organizations: For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to meet annual obligations of membership in international multilateral organizations, pursuant to treaties, conventions, or specific acts of Congress, $35,899,243.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 6, line 9, strike out the figure "$35,899,243" and insert "$28,859,285."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. GROSS. I would rather not yield at this time for you to obtain consent to limit debate. It is possible that somebody else might want to talk for 1 or 2 more minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the committee report shows that this appropriation has been increased $2,039,958 over the present fiscal year. My amendment would cut off the $2,039,958 increase and then apply a $5 million cut.

Let me give you one of the good reasons why I think these various international organizations ought to be cut. If you will turn to page 673 of the hearings, you will find that last year UNESCO held a meeting in New Delhi, India. At that meeting, they decided it was time to increase the United States contribution. So they voted, 27 to 20, with 19 abstentions and 13 absent, to raise our contribution to UNESCO, which is another way of saying that 27 foreign countries voted to increase the taxes of the people of the United States of America. Irrespective of the amount, that is what happened.

Now, let me tell you what countries voted to increase our contribution: Afghanistan, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Monaco, Morocco, Panama, Peru, Spain, Switzerland, Tunisia, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia. They all voted to increase our contribution to UNESCO.

Let me give you a little more information with respect to this vote. Ecuador, Egypt, Guatemala, Peru, Israel, and Uruguay are delinquent in their payments to UNESCO. They owe their contribution to UNESCO and they have not paid, but they have the gall to slap higher taxes upon us.

There was a time when you could get at the separate appropriations for the Interparliamentary Union, NATO parliamentary group, and other of these junketing outfits. I went to a usual interparliamentary union meeting in the old Senate Chamber this year and it was interesting to hear a Member of the other body, who made a trip to Bangkok, Siam, last fall get up in that meeting and chide his colleagues for some of the spending that went on, and some of the families that were taken along on that trip. When will Congress cut down on these outfits? When are you going to stop this boondoggling and these junkets? When are you going to stop sending people all over the world at the expense of the taxpayers when the record shows they accomplish nothing?

I understand a lease-purchase building has been approved by the House and Senate Public Works Committees for the United States mission to the United Nations. It is to be constructed in New York next to the Tower of Babel, otherwise known as the United Nations. I do not know whether this United Nations crowd has priority over lease-purchase buildings that are needed in your districts and mine. Anyway, the State Department came to this Appropriations Committee and asked for $200,000 for new furniture and other equipment, when they have not even turned a spade of earth for the building. That is the way some of the "fancy Dans" in the State Department and these various international organizations are operating. But I object, Mr. Chairman, to a bunch of foreigners in New Delhi, India, voting to increase the taxes of the taxpayers of the United States. It is time to begin cutting these people down to size, and I am giving you an opportunity to start.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate close in 12 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there ojection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, assuming that this amendment should be voted down by the House, would another amendment then be in order?

Mr. ROONEY. It would depend upon what the other amendment was.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Would debate on another amendment be in order under your unanimous consent request?

Mr. ROONEY. Of course there are certain privileges that belong to the Chair in deciding these parliamentary questions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that as the Chair understood the unanimous-consent request, it was that all debate on this amendment and amendments thereto close in 12 minutes. That would not preclude debate on another amendment if it should be offered.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] is recognized.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to direct a question to my good and able friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]. I note the recommendations for this particular item: Contributions to international organizations was $33,859,285 for the fiscal year 1957; that the estimate for 1958 is $37,475,552, of which the committee granted $35,899,243.

This represents an increase of $2,039,958 over last year.

May I ask, Mr. Chairman, what is so necessary about these organizations as to recommend this $2 million increase?

Mr. ROONEY. Oh, I guess that the folks down in the State Department and Secretary Dulles just do not seem to be capable of cutting down the amount of our contributions to these international organizations; and the committee had no alternative but to sign the check for the money.

Mr. GAVIN. Evidently the gentleman agrees with Secretary Dulles. That

is a rather unusual position for him to take. The gentleman has differed with him in the past on many issues, and I have heard considerable discussion—I decline to yield—about Mr. Dulles. I am greatly pleased to note that the gentleman is now acquiescing and conciliating with the distinguished Secretary of State to the extent of $2,039,918.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. Not at this time; permit me to secure a little further information. The gentleman has been talking about this justification and the report page 21 states that this International Exhibition at Brussels is being used for these gala theatrical enterprises, presenting such attractions as "Guys and Dolls" and so on.

Mr. ROONEY. That is in another part of the bill.

Mr. GAVIN. But these funds are appropriated for the international program. The two sort of go together, do they not?

Mr. ROONEY. No; there is no connection whatever.

Mr. GAVIN. No connection whatever?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. They put that extra $2 million in here so they could increase the number of State Department people who are working over in Geneva on the Trade and Tariffs Agreement. That is already approved by Congress.

Mr. GAVIN. Regardless of other sections, I am glad to know that my good friend from New York is conciliating with the State Department and increasing this appropriation over last year. Here is a considerable sum of money, $35 million, and you have an opportunity to reduce it. You who are so economy minded have a chance to be recorded for the folks back home to see. I hope you will respond with the same fine alacrity that you have in the past.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] is recognized.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not know too much about these figures and it is difficult to follow them. In the bill itself I cannot find this item at all. I just asked a few minutes ago what we raised three Congresses back, in 1950, and I found for salaries and expenses it was $78 million. This year they are asking for $112 million, quite a lot more than before, as a matter of fact about $24 million more.

The reason I rise at this time is to state that I am not going to vote for any increases in this budget and every opportunity I get to cut it I am going to do so because I know it can stand cuts.

They are building a new building for the State Department, making it bigger and bigger. For what? Are we going to run the world or are we going to take care of the United States? I do not know how far back it goes but in the 10 years I have been here this item alone has more than doubled. It is about time we take another look. I am not what you would call a real isolationist, but you are gradually getting me there and you will get more and more letters from home if we do not start on this proposition of letting a man in this country save something for a rainy day.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, before urging that the pending amendment be rejected, I should like to say in regard to the remarks of my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN], that I think Secretary Dulles is a fine, kindly gentleman. But when I find Secretary Dulles or his assistants in the Department wrong, I feel it is my duty to say so. On the other hand, when I find that they are right I will commend them. I shall continue to follow that policy.

If the House were to adopt the pending amendment, such action would not save the taxpayers of this country 5 cents. There would be no saving, as alleged by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS]. While the United States is a member of these organizations we will have to pay our dues. Some think we should not be in the United Nations. There are many who do. But that question should not be resolved here in a few minutes in the consideration of an appropriation bill which merely contains the annual dues.

The requested increase this year is the result of agreements made within these organizations. I know some of them, if not all of them, were opposed by our State Department representatives to these international organizations. In the United Nations there is an increase of approximately $250,000. In the International Civil Aviation Organization, which is of more benefit to the United States than any other nation in the world, there is a requested increase of $414,000. In the World Health Organization $457,000, the Food and Agriculture Organization, International Communications Union, World Meteorological Organization additional increases. When all these items are added together they come to the amount which would be temporarily denied if the pending amendment were to be adopted.

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

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not true that when the legislative bodies of these respective international organizations or agencies voted to raise their budgets for the present year and thereby raised our dues or contributions, they also raised their own in exactly the same proportion?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question: Since the World Health Organization is one of these organizations, did not a certain Member of the Congress come before your committee seeking to bring the world health convention to this country to the tune of $400,000, with us paying the expense of a lot of delegates over here?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes; that is so. And maybe that is good, I will say to the gentleman. I should first like to hear all the testimony. I like to go into these budgets and listen to all the witnesses and then decide what is the right thing to do.

To get back to this amendment, this is an ineffective attempt at economy, because you are not saving the taxpayers 5 cents. Our dues will continue in the United Nations and in these organizations until such time as the Congress formally decides we should not belong to them.

Mr. GROSS. Did this same gentleman, a Member of the House, not ask your committee to ask the State Department to extend an invitation to the World Health Organization to come over here, using your committee as a vehicle to spend $400,000?

Mr. ROONEY. I took the position and all the members of my committee took the position that we would do nothing about this $400,000 request until it came from the Bureau of the Budget and was formerly presented to us by the State Department. I think that is sound.

But, let us stay with the pending amendment. This amendment would be a slap in the eye to the United States of America in every one of these international organizations. Mr. Chairman, not only does this appropriation apply to the organizations I have already mentioned; it applies to many other organizations. It applies to our membership in organizations such as the Organization of American States, the Inter-American Radio Office, the Pan-American Sanitary Organization; it applies to the International Sugar Council, the International Wheat Council and two parliamentary organizations in which this House itself is interested. If we were to accept the pending amendment, the United States of America would look very bad in each and every one of these organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY) there were—ayes 76, noes 59.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Missions to international organizations: For expenses necessary for permanent representation to certain international organizations in which the United States participates pursuant to treaties, conventions, or specific acts of Congress, including expenses authorized by the pertinent acts and conventions providing for such representation; attendance at meetings of societies or associations concerned with the work of the organizations; salaries, expenses, and allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801–1158); hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding, without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); and purchase of uniforms for guards and chauffeurs; $1,350,000.

PASSAMAQUODDY TIDAL POWER SURVEY

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the act of January 31, 1956 (Public Law 401), including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the

purpose of this appropriation; $935,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOWDY: On page 11, line 14, strike out line 14 through line 22, both inclusive.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that this amendment will not be one that will create chaos in the State Department or any other department. The truth of the matter is that I feel these bureaus can, within themselves, create all the chaos they need without any assistance from Congress.

This Passamaquoddy tidal power survey is what my amendment would propose to strike from the bill. It is my understanding—and this happened before I came to Congress—that President Franklin D. Roosevelt considered this a pet of his and Congress in those days appropriated and there was spent some $15 million investigating this particular program. Finally even President Roosevelt, who was interested in it, decided that it would not work, that it was a fantasy and a boondoggle. So it was dropped.

There has been some mention of deals made. Last year there was a Democratic Governor elected in Maine for the first time in some time, I am sure. It was intimated that there was a deal between Republicans and Democrats to have another survey made of Passamaquoddy tidal power and about a million dollars was spent last year on that survey. Whether that be true, or not, they are here again attempting to appropriate an additional $935,000, substantially $1 million, for the same purpose. It is purely for a survey to redetermine a matter that has heretofore been decided negatively at a cost of $15 million. There is no indication how long this survey will keep up. I am sure the people that are hired to do it will not be talking themselves out of a job by bringing it to a conclusion. I feel that my amendment should be adopted.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I call to the attention of the Committee page 739 of the hearings on the State Department. It is estimated that the total cost of this project is going to be $2,700,000. An appropriation of approximately $900,000 was made last year, and of that amount of money, by late February something like half, over $400,000, had actually been obligated.

The facts are that if we were to drop this project at this time, very little of that $900,000 that was appropriated last year could be salvaged. An additional $900,000 is carried in this budget. The idea is to determine once and for all whether the tides at Passamaquoddy can be harnessed to provide electric power. Nobody knows. This thing has been debated for many years. A great many qualified engineers believe that a very large amount of public power can be generated at Passamaquoddy. We will not know unless we complete the entire expenditure of approximately $2,700,000. Nine hundred thousand was appropriated last year. An equal amount is carried in this bill. We are well embarked on this survey, and we can justify spending the total amount of the money required for the survey to find out once and for all what the facts are in connection with the harnessing of the tides at Passamaquoddy. Therefore, I trust the amendment will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield my time to the minority leader, Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BOW. I reserve my time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEAL].

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I am a firm believer that if we are going to cut the budget, if we are going to bring about sensible conduct in governmental affairs, there are only two approaches we have toward restoring Government economy. The first is to reduce the number of personnel employed, and the second is to postpone projects which are of very doubtful value in the end, and thereby save as much as we can. The Passamaquoddy project has been studied over and over and a lot of money has been spent on it. It will not hurt to delay this matter for a few years.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine [Mr. COFFIN].

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time I have ever spoken on this project to this body, but this is a project that from my childhood I have watched and dreamed about together with all the other citizens of our State. This project is not in my district. It is in the district of my good friend, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE]. But, this is so close to the hearts of all our people, that I must tell you something about it. Sitting with you here today and hearing us discuss the matter of spending some $600,000 for ceremonial expenses and the cost of entertaining people in foreign countries, I have been thinking of our people in that most remote Down East corner of Maine, a part of this country the nearest to Canada where it is, indeed, very hard to make a living and where the people are just waiting for a chance to find out once and for all if there does lie in those tidal waters of the Passamaquoddy a chance for them to make a decent living and to bring up their children to have the kind of life shared by the rest of the country. Now to think of the hopes and dreams of making that determination go sailing out the window at this time is indeed something that is most disheartening. So, if you can only think of the welfare of the people of this country as well as the people across the seas and establish for yourselves a sense of values that will place our own people at least as high up in that scale as the people who will be entertained in the ceremonial parlors of our chancelleries abroad, then I think you will be doing your duty. I pray that you may not cut the cord of this experiment at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] is recognized.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE].

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to oppose this amendment. Let me point out to the Members of the Committee that I am acquainted with the history back of this project. Let me point out to you that this is a survey which is not associated with the concept of the original project. This is a survey of the international approach to this resource. I want to point out to you that this resource has never been surveyed on this basis. The survey of the work which was done was on an American project which was held solely to the American side of the line. This appropriation is for a survey of the resources of the project as an international project. I point out to you that this legislation and the authorization for this survey was very carefully considered by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The authorization came to the floor of the House in the usual manner. Agreements have been made between the United States and Canada. The staffs are in the field. The commissions associated with the survey are established and functioning. Last year the appropriation of $935,000 was made. The recommendation of the committee this year is to provide an appropriation in the same amount as last year. This is a survey established under agreements reached by a careful review on the part of the Canadian Government and the American Government through the International Joint Commission.

I cannot conceive of the logic behind this amendment. Work has already started. Certainly it is not good business to strike this appropriation. I urge defeat of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, this is the same old project that has been before us for years and years. Way back when the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] was a Member of this House and later when in the Senate, we had this project before the Congress. What they are trying to do is to have the people of the country finance a power project through control of the tides which rise to an exceptional height in a bay or inlet on the main coast. Well, now, every bay along the coast on this side of the continent and on the other side, on the Pacific Ocean, where there is a trap for tidal waters of great height, might well demand the same or similar project.

How many millions or billions of dollars have been wasted on that idea

I cannot recall. But, it is plenty. Here they go again.

If there is any way we can at this time spend more money and get less results, I cannot think of it. Why revive it again and start off on another spending spree at this time when we are calling for a reduction in taxation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, we started this last year. This is a continuation of a program. Personally, I think it is poor business to stop a survey once you have started it, because it will simply mean that the question will still be undetermined. Why be so foolish? Let us complete the survey and ascertain whether or not it is worthy.

I yield to the gentleman from Maine, Mr. HALE.

Mr. HALE. I thank the gentleman. I have always been a warm admirer of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], but he could not have made a statement which was more unfair, inaccurate and misleading than the statement he just made. This Passamaquoddy Bay area is unique in the whole world. This money is being spent on a study of a project which everybody admits is feasible from an engineering standpoint. We are trying to learn the costs. The resolution authorizing this expenditure was originally reported from the Committee on Foreign Affairs twice. It passed the Senate in the 83d Congress. It passed the House and Senate in the 84th. We have already spent nearly a million dollars. If you turn down this appropriation, you are throwing away almost a million dollars that has already been spent. If you spend this money, which is less than the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, you are advancing toward some knowledge which will be extremely valuable. I urge the defeat of this ill-considered amendment.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. BOLAND. Is it not true that this is the only place in the world where there is a possibility? Is it not true that the thing is engineeringly feasible and what is being done is to find out once and for all whether it will pay off if it is built?

Mr. MARTIN. That is exactly it.

Mr. BOLAND. And is it not true that this is one area where there is no money being spent? I have just sat for the past 4 weeks on public-works projects all around the United States, and this is one area that gets little or no money. I think this is one project that is feasible and has been shown to be feasible. It would be a rank injustice to the Members of the State of Maine to knock out this project at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] to close debate.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, in urging rejection of the pending amendment, I should like to say I cannot approach this subject on the basis that one should be against it because it was the brain child of Franklin D. Roosevelt, or for it because President Eisenhower now considers this a feasible proposition. When I say "proposition," are we talking about a project? No. We are talking about a survey. This House, this Congress—I mean the last Congress just 1 year ago—appropriated $935,000 as part of a $2.7 million total survey. As the gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished minority leader, points out, it just is not good business, having spent $935,000 in the current year, to now turn down another payment on the $2.7 million survey which is to determine whether or not the project is economically sound. Further, our good neighbor, the Dominion of Canada, is concerned with this project. That is the reason it is in this bill, because it is an international project.

The Dominion of Canada contributes to the extent of $300,000 on the cost of this survey. I think that under all the circumstances the House will use just good plain business sense and reject the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. COFFIN] may revise and extend the remarks he made in connection with the amendment just adopted.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

International educational exchange activities: For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, to enable the Department of State to carry out international educational exchange activities, as authorized by the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (22 U. S. C. 1431–1479), and the act of August 9, 1939 (22 U. S. C. 501), and to administer the programs authorized by section 32 (b) (2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 1641 (b)), the act of August 24, 1949 (20 U. S. C. 222–224), and the act of September 29, 1950 (20 U. S. C. 225), including salaries, expenses, and allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801–1158); expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with activities provided for under this appropriation; hire of passenger motor vehicles; entertainment within the United States (not to exceed $1,000); services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and advance of funds notwithstanding section 3648 of the Revised Statutes as amended; $17,575,000, of which not less than $6,750,000 shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States: *Provided*, That not to exceed $1,275,000 may be used for administrative expenses during the current fiscal year.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the Appropriations Committee has recommended such a drastic cut in the request for the international educational exchange program of the State Department.

At a time when there is so much misunderstanding regarding America in many parts of the world, and the Communists working day and night and by every device to create misunderstanding, I believe that money for exchange of persons is a sound investment. We should be doing more, not less.

Students, teachers, and influential leaders from other lands are brought to America to learn and observe our way of life. They return home, better citizens of their own countries. They tell others in their countries about the true picture of America. They are believed in their own countries as Americans themselves may not be. They use what they have learned here to help their countries.

We also send out carefully selected American teachers, professors, and specialists to these other countries to study their cultures—to teach their young people—and to work with their leaders on projects of mutual interest.

This two-way flow of culture and understanding is making a contribution to the defense of the United States. It is our best long-range defense against creeping, but deadly, communism. It is one of the best things we are doing in the international field. It is a mistake to have this request for the exchange program cut so deeply.

Now, Mr. Chairman, earlier we heard the mention of a tennis player who is presently working in Haiti under the exchange of persons program.

Many are not intimately familiar with how the exchange program works. They read in the press that the State Department has sent a tennis player overseas. Naturally, they may have honest questions about the use of taxpayers' funds for that purpose. Some may even suspect that this is just a method of getting a free tennis coach for the Embassy staff.

Now, I happen to think the exchange program is a necessary program. It must be made a good program. So I decided to check the facts. This is what I found.

Albert Ritzenberg, a tennis coach, is in Haiti on a State Department exchange grant, working hard for his country. We are paying part of his expenses and the Haitians are paying part of his expenses. His primary function is to encourage and help the Haitians develop playgrounds and recreation facilities for their youth.

Tennis is a popular sport in Haiti. The Haitians wanted a topflight coach in tennis. They wanted to get their recreational facilities better organized for the thousands of children who can not go to school for lack of educational institutions.

They were willing to pay as much as possible, and asked our Embassy for help to get a man who could work with their youth and coach tennis.

The State Department invited Albert Ritzenberg. He is a professional tennis coach but he has other qualifications. For example, he received his Master of Arts degree in sociology from George Washington University. He served as a recreation officer in the United States Air Force in the Pacific during the Second World War and later at Wheelus Air Force Base in Libya. He coached tennis at Georgetown University.

His assignment in Haiti has been highly successful. He is working with the most influential people in Haiti as well as helping the Haitians of the future—the youth.

He has conducted daily classes and clinics in tennis. His work with the youth has resulted in a request, by the Government down there, that he plan a new playground system for the children of Haiti. He is trying to get the donation of additional recreational equipment from his broad acquaintances in the States.

Ritzenberg's project has resulted in the organization of the Haitian Lawn Tennis Association. He has helped organize a Davis Cup Club.

But more important, I think, is the fact that he has sponsored a Junior Davis Cup Club.

The local newspapers have praised the work of this great American athlete and youth specialist. One paper devoted a full page to his project.

The people of Haiti have not asked for a handout. They are paying $200 a month toward his expenses.

Coach Ritzenberg is making a major contribution to Haiti, at their request. He is also creating better friendship and international ties between Haiti and our country, to our credit.

The awarding of this specialist grant to Albert Ritzenberg may not materially alter the history of the world, but it has contributed to the well-being of Haiti and it will contribute to the type of international understanding which is indispensable to the Western World in our fight against communism.

The primary target of communism is the restless youth of underdeveloped areas. If American sports figures can stop this menace we need more, not less, Albert Ritzenbergs.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have no quarrel with the subcommittee or the full committee on the cut in this appropriation for international educational exchange. They heard the testimony and were able to evaluate it. I do want, however, to say here that I think that among all the programs of the State Department which contribute to the great reservoir of good will which we are endeavoring to build throughout the world through our expenditures and high taxes, this is one of the best.

I had an experience at home this last fall in one of the great rural counties of my district which I want to relate. Two girls from India, lovely young ladies, came into that county on this student-exchange program. They came in their native dress, and they came into the community and stayed in homes in that community and visited the high schools. It was my good fortune to be in the county and at the high school while those children were there. I want to say that those two young ladies, even though their dress was completely different from that of the children in that county and community, even though their language was different, they endeared themselves to the people of that county, and they have done more to get across the spirit of America and her feeling for the peoples throughout the world than anything that has happened since I have been connected with that county or community, and I just wanted to testify to that effect from my personal experience.

I have not made any of these trips overseas, but if two children from faraway India can come here to our country and win the hearts of our people by their good sense and their winsomeness, surely we can afford to spend the money which this program requires. Let us send our young people to other countries, and welcome their young people over here.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I have listened with great interest to the splendid statement of my colleague from Arkansas. I agree with him that the exchange program is a great asset to our country and to the cause of freedom. The agency is bringing to the United States many people of influence in other lands and as a result of information acquired here will be able to interpret our institutions and our purposes in the world.

One of the cities of my district recently had a young teacher from India on exchange and she returned to her home singing the praises of this Nation. Both countries were served, for she made many friends here who, as a result of her visit, have a better understanding of India. I trust that the House will make no further cuts in funds to operate this valuable service.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

First, I would like to inform the membership with regard to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], which was adopted a while ago, that the Committee plans to give every Member of the House a chance to record himself on that amendment.

Secondly, in regard to this International Educational Exchange program, I am for such a program. I have voted for it many times. I have on previous occasions been criticized for not appropriating enough money, but this year we have given the State Department for International Educational Exchange Activities an amount which together with the $3,575,000 in foreign currencies under Public Law 480, disposition of surplus agricultural products, comes to exactly the same amount as they had requested for the current fiscal year.

I suggest that this Office of International Educational Exchange Activities sort of tighten up, and not let things happen, such as in the case of Allie Ritzenberg, the tennis pro; $6,800 of the taxpayers' money was used to send him to Port-au-Prince, Haiti, to teach tennis for 6 months. The money used came out of International Educational Exchange Activities.

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

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I wish I had finished what I started to say a while ago instead of extending my remarks in the RECORD because in them I included information on the Ritzenberg case. I asked the Department for the details, and they will be in the RECORD tomorrow morning. It ought to be said he is not down there only or primarily to teach people to play tennis. He was sent down at the request of Haiti because they did not have schools enough for their children and they are interested in getting more playgrounds and recreational activities.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, this should be quite interesting. Evidently the gentleman has the last self-serving script written by the State Department, but we have some information over here which we shall insert in the RECORD. I have in my hand a dispatch in the State Department dated August 13, 1956, subject: Educational Exchange—Tennis Coach, reading as follows:

EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE—TENNIS COACH

In the Educational Exchange estimated budget fiscal year 1958, referenced above, a project was outlined for the establishment in Port-au-Prince of an American tennis coach for a 1- or 2-year period.

It was pointed out that such a coach could be of great value to the overall United States objectives in Haiti since he would be in intimate, day-to-day contact with the most important and influential members of the opinion-molding class here.

Tennis is an extremely popular sport in Haiti in the upper economic levels although there has never been any experienced person available to teach the fundamentals. We have received repeated requests from prominent Haitians for a coach. As outlined in our budget estimate, the Haitians themselves are willing to meet part of his expenses. We have recently been informed by a group representing several tennis clubs in Port-au-Prince that they are prepared to guarantee a sum of $250 per month for the services of a competent coach.

We should appreciate the Department's suggestions in this matter. Someone such as a retired coach of a university tennis team would be ideal for this project. Although the project is still in a highly amorphous state, we would appreciate the Department's reaction and comment.

Then, thereupon the exchange program spent $6,800. Where did he teach? The Belevue Turgeau Port-au-Prince Tennis Club and the Petionville Country Club.

He was not anywhere around the iron market where the poor Haitians are. He was up in the hills, at the country club.

Mr. JUDD. I wish I had my earlier statement here because in what the gentleman calls the latest script, I had all the facts as to this man's work.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentleman dispute anything I have said here on the floor today in regard to this matter?

Mr. JUDD. But what he has said does not in the least disprove my contention that the primary purpose of sending him is to help them in a field where they have expressed a need. Their primary concern is to create interest in building up such things as playgrounds where youth can be given an opportunity to become good citizens instead of becoming delinquents. Nothing attracts youth more than athletic heroes. The newspapers there have given the project favorable attention. One newspaper used a whole page to commend the United States for its help in this field. The No. 1 target of

the Communists around the world is the mind of restless, unemployed, frustrated youth. And to get them interested and engaged in athletic competition is just as healthy in Haiti or Puerto Rico or anywhere else as it is in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, this gets more interesting as we go along. I want to read another paragraph of this dispatch:

> Tennis is an extremely popular sport in Haiti in the upper economic levels, although there has never been any experienced person available to teach the fundamentals. We have received repeated requests from competent Haitians for a coach. As outlined in our budget estimate, the Haitians themselves are willing to meet part of his expenses. We have recently been informed by a group representing several tennis clubs in Port-au-Prince that they are prepared to guarantee a sum of $250 a month for the services of a competent coach.

Now, not only did Allie get compensation at the rate of $600 a month out of the American taxpayers' money under the exchange program, a total of $3,600 for 6 months, but he got $14 a day in addition to that, or a total of $2,520 in per diem. His travel was $245; his excess baggage was $56; books and equipment, $150; internal travel in Haiti, $200; and miscellaneous, $40. In addition, he is receiving $250 a month from a group in Haiti representing several tennis clubs.

It also turns out that although this request was made in the field for a coach for next year, in the 1958 budget they found that they had $6,800 in the international exchange program that might have been used to bring 2 or 3 of the children that the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE] spoke of awhile ago, to this country. So they used that to teach the country club set in Port-au-Prince how to play tennis. Here are some details:

UNITED STATES SPECIALIST—ALBERT RITZENBERG (TENNIS COACH)

Grant No. 362–7, dated November 2, 1956.

One hundred and eighty days' duration (6 months), began November 12, 1956; terminates May 11, 1957.

Cost of grant

Compensation ($600 per month)	$3,600
Per diem ($14 rate for Port-au-Prince)	2,520
International travel	245
Excess baggage	56
Books and equipment	150
Internal travel in Haiti	200
Miscellaneous	40
Total	$6,811

In addition Mr. Ritzenberg is receiving $250 per month from a group in Haiti representing several tennis clubs.

See despatch 47 dated August 13, 1956, from American Embassy, Port-au-Prince, requesting an American tennis coach.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], will be on the floor tomorrow if this debate continues, because I am going to ask someone then about this character by the name of Tom Two Arrows, who is mentioned in the committee hearings. I cannot find out what he has been doing, or how much has been spent on him.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Please do not make a mystery of this. The gentleman knows who Tom Two Arrows is.

Mr. GROSS. No; I do not.

Mr. ROONEY. Why, we have discussed Tom Two Arrows previously on this floor. He is the Indian-lore teacher and lecturer. He is quite a man with the bow and arrow. Last year and the year before we were asked to include, in this cultural program of President Eisenhower's, money for Tom Two Arrows. This year I found the name of Thomas Dorsey on the program. Knowing that Tommy Dorsey, the orchestra leader, died some 8 or 9 months ago, I felt that surely they did not mean him. Now, who do you think Thomas Dorsey was? Tom Two Arrows.

Mr. GROSS. I want to say to the gentleman that he seemed to be confused about this in the committee; and I am still not completely enlightened.

Mr. ROONEY. No. I am very seldom confused, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I read the hearings, and I saw Tom Two Arrows' name and then Tom Two Arrows, alias Thomas Dorsey, and I would like to know something about Tom Two Arrows, how much he was paid and what he did and so on and so forth. Perhaps the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] could enlighten us, since he claimed to have all the information on the tennis player.

Mr. ROONEY. I thought the gentleman had read all the hearings. He will find all this in the hearings.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. DOWDY: Page 13, beginning in line 2, strike out "of which not less than $6,750,000 shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "of which such portion, not less than $3,575,000, as may be equal to the dollar equivalent of any foreign currencies or credits acquired under the provisions of Public Law 480, 83d Congress, and used to carry out activities or programs under this paragraph shall be used to purchase such currencies or credits and not less than $6,750,000 shall be used to purchase other foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against this amendment and reserve it at this time.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, it is likely that a member of the Committee on Agriculture should be presenting this matter rather than I. However, I discovered it too late to talk to any of the members about it so I thought it might be well to have it called to the Committee's attention. I hope I can make clear what I refer to in this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, you will note that of the amount to be spent for this educational exchange—and I always thought it was a pretty good program; it is a matter of principle that I am offering this amendment. However, it seems that there may be some question about it from some of the things I have heard here today. Perhaps it is not all good. But that is beside the point.

You will note that the bill provides that of the money appropriated not less than $6¾ million shall be used to purchase foreign currencies and credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States.

I find in reading the budget and also in some of the hearings and the committee's report on this bill that in addition to the foreign exchange and foreign currencies they are having to reimburse by appropriations, there is a further amount of $3,575,000 which comes under Public Law 480 of the 83d Congress, with reference to the disposal of some of our surplus agricultural products. That was title I of the Agricultural Trade and Development Assistance Act of 1954 which authorized the sale up to $3 billion of surplus agricultural commodities to friendly nations for their currencies.

The Commodity Credit Corporation finances the cost for these, and most of the currencies that are obtained from the sale of the products are used without charging it to appropriations; in other words, just turning it over to the State Department or somebody else and they spend it actually without much accounting for it. A small amount of it is charged to appropriations. The proceeds of such sales go to the Commodity Credit Corporation, what little is sold.

I feel that when we are using this money for other purposes then it should be charged to appropriations and the Commodity Credit Corporation given credit for it, because they will be coming in charging these as costs of farm program while using money which is charged against the farm program for other purposes. I think these other purposes should reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for the money that they use for other purposes. Public Law 547, passed in 1952, provided that foreign credits owed to or owned by the United States Treasury will not be available for expenditures by agencies of the United States after June 30, 1953, except as may be provided for annually in appropriation acts and provisions for the utilization of such credits for purposes authorized by law are thereby authorized to be included in general appropriation acts. That law was passed, and then when this Public Law 480 came along it repealed Public Law 547 as to parts of the sales of agriculture products. The only purpose of my amendment is to bring all of it under the provision of this Public Law 547 of 1952.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWDY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. As a matter of clarification, to see whether I understand what the gentleman's amendment would do or what he intends by the amendment, does the gentleman submit to the Committee the fact that the 480 funds are not subject to appropriation?

Mr. DOWDY. Apparently not. The report and the budget show that they expect to expend $3,575,000 of 480 funds in connection with this without any reimbursement.

Mr. BOW. Reimbursement, the gentleman means, to the agricultural fund? Is that the point the gentleman is making?

Mr. DOWDY. That is correct.

Mr. BOW. But the 480 funds are subject to appropriation and cannot be spent without appropriation.

Mr. DOWDY. They are not subject to appropriations so that the particular department will be bearing the cost.

I hope I have made plain my contention, and the purpose of my amendment. It should be adopted. I will have a similar amendment for the same purpose in the appropriation for the propaganda agent, the United States Information Agency.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order, and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, if the pending amendment were to be adopted, the result should be very apparent. It would not in the least cure the situation the gentleman from Texas talks about. It would deny $3,575,000 in funds for the educational exchange program. If he has fault to find with regard to the provisions of Public Law 480, I think you will agree that the legislative committee is the proper place to bring up a proposal such as this.

Adoption of this would really gut the program. This is the danger of amendments offered here on the floor of the House without consultation with the committees and the department to find out what happens if such an amendment were adopted. This is such an instance. This amendment would gut this program and reduce it to the tune of $3,575,000. Mr. Chairman, I urge that the pending amendment be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

RAMA ROAD, NICARAGUA

For an additional amount for necessary expenses for the survey and construction of the Rama Road, Nicaragua, in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 160), as supplemented by section 8 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 74), $1,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That transfer of funds may be made from this appropriation to the Department of Commerce for the performance of work for which the appropriation is made.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MEADER: On page 13, line 13, strike out "$1,500,000" and insert "$500,000."

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, this is an illustration of a foreign project which originated without the approval of Congress and which has grown and grown and grown.

The Rama Road, which has nothing to do with the Inter-American Highway, but extends from the Inter-American Highway about 160 miles to the Escondido River at the port of Rama in Nicaragua, was the result of a private agreement between President Roosevelt and President Somoza of Nicaragua when the latter made a visit here in the early days of the war.

President Roosevelt agreed to give Somosa $2 million out of the President's defense emergency fund. What connection the Rama Road had with the defense of the United States in World War II is a little hard to conceive. Nevertheless, Congress had nothing to do with it and did not even know about it.

Two million dollars was not enough so $4 million was taken out of the President's emergency fund. When that too proved insufficient, then, for the first time, they came to the Congress and twice in authorization acts brought in by the Public Works Committee, we have authorized an additional $4 million or a total of $8 million plus $4 million from the President's emergency fund or a total authorization of $12 million for a project that was originally supposed to have cost $2 million.

On top of that we learn from the hearings on the pending bill, on page 836, that the Nicaraguan Government itself put $4,128,000 into this project.

The amount requested by the administration for fiscal 1958, was $2 million, which would use up all of the funds that have been authorized by the Congress.

The committee saw fit to cut that by $500,000 and the item on the bill is for $1,500,000. I am suggesting we cut $1 million off that and make it only $500,000 this year.

I want to call your attention to a question asked by Mr. MAGNUSON on the subcommittee on page 836 of the hearings:

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the $12 million complete the job?

Mr. RUBOTTOM. We cannot assure the committee that it will. The survey which is now being undertaken for this last 19 miles has not been finished, and the survey will have to be finished before any estimate can be completed of the cost of the termination of the job. On the basis of very informal estimates now, and taking into account the increased cost of steel and other items that have to go into the highway, there is a very real likelihood that some additional funds will be required in order to terminate it.

Why do we not make them tell us what the whole project is going to cost before we go on year after year adding to a project that has already cost $16 million, and which may cost more, when the original cost was estimated at $2 million and the Congress did not have the slightest thing to do with approving it in the first place.

I think it is high time that we not permit these bureaucrats to go around spending money and committing us and getting us part way into a program and then coming to the Congress to say that to keep an international commitment, we, in the Congress, have to back them up and underwrite the cost no matter what it may be. Let us postpone this expenditure until we know what it is going to cost to bring an end to this road to finish it and then we can act intelligently.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. HALEY. Why does not the gentleman just try to cut the entire amount out so that we could then try to arrive at some figure as to what the total cost is going to be? Why leave the half million dollars in the bill?

Mr. MEADER. I leave the half million dollars in because there is probably work in process which we ought not to shut down completely. But, I think before we give any more appropriations or an additional authorization, if we exceed the $12 million already authorized, let us hold back until they get their figures in order so that they can come in here with a reliable estimate of total cost so that we can act intelligently.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that this road, the Rama Road, had its inception in an old agreement that the Nicaraguans gave us to build an alternate canal for use in lieu of the Panama Canal through Nicaragua. As the years passed it became apparent that we would not need the alternate route for canal purposes between the Atlantic and the Pacific. It was decided it would be a worthwhile thing, however, to have a highway in the event the Panama Canal was blocked or destroyed during wartime. The Nicaraguans, interested in hemisphere solidarity and development, gave assent. Therefore, President Roosevelt started this project with emergency funds under his control. Since that time, each President, including President Eisenhower, has endorsed the value of the project. We have a commitment with the Nicaraguan Government to finish the project. The project is contributing materially to the development of Nicaragua. The end is in sight. There is not too much more of the road yet to be built. We are not the only ones paying for this project. The Nicaraguans themselves are contributing substantially to the main road, and in addition they are constructing feeder roads that are built entirely from their own resources. This money in the current budget would, except for $500,000, complete the appropriations for which there is authorization. Apparently, some additional money is going to be required, but not a great deal. I can see no useful purpose that can be served by disrupting the project at this

time when it is moving toward completion. Therefore, I trust the Committee will vote down this amendment and that we will complete our commitment to the Nicaraguan Government and people—a very good neighbor—and help them to build this road.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MEADER), there were—ayes 57, noes 53.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ROONEY and Mr. MEADER.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 67, noes 70.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV—UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable the United States Information Agency, as authorized by Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1953, and the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1431 et seq.), to carry out international information activities, including employment, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, of (1) persons on a temporary basis (not to exceed $120,000), (2) aliens within the United States, and (3) aliens abroad for service in the United States relating to the translation or narration of colloquial speech in foreign languages (such aliens to be investigated for such employment in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary of State and the Attorney General); travel expenses of aliens employed abroad for service in the United States to and from the United States; salaries, expenses, and allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801–1158); expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with activities provided for under this appropriation (not to exceed $6,000); entertainment within the United States not to exceed $500; hire of passenger motor vehicles; insurance on official motor vehicles in foreign countries; purchase of space in publications abroad, without regard to the provisions of law set forth in 44 U. S. C. 322; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); payment of tort claims, in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of section 2672, as amended, of title 28 of the United States Code when such claims arise in foreign countries; advance of funds notwithstanding section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; dues for library membership in organizations which issue publications to members only, or to members at a price lower than to others; employment of aliens, by contract, for service abroad; purchase of ice and drinking water abroad; payment of excise taxes on negotiable instruments abroad; cost of transporting to and from a place of storage and the cost of storing the furniture and household and personal effects of an employee of the Foreign Service who is assigned to a post at which he is unable to use his furniture and effects, under such regulations as the Director may prescribe; actual expenses of preparing and transporting to their former homes the remains of persons, not United States Government employees, who may die away from their homes while participating in activities authorized under this appropriation; radio activities and acquisition and production of motion pictures and visual materials and purchase or rental of technical equipment and facilities therefor, narration, script-writing, translation, and engineering services, by contract or otherwise; maintenance, improvement, and repair of properties used for information activities in foreign countries; fuel and utilities for Government-owned or leased property abroad; rental or lease for periods not exceeding 5 years of offices, buildings, grounds, and living quarters for officers and employees engaged in informational activities abroad; travel expenses for employees attending official international conferences, without regard to the standardized Government travel regulations and to the rates of per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence expenses under the Travel Expense Act of 1949, but at rates not in excess of comparable allowances approved for such conferences by the Secretary of State; and purchase of objects for presentation to foreign governments, schools, or organizations; $105 million, of which not less than $9 million shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States: *Provided*, That not to exceed $50,000 may be used for representation abroad: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for expenses in connection with travel of personnel outside the continental United States, including travel of dependents and transportation of personal effects, household goods, or automobiles of such personnel, when any part of such travel or transportation begins in the current fiscal year pursuant to travel orders issued in that year, notwithstanding the fact that such travel or transportation may not be completed during the current year: *Provided further*, That funds may be exchanged for payment of expenses in connection with the operation of information establishments abroad without regard to the provisions of section 3651 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 543): *Provided further*, That passenger motor vehicles used abroad exclusively for the purposes of this appropriation may be exchanged or sold, pursuant to section 201 (c) of the act of June 30, 1949 (40 U. S. C. 481 (c)), and the exchange allowances or proceeds of such sales shall be available for replacement of an equal number of such vehicles and the cost, including the exchange allowance of each such replacement, except buses and station wagons, shall not exceed $1,500: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665), the United States Information Agency is authorized in making contracts for the use of international shortwave radio stations and facilities, to agree on behalf of the United States to indemnify the owners and operators of said radio stations and facilities from such funds as may be hereafter appropriated for the purpose against loss or damage on account of injury to persons or property arising from such use of said radio stations and facilities: *Provided further*, That existing appointments and assignments to the Foreign Service Reserve for the purposes of foreign information and educational activities which expire during the current fiscal year may be extended for a period of 1 year in addition to the period of appointment or assignment otherwise authorized.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHEEHAN: On page 32, line 6, after the semicolon, strike out "$105,000,000" and insert "$104,567,000."

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the debate we covered the principle behind this cut. This strikes out $433,000 from the appropriation for the United States Information Agency. The $433,000 is the amount which the United States Information Agency is going to pay or hopes to pay during the fiscal year 1958 to the New York Times to the extent of $255,475 and to the New York Herald Tribune to the extent of $177,584 for subscriptions of which the greatest bulk will be sent to various people throughout Europe to help influence their opinion, as I see it and understand it, on how the American people think.

As was pointed out in debate, I personally feel, and I know a lot of other Members feel, that the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune with their extreme internationalism and their political philosophy do not represent the real thinking of the people of America. Therefore, if the State Department and the United States Information Agency really desires to convey to the interested people of Europe, Pakistan, India, and other places where these papers are sent, the true feelings of Midwest America, Far West America, the northern part of the United States, and the southern part of the United States, then they will embark upon a program to see to it that not only these internationalistic viewpoint papers are given to the Europeans but a cross section of the other sections of America are distributed abroad.

I am not sure how this can be done. My amendment will strike out this amount of money, not that I object to the main purpose for which the money is being spent, but I am objecting to the way in which the United States Information Agency does it. It would seem to me if the United States Information Agency would come back here at a later time and show the Members of Congress that they are attempting to give to the people of Europe and other sections of the world a real cross section of the ideas, the thinking, and the political philosophy of America, then I do not think I would have any particular objection to the amount because I believe the members of the committee under the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] have done a very fine job on this appropriation bill. But until such time as the State Department can adequately show us that the entire viewpoints of the country are represented I think this amount should be stricken from the bill.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment. This amount has been cut enough. It should not be cut any more.

On this question of circulating newspapers in Europe, we have heard a lot of talk about how the Chicago Tribune ought to be circulated over there. I would like to put in a word for the Ohio State Journal, the Columbus Dispatch, and the Columbus Citizen, all great dai-

lies in my district. I will back them against any paper in the Nation. The only trouble is that these papers from my home town, and from a lot of other places in the United States, do not publish in Europe, and therefore it would be slow and expensive to circulate them abroad. The Times and the Herald Tribune are published over there, with special European editions, and those who have traveled in Europe know they are published primarily for the benefit of American tourists and businessmen so that they contain the sort of news of the United States that is pretty well planned to fit over there.

While I admit that it is pretty foolish to send all the Members of Parliament a copy of these papers every day—I doubt if they read them—yet I think that the general idea involved, of making sure that these papers get to libraries and places like that where they will be read, and where they will give information on what is going on in the United States day by day is a pretty good idea. It is probably less expensive, and more readable than circulating USIA bulletins.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. I would just like to add to what the gentleman has said about other papers. There are excellent newspapers in New York besides the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune that would be certainly as well qualified to give American views abroad if they were published abroad and equally available.

Mr. VORYS. That may be, and I do not want to yield to all of those who claim that their papers are as good as the ones in my Congressional district.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. I am not going to praise all the newspapers of my city, but I just want to point out that in some large cities of the world there are no wire services available to our representatives there, and that is why American newspapers published abroad will often take the place in the dissemination of information which would otherwise be provided by wire service.

Mr. VORYS. I do not want to defend in detail the distribution of these papers, but I am certain that this is a good idea, to take something that is already printed up and is in pretty good shape and have it made available to show what is going on in the United States day by day, and get it circulated around without having the USIA label stamped on it. Since Europeans know that these papers are prepared primarily for Americans to read, this takes the propaganda label off the information they obtain.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is not the Chicago Tribune published in Paris?

Mr. VORYS. I asked our friend from Illinois, and he informed me that it is not at the present time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. At the present time, you mean?

Mr. VORYS. Yes.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto has been closed. The gentleman may offer his amendment after the debate is over.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York, Mr. ROONEY.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROONEY. Is the gentleman from Pennsylvania withdrawing his amendment?

Mr. GAVIN. I am not. I am offering the amendment after the vote is taken on this amendment. I am offering this later at the suggestion of the Chairman.

Mr. ROONEY. Should it not be read at this time? Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment now at the Clerk's desk offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania be read.

The CHAIRMAN. For information?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Is the amendment by the gentleman from Pennsylvania in order after this is disposed of?

The CHAIRMAN. Well, the Chair will have to wait to see what is offered. In the first place, he will have to offer something.

Mr. GROSS. If he has not offered it, I object.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I thought the gentleman had offered the amendment.

Mr. GAVIN. The Chair has ruled otherwise.

Mr. ROONEY. Oh, no; the Chair has not ruled otherwise.

Mr. GAVIN. I withhold the amendment until the vote is taken on this amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Then, in rising in opposition to the pending amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. SHEEHAN], I should also address myself to this secret amendment which is about to be offered by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, my dear friend, Mr. GAVIN. I think that we are getting into a very, very dangerous area with amendments such as these. The committee took into consideration all the facts at the time it arrived at the $105 million of appropriations for the United States Information Agency. I do not believe that this is the way for us to proceed on an appropriation bill.

The committee is unanimous in opposing the pending amendment. If I were so disposed, or that kind of a fellow, I should be the last one to get up here and oppose this amendment because the New York Times did a very nice job on me this morning, entitled "Meat Ax 'Economy,'" when they said that—

> The proposed cut is of unreasonable proportions. Even more unreasonable is the absurd but characteristic statement of Representative JOHN J. ROONEY, Democrat, of Brooklyn, unfortunately one of the committee's influential members.

I should be the last fellow in the world to be up here opposing this amendment. But I do not believe in permitting personal differences to interfere with my judgment. I do not think and I have never believed that it should be the function of Congress to take over the executive agencies. I am not going to assume the decision as to whether USIA should send copies of the New York Times to any members of the British House of Lords and the British House of Commons. But the public and the Congress are entitled to know that there is $433,000 in the USIA request for the European editions of 2 newspapers. Everybody is entitled to know what is going on. If the United States Information Agency were intelligently run they would heed the debates that take place up here; they would read the committee's report; and perhaps then they might send only a few copies of these American newspapers to the British Parliament. Then they would save some money.

After a committee cut of $35 million, to proceed further and cut another half a million dollars on the basis of a situation that the committee has known about all along, and has specifically mentioned in its report, does not seem like good judgment to me.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to say that I am entirely in accord and on behalf of the minority I am opposed to this amendment. I trust it will be beaten. $105 million is the absolute minimum. I think it should be more, not less.

Mr. ROONEY. The President would surely be against this proposed cut.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know whether USIA has ever given any thought to sending free copies of the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune to the Members of Congress so they can brainwash us?

Mr. ROONEY. For goodness' sake, let us not get into that; they are liable to do it.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the rejection of the pending amendment and now ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY) there were—yeas 56, nays 76.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. GAVIN: On page 32, line 6, strike out "$105,000,000" and insert "$100,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

Mr. GAVIN. I do not yield for that purpose.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GAVIN. I might say to the gentleman the feeling is mutual. I hope very much my very good friend, whom I greatly admire, and I really do admire him, will remain on the floor and listen, because he was very much concerned about this last cut, which was around $400,000. This amendment is for a $5 million reduction. If you want to do some reducing, and I doubt it, you have a chance now to show the folks back home you really mean business. Many were very much interested in reducing the Health, Education, and Welfare program. Many amendments were offered and many wanted to be recorded, so you had 14 record votes on amendments and several unrecorded on that appropriation bill. However, not many amendments today.

This proposed amendment, which I offer, concerns—and I quote from the bill—"the radio activities and acquisition and production of motion pictures and visual materials and purchase or rental of technical equipment and facilities therefor, narration, script writing, translation, and engineering services, by contract or otherwise; maintenance, improvement, and repair of properties used for information activities in foreign countries; fuel and utilities for Government-owned or leased property abroad; rental or lease for periods not exceeding 5 years of offices, buildings, grounds, and living quarters for officers and employees engaged in informational activities abroad; travel expenses for employees attending official international conferences, without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, and to the rates of per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence expenses," and so forth, and so forth.

To show how these activities have grown, I ask my very good friend, the chairman, what does it cost to run this United States Information Agency? In 1955 it cost $73,914,000. Then in 1956 and 1957 apropriations were increased from $73,914,000 to $113 million. Note this Agency is growing by leaps and bounds everywhere. Evidently by expansion programs, greater contribution requests jumped from $113 million to $144 million, but the committee turned in a good job and reduced it to $106,100,000. Let me remind the House that in 1955 the Agency was granted only $73,914,000, so they have been increased $32,186,000 in a couple of years—not a bad increase for a short period of time.

We have been vociferous in our talk about effecting economies. We have been talking about giving relief to the American taxpayers. You want all branches and all departments of our Government at home to effect economies and to cut down on the number of their employees and cut down on the expense of everything that goes on in our own Government. Note the attitude toward the Post Office Department in the recent $47 million deficiency appropriation. Now here is an opportunity to reduce the appropriation and help bring about a tax reduction. Maybe it will cause this agency some difficulty, but, nevertheless, it will cause them to effect a more businesslike approach and efficient operation because they will be a bit restrained and restricted and will not be able to have all the money available that they want to carry on every program and project they might conceive. When I review these programs here that are in the report, there are some they can do without. On this one item alone on page 22 of the report, item B. Twenty-six weeks of evening performances in the National Pavilion Theater, which was cut out, $1,305,000 to produce all the musicals and plays. Maybe one might say that is not relevant to this particular item before us; however, this is part of what I think is an unwise use of the American taxpayers' money. Even if it was rejected it should never have been recommended under such circumstances. I am concerned about the whole program. It is about time this agency got down to doing things in a businesslike, practical, sound, sensible, and efficient manner. It is about time we effect economies and give some relief to the American taxpayers. I present my thinking because you are all now apparently economy minded. You are hearing from the folks back home. What are you going to do about it? How are you going to vote? Certainly you want to be recorded. Here is an opportunity to be recorded that you, too, mean to get results. It will save the taxpayers $5 million at one time.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not really think it is necessary to debate this amendment at any great length. I do not believe that the good judgment of the House will permit the adoption of this amendment. It is interesting to note that in every department or in every area for which we appropriate, there is always one good popular whipping boy. Members frequently blow off steam and use this whipping boy to make speeches in the well of the House. This USI program is a program of that type. The reason it is is because there is not any way in the world to evaluate this program. I do not care how expert you are. I do not think there is a human being in America with all the experience that he may have in TV, radio, and newspapers, magazines, and so on who can really evaluate this program and tell us whether we are getting our money's worth. Unfortunately, it is that type of program. It is a program of trial and error. It is a highly specialized program. Now I do not care who runs it and I think the present director is a very able man—but I do not care who runs this program, he should have the privilege of trying to convince the Congress that we are getting our money's worth out of what we have spent. We are not experts here in the House on this subject. We must have faith in our appointed leaders of Government. There is no reason to believe that the present director does not have the capacity and capabilities to run this program properly. He is entitled to a fair trial. He is already starting out on the fiscal year 1958 with a handicap of $7 million that we have cut off this program. This amendment would seek to take off $5 million more. We are penalizing and punishing him when he has not had a decent chance to prove his worth at running this great and important program that is so important that the President of the United States has emphasized publicly and by letters to Members of the Congress his deep concern about this cut.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. I join the gentleman in his opposition to this amendment. I think it would be assuming a terrific responsibility for the Congress to reduce this figure any more than it already has been reduced. This money is for peace. This money is to protect America from an atheistic foe who is striving to spread its ideology all over the world. I cannot believe when the President of the United States has so strongly made known that he thinks this is a great and important sustaining part of his program that this House will reduce the amount of money involved here.

Mr. PRESTON. I thank the gentleman. I do not think the House will either.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Are not the potential enemies of this country spending this same kind of money on their own kind of propaganda?

Mr. PRESTON. The Russians are spending much larger amounts than has ever been spent by the United States.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I join with the gentleman in his opposition to this amendment, and also the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]. I think it might be decidedly harmful to the best interest of our country if this amount is further reduced. As a matter of fact, my own personal opinion is that the amount reported here is not sufficient, but I am going along with the committee. I strongly urge the defeat of the present amendment.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. Is it not a fact that the Russians spend more money jamming the American programs than we spent on this program entirely?

Mr. PRESTON. Well, I do not know about that.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman knows, does he not, that the statement made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is entirely inaccurate?

Mr. PRESTON. I do not have the figures and so I do not know.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. I agree with the gentleman. I am in opposition to this amendment.

We are all familiar with the tremendous growth of television in the United States.

It may be surprising to know that in some foreign countries, the rate of growth exceeds even that of our country. In 1956, it is estimated that there were 10,051,000 receivers in use in Free World nations. Of course, the potential viewing audience exceeds this many times, particularly in countries where sets are located in public places.

We all know from firsthand experience the impact of TV in telling a story, in depicting the truth about people and places.

I am glad to note that the United States Information Agency has moved quickly to take advantage of TV as a communications medium.

Last year 58 new foreign TV stations went into operation bringing the total of 212 stations in the free world. For the period 1957–58, 203 more stations are planned.

USIA has the advantage of American experience and know-how in the television field. Other countries seriously lack the producers, technicians, and performers necessary to produce good, professional programs. As a result foreign TV stations are anxious to use the programs we can offer. The TV industry's fine cooperation makes possible our being able to send abroad some of the best programs in American television.

Many TV systems abroad start under the direction of the educational authorities, particularly in the Near East and southeast Asia. In these areas TV is particularly adaptable to the cultural development of these areas. There the people hunger for knowledge, yet their facilities will not be able to cope with the demand for years to come. TV is a natural method to reach quickly mass audiences and large student groups.

USIA, in cooperation with other government agencies, stimulates the inception of TV abroad through the educational approach. The United States knows that the more people everywhere know of their neighbors, the wider their knowledge of what we stand for, the closer we will come to a peaceful world.

At present TV programing by USIA is active in 43 countries. I am glad to note that it is the Agency's intention to keep pace with this dramatic new medium for reaching the minds of people everywhere.

It is well to remember that it is what people believe about us which determines their attitude toward us.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to say to the gentleman from New York that the figures I obtained from you, as far as accuracy is concerned, they are what your executive gave to me.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentleman refer to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]?

Mr. GAVIN. Certainly. I will call you "Mr. ROONEY." When you refer to me, you refer to me as "Mr. GAVIN."

Mr. ROONEY. Did the gentleman ever get any inaccurate figures from me? I have always addressed the gentleman as the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN], as required by the rules.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment. I did not understand what the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] was saying a moment ago. He had some papers in his hand and he pointed over in this direction. I wonder if he believes that I ever gave him any incorrect information.

Mr. GAVIN. No. You were referring to my statement as being incorrect. I am merely telling the gentleman from New York that I got the figures referred to from your executive secretary.

Mr. ROONEY. If you have any figures that are incorrect, they were not supplied by the committee or anyone connected with it. When the gentleman offers an amendment to cut an appropriation by $5 million, based on what he has had to say in the well of the House in presenting his amendment, he expects us to go quite far. I think that the committee, in the interest of economy, has taken the fat out of the Information Agency to the farthest extent possible at this time. This program is now far more costly than it ever was. Previously we never had requests for such amounts as $135 million and $140 million. We have always gone into the USIA budget. This committee works hard on all of them.

I recall, some 5 or 6 years ago, when this committee, with the support of the House, reduced a request of USIA for $97½ million for radio facilities, to $9,500,000—a 90-percent cut—and the cut was sustained in the other body, and that $9,500,000 became the law with regard to that requested appropriation. Does the House know that there is still in the hands of the Information Agency a good part of that $9½ million which had been reduced from $97½ million?

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. I am a little disturbed getting down here between these two Irishmen today.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. No.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Georgia put it very well when he said that any program such as this must necessarily be a program of trial and error. Errors will occur, there will be here a mistake and there a mistake, but the whole program should not be condemned because of a few mistakes.

Whether we like it or not, and we don't like it, we cannot escape the fact that there is a worldwide struggle between the slave way of life and the free way of life. We know that the struggle affects us because we are getting ready to appropriate billions for the defense of our land.

Why do we do that? Because we must protect ourselves from the possibility of aggression from the Communist forces arrayed against us.

In this struggle we not only must maintain our defenses, but we must take part in a struggle for the minds of men; it is a struggle in which if we are to be ultimately successful we must one day convince enough of the people of this world that ours is the best way of life for everybody, that it is better than the slave way. That is what this program is about; and as far as I am concerned I rise in opposition to the amendment and I hope the amendment is defeated. The committee has already substantially reduced this amount.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Indiana. I appreciate what he says and am glad that in this instance I can go along with him. I am glad he feels the way he does with regard to the pending amendment. He is one of those who on the last vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman Illinois was so courageous as to stand up and vote with President Eisenhower.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. I also rise in opposition to the amendment.

I want to express my strong regret at the action of the Appropriations Committee in slashing USIA funds so heavily. To my way of thinking the information program is one of the most vital programs of the Government in these critical times. Take the case of Latin America, about which I know a little more than other foreign areas. A strong information program in that area is vital.

Two basic facts stand out in the relationship of the United States to the 20 neighboring countries of Latin America: First, years of friendly association have tended to make us take them for granted. We forget too easily the multiplying populations, the rampant nationalism and ambition for national improvement.

Second, we are inclined to assume that the Latin American is aware of our good intentions, that he understands the United States, its policies, its actions, and its people. We forget that his actual knowledge of us is limited, and that our special economic position in his territory makes it easy for unscrupulous forces to turn him against us, to make him feel exploited by us.

If we are not farsighted, a familiar pattern can be repeated in this area as in others. Communists, taking advantage of inevitable nationalisms, will create conditions that will multiply the problems of the United States in this area many times, and jeopardize the important economic and strategic interests we have in Latin America.

A case in point was the Guatemalan crisis which suddenly demanded emergency attention. That situation is now

under control but the Communists have only been checkmated. They are still at work in that courageous country, and in almost every other country in Latin America. This is evident in the uprisings; in the never-ending attempts of local stooges to infiltrate and gain control of labor unions, and in the increasing volume of books, magazines, and Communist-controlled newspapers. More and more Latin Americans are being invited behind the Iron Curtain; more and more cultural exchange programs are being carried out with the Soviet bloc. Also, more and more Soviet-bloc countries are soliciting trade with Latin America and showing their wares at Latin American trade expositions.

This is the situation confronting the United States in Latin America today. Fortunately, we are not completely on the defensive there. We can, if we adopt proper measures, take advantage of historic and geographic factors which are in our favor, and also of the very factors which are being exploited today by our enemies.

But a vigorous information program is a primary necessity. Not only do we need to counteract the lies and rumors and half-truths, but we need to convince our neighbors that our interests parallel theirs, that what we believe and stand for is fundamentally the same as their own convictions and aspirations. Essential to this end is a strong and effective information and cultural program.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. If the gentleman can contribute anything.

Mr. GAVIN. Yes; I think this is a contribution. The only thought I want to call to the minds of the Members is that on the health and welfare bill everybody wanted to be recorded. Why not accept this amendment? Then you can be recorded as showing just how you voted, whether you are for economy or otherwise. If you have the courage of your convictions let your vote be recorded.

Mr. ROONEY. In conclusion I remind the Committee that a deep cut has already been made in this appropriation and I urge the rejection of the pending amendment and ask for a vote.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the gentleman from New York if this is not the same agency that put 950 persons on the payroll?

Mr. ROONEY. No; they put on only 508 of the approximately 950. The State Department did that with 446 positions; this agency did it with only 508.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, despite the committee's injunction a year ago that they must not increase personnel. Is that not correct?

Mr. ROONEY. Despite a reduction of $22 million. We took into consideration these matters which were uncovered by the committee and used them in arriving at the figure of $105 million.

Mr. GROSS. Here is an agency, Mr. Chairman, which has expended thousands of dollars to hire reporters to propagandize, to brainwash the people of this country, not some foreign country, but in this country. This is the same organization that paid a sportswriter in New York City on the New York Times $100 to write an article about Casey Stengel for the benefit of the Japanese.

This is the same outfit that has produced a movie. I believe it is the same outfit that has produced a movie in this country, a commercial movie, but I have not been able to discover the name of that movie or what has happened to it. Apparently it was a boxoffice flop, at a cost to the taxpayers of at least $100,000. Perhaps the gentleman would like to enlighten us on that.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is very modest. This ought to be cut deeper than the gentleman from Pennsylvania proposes, in view of the hearings and the information that we have before us.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I would like to close debate on the pending amendment if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. GROSS. Could the gentleman give us a little information about this mysterious movie that was produced and that was such a boxoffice flop?

Mr. ROONEY. There is included in the printed hearings everything in this regard the agency wished to disclose.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that.

Mr. ROONEY. The title of the picture is classified. The agency made it classified information; I cannot tell the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. That is what we run into in connection with this particular outfit. I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be adopted.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct a question to the chairman of the subcommittee. Did my ears serve me right when I heard him say that the title of the play produced for distribution or showing in the United States was classified information?

Mr. ROONEY. That is correct. The United States Information Agency classified the title of this movie and will not release it to the press. I know the title.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Can the gentleman give any valid reason for the classification of such information?

Mr. ROONEY. That inquiry should be directed to Mr. Larson and the United States Information Agency.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I think, certainly, that the committee should be profoundly interested in knowing the reason.

Mr. ROONEY. I am not the one who classified the title of the movie. The committee did not classify it. Mr. Larson, of the Information Agency, did that.

Mr. JOHANSEN. The gentleman did not say that the committee classified the title. The gentleman said he thought the committee should be profoundly interested in the reasons for doing that.

Mr. ROONEY. I know all about the picture and all about the alleged reasons, I may say to the distinguished gentleman. The Information Agency has made the information classified, and I have respected that classification. It should not be too long before it is declassified.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I am not asking the gentleman to betray any confidences, but I do think the gentleman from California, who is making headlines in the suppression of information to the American people in the executive branch, I think my good friend the gentleman from Californa [Mr. Moss], would be very much interested in the reasons for classifying the title of this movie.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 2 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to an article appearing in the Evening Star of Thursday, January 1, 1957, by Mary McGrory titled "New USIA Chief Plans Worldwide Program."

I want to read a couple of paragraphs of that article and then ask the gentleman whether or not in the hearings they were able to determine the philosophy of the new director of this program. I read the following:

> The former Under Secretary of Labor, who was widely advertised during the campaign as living proof that the Republican Party is big enough for intellectuals, does not believe in telling other countries how grand we are.
>
> "Rather," says Mr. Larson, "we should increase their own self-respect, their devotion to their own institutions, their own public and private associations, their religion, their families—everything under the sun that makes them want to stand on their own two feet."

The problem as he sees it is "not to make them love us but to make them love themselves."

Are we spending $105 million to make other countries love themselves when they probably love themselves already?

Mr. ROONEY. I must say in answer to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan that I am not responsible for anything that Mr. Larson says. He happens to be a Republican. He is known as "Mr. Republican," is he not?

Mr. MEADER. I did not know him that way. He wrote a book, I remember.

Mr. ROONEY. Is the gentleman criticizing his book?

Mr. MEADER. I was asking the gentleman whether or not in the hearings Mr. Larson had indicated that he was going to convert this agency into a totally different organization with a completely different purpose than it has had in the past.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Larson may have some grandiose ideas, but if you follow

the judgment of this committee, we shall keep any grandiose ideas to a minimum, I assure you.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. I call the attention of the members of the committee to the fact that this $100 million is not $100 million comparable to current figures. It is $98 million, because of the $2 million mandatory item for contribution to the retirement fund and extra days' pay for 1958; in other words, $105 million in the bill is really $103 million compared to $113 million in the current year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GAVIN) there were—ayes 48, noes 81.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOWDY: On page 32, beginning in line 6, strike out "of which not less than $9,000,000 shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "of which such portion, not less than $1,350,000 as may be equal to the dollar equivalent of any foreign currencies or credits acquired under the provisions of Public Law 480, 83d Congress, and used to carry out activities or programs under this paragraph shall be used to purchase such currencies or credits and not less than $9,000,000 shall be used to purchase other foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States."

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, this has reference to the same Public Law 480 that I referred to at another time this afternoon, and I will not go into that. I did not get to finish what I wanted to say before, as my 5 minutes ran out.

Now, Public Law 480 has a provision in it which says:

And any department or agency of the Government using any of such currencies for a purpose for which funds have been appropriated shall reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation in an amount equivalent to the dollar value of the currencies used.

I find from page 173 of the President's budget request for this year that this United States Information Agency, or whatever the name of it is, has $1,350,000 worth of these Public Law 480 funds in addition to the $105 million provided for in this bill.

The purpose of my amendment is to cause this agency to pay into the Treasury for the foreign currencies and credits they are using and the Commodity Credit Corporation would get the credit for it.

I did notice in the President's budget request in another place in regard to these Public Law 480 funds that the President recommends that a lump-sum appropriation be made to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for its losses which are not made up through these appropriation sales which, of course, would have the effect of charging this information and propaganda agency's expenditures to the farm program of the United States.

That, together with what I said before in connection with another amendment, should explain the purpose of this amendment. I trust it will be adopted by the committee.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not think very much time need be taken with this amendment. It is similar to the amendment which was offered by the distinguished gentleman from Texas awhile ago with regard to the educational exchange activities of the Department of State. It is, again, a question with regard to Public Law 480. If he was amending that law I would be for it. But to accept an amendment such as this on the floor is something I think the Committee of the Whole will not do.

So, Mr. Chairman, I now ask for a vote on the pending amendment which should be rejected, being similar to the one that was rejected by the committee about 20 minutes ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DOWDY) there were—ayes 23, noes 67.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: On page 32, line 6, after "$105,000,000", insert "of which not more than $500,000 shall be used to purchase objects for presentation to foreign governments, schools, or organizations."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, several amendments have been offered during the afternoon, the purpose of which was to induce the United States Information Agency to give to the people of other countries the views of some of our people who did not live on the eastern seaboard. To date internationalized New York and the Northeast has been brain washing and propagandizing the people of Europe and the Middle East through the New York Times and the Herald Tribune as well as by the other biased views it puts out. The New York Times and the Herald Tribune seem to represent the views of a comparatively small section of the country. On page 32 beginning on line 4 is found this language: "and purchase of objects for presentation to foreign governments, schools, or organizations; $105 million, of which not less than $9 million shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States." That leaves $96 million.

The purpose of the amendment which reads: "of which not more than $500,000 shall be used for the purchase of objects for presentation to foreign governments, schools, or organizations" is to limit the amount which can be spent for New Deal international giveaway propaganda.

Being curious as to the purpose of the language which just precedes the amount named, naturally reference was made to the index of the hearings, and there it was found. On page 4 of the index, identifying this provision of the bill is found the descriptive title, which is "Giveaway Programs." If there is any doubt about what this program is, we have this characterization of it by the committee itself.

The gentleman from New York who is in charge of the bill and presumably an advocate of economy gives us a report which describes this provision or subtitle as "Giveaway Programs." Permit me to congratulate him upon an accurate description.

Then, if reference is made to page 36 of the hearings you will find among other things this:

PRESENTATION OF AMERICAN PUBLICATIONS TO LOCAL FOREIGN AUTHORITIES

Mr. LARSON. We make use of anything we can possibly use to do our job, whether it is purchasing existing periodicals, or magazines, or papers, or books, or producing them ourselves. Whichever is the most efficient we try to do. We want to do whatever will do the job.

Mr. COUDERT. What do you do with the American magazines and newspapers that you purchase?

Mr. LARSON. We see that they get to the people that will do the most good.

* * * * *

Mr. ROONEY. Will you please insert in the record at this point a statement with regard to the American newspapers and publications used in connection with this French program, listing each one, how many, and how much?

Mr. POSNER. That is American newspapers and magazines?

Mr. ROONEY. That is right.

Mr. POSNER. Used in connection with the French program?

Mr. ROONEY. That is right.

(The matter referred to follows:)

American newspapers and magazines used in the French program, fiscal year 1957

	Number	Cost
For presentation:		
1. Purchased in France:		
New York Times (international edition)	537	$9,642.00
Herald Tribune (international edition)	209	5,065.00
Subtotal	746	14,707.00
2. Supplied by Information Center Service, Washington: Periodicals (see following table)	111	758.55
Total presentations of periodicals and magazines for French program		15,465.55
For information centers (supplied by Information Center Service, Washington): [1]		
Newspapers	28	1,225.61
Magazines	1,094	10,128.14
Subtotal		11,353.75
Grand total, American newspapers and periodicals in French program		26,819.30

[1] All American newspapers and periodicals are supplied to information centers in France by the Information Center Service, Washington.

Over on page 316 you will find this:

The breakdown by categories for the full program is as follows:

Recipients in England of New York Times and Herald Tribune

Category	Herald Tribune	New York Times
Individual members, House of Commons	216	251
Individual members, House of Lords	79	98
Ministries	12	21
Public libraries	253	219
Newspaper editors	334	149
Writers, opinion leaders	196	104
Unions, union officials	32	43
Universities		25
Colleges, schools	28	
Teachers	30	69
Clubs, training centers	14	27
United States and other reading rooms	17	14
Total as of Mar. 15, 1957	1,211	1,020

If that is the way it is to be, it does seem as though the amount which is to be expended, that is, the amount which the information agency is to pay to inform and educate the people of other countries, but only in the giveaway program the amount should be limited to $500,000. In all fairness—and this argument was made before—in all fairness the agency should give those people they are trying to educate a little information about the rest of our country. It is un-American to lead the people of other lands to believe that the views of the New York Times and Herald Tribune are the views of the United States.

That is all I care to say about it. The language of the bill is not confined to publications. You will notice it says "purchase of objects for presentation to foreign government, to schools and to organizations." What objects? What organizations? Some policymaking positions have been wide open to and held by Communists.

Let me conclude with the statement that you can accept the characterization of this bill made by the committee itself when it said it is a giveaway program. And there is little if any reason to doubt the statements of our colleague, Dr. JUDD, of long experience in the East, in China, and of intimate connections with officials of the State Department which oversees this program as quoted in an April 15 editorial of the Chicago Tribune which reads:

THE LAW OF AVERAGES

We have been reading Congressman WALTER JUDD'S stirring tribute to the State Department before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. An interesting snatch of the colloquy went as follows:

"Chairman EASTLAND. Then you think some of these people that are pro-Communist are still in the State Department, and still in the Pentagon?

"Mr. JUDD. Why, yes. I don't mean pro-Communist in the sense that they are in the party, but they advocate policies that work out to the good of the party. On the law of averages, a mere moron, once in a while, would make a decision that would be favorable to the United States. When policies are advocated by any group which consistently work out to the Communist advantage, that couldn't be happenstance."

What Congressman JUDD seems to be telling us is that the country would be fortunate if the State Department were to be staffed with mere morons. Even if of subnormal intelligence, they might be prompted by some instincts of patriotism, and, by fluke, would occasionally do a stroke of diplomacy to the advantage of the United States.

But, unhappily, we are short of well-intentioned morons in the State Department, which inclines to brighter types, some of questionable loyalty. They never miss in loading things the Soviet way.

Mr. JUDD says they get in their licks chiefly by writing policy papers that the higher-ups study in determining decisions and policy.

"If you allow me to write the papers on which my superiors make their decisions," said the Congressman, "I think I could have a good deal to say about what my superiors will think.

"For example, if the top man comes in and he has the choice between two memoranda on his desk, and both are written by a fellow who is a pro-Communist, the man's freedom of decision is not too wide. He has to decide between two positions, both of which are in various degrees pro-Communist, which means, in my book, inimical to the interests of the United States."

What to do about it? When Senator EASTLAND asked if the State Department couldn't fire these people who always load the dice in favor of the Kremlin, Mr. Judd replied:

"Well, it seems to me they could. It seems they could, if there was the will to be really tough in policing an organization and tightening it up. They could go back to the papers and find out what a man's position consistently has been. Then, if he has been consistently advocating over the years policies which events have proven wrong, he ought to be fired, not as a Communist, but as a fellow who is consistently wrong.

"If I have a doctor who takes care of my father and he dies, who takes care of my mother and she dies, who takes care of my wife, and she dies, and then I get sick, I am going to fire him, not as a Communist, but because he is just not a good enough doctor."

Looking back over the course of American diplomacy in the last quarter century, it is plain to see that the American public has never had the services of a very good doctor. In fact, it is almost cause for self-congratulation that the patient has survived the treatment at all, even if his present condition is not too flourishing.

Our colleague on this occasion "has something" and the United States Information Agency needs a new Director and direction—One who is an American in his views and practices.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendments and all amendments thereto close at the end of 2 minutes. to be reserved to the committee.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not think we should take too much of our time to discuss the pending amendment. Again this is a matter where, when the committee has spent 2 months on a bill, an amendment is offered which would undo the painstaking work of the committee. Everything mentioned by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] was taken into consideration by the committee at the time this bill was written. I do not believe the Committee of the Whole or the House will go along on a further limitation such as this.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman not believe that the rest of the country should have its views presented to other people?

Mr. ROONEY. I am one who is thoroughly in favor of everybody's having a chance to present his views. There is no question about that. But this is a question of judgment, the amount of time spent in arriving at the committee figure, which has been a sufficient cut in connection with this agency.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote and the rejection of the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I believe unwise the drastic budget cut for the United States Information Agency recommended by the House Appropriations Committee, which will require a cutback of this country's information operations in all areas of the world. The place where we have been losing some ground is the Far East. Do we realize the extent to which Red China has stepped up its own propaganda efforts throughout the Far East? The extent and nature of their activities measured in terms of our efforts are fantastic. Their efforts indicate the importance they attach to the area and their own appraisal of their chances of effectively influencing these people.

Let me give you some facts on the Red Chinese propaganda offensive: 1954 marked the intensification of their efforts in this field for purposes of "peaceful" penetration. The scale of effort continues upward. In 1956, Peiping radio broadcasts added the Lao and Cambodian language service, doubled broadcast hours to Indonesia, and raised total hours for the area from 136 in 1955 to 216 hours in 1956. Book output for Southeast Asia was raised from 10 million copies in 1955 to roughly 24 million copies in 1956. Red China's "people's diplomacy" campaign showed even more striking gains than those in radio and books—delegations from Peiping to Free Asia countries increased from 65 delegations totaling 400 persons in 1955 to 105 delegations totaling 2,000 persons in 1956. Add to this their subsidized trade, their offers of unfettered economic aid, their large expenditures to bring foreign visitors to China, and some measure of the competition we face can be seen.

Under these circumstances, this country should intensify and strengthen—and certainly not relax—its efforts to keep Asians aware of the threat posed to their security by Communist China. If the United States reduces its efforts

in the information field, you can be sure that the Red Chinese propagandists will be quick to follow up and exploit our pull-back. The instability of key countries—Indonesia is a prime example and Singapore is another—causes the area to be particularly vulnerable to Communist propaganda attacks, and makes it all the more important to make the voice of truth more clearly heard throughout the Far East.

Then there is the positive aspect: The Hungarian revolt dramatized the complete failure of the Communist system in a country which had the opportunity to know it first-hand. And all the world could see the brutality with which the Communists shot down the very people whose support they have always claimed—the workers, students, and intellectuals. The Hungarian story is the one great embarrassment for Peiping, on which it has no ready answer for its Asian neighbors. The United States must repeat, and keep on repeating even louder, the true story of the Hungarian tragedy—we cannot afford to let the Communists divert attention from it and sweep it under the rug.

For all these reasons, I believe the budget recommended for the United States Information Agency for the coming year by the House Appropriations Committee is inadequate, and I hope the other Body will see fit to restore a substantial portion of the funds cut from the Agency's request.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill do now close.

Mr. GROSS. I object, Mr. Chairman. I have an amendment to offer.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE V—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

President's special international program

For expenses necessary to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956, $10,900,000, of which $5 million shall be available for the Universal and International Exhibition of Brussels, 1958, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed a total of $25,000 may be expended for representation.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask a question of the gentleman from New York, who I may say has done a magnificent job today in defending this bill. On a few items I might disagree with him, and maybe some should be cut further, but I think the committee has done an excellent job.

I would just like to ask the gentleman a question or two here, if I may. I note in this item you have cut it very substantially and that you have disapproved an item or requested item on page 22 pertaining to the performances in the theater. Does the gentleman think he has reduced this budget enough so that those performances will not be given?

Mr. ROONEY. The committee has examined the justifications and taken testimony that they were going to produce 3 musicals at $60,000 a week at Brussels. The request included 12 weeks of legitimate plays at $45,000 a week. When we inquired, we found that these legitimate plays costing over half a million dollars were going to be presented in English to the foreign audience. Finally, the Director General, Mr. Cullman agreed that it would not be a good idea. In effect, he withdrew the request for the $540,000 to produce the legitimate plays abroad in English, but he said he would like to have the money—he would substitute something else. I think that was the way he put it.

Mr. HALEY. I hope the gentleman will think about some of the American insitutions—there is one I have in mind.

Mr. ROONEY. The Ringling Bros., Barnum & Bailey circus?

Mr. HALEY. Yes, the Ringling Bros., Barnum & Bailey circus.

Mr. ROONEY. I am all for the Ringling Bros., Barnum & Bailey circus.

Mr. HALEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALEY. I yield.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to express my regret at the action of the Appropriations Committee in striking an appropriation for the 1959 pan-American games which were scheduled to be held in Cleveland, Ohio.

At this time, it is not yet determined whether or not these games will be held. Some efforts are being made to conduct the games with private financing. Prospects are very dim that adequate financing will be provided. There is some talk of the games being held in another American or Latin American city. As a matter of fact, the failure of Congress to provide necessary funds may result in an undefinite postponement of the games. Certainly the future of the pan-American games may be imperiled and jeopardized.

Other nations have found it good government business to encourage their athletes and have, to a considerable degree, subsidized them throughout their period of development If it is good business for other nations of the world which can less afford it, why should it be bad business for America? We are spending billions in establishing what we think is a mutual security defense system. We are spending tremendous sums for our internal defense, but it may be that the dollars we spend to establish the moral and spiritual leadership of this country might in the end bring a greater dollar return in good will than any other investment which we can make.

During the past many months we have given considerable emphasis to providing to the need for military and economic aid to the countries of the Middle East, many of which have been openly hostile to our Nation's best interests. For too many years we have been taking our friendship with the Pan American countries for granted. In the final analysis, and when the chips are down, they may prove to be our only friends. It seems to me that we must try to do more than load nations friendly to us with military equipment and impose upon them various sums of economic aid. We must strive to build good will in other ways, and it is my belief that good will through an international athletic event, such as these Pan American games, may bring many times over the return that is realized from any investment in guns and planes.

In the world of sports there are more areas of accord among the discordant people of the world than there is anywhere else. It is an essential structural part of the moral rearmament with which democracy must make its way in this world. We must make it clear that we are dedicated to human progress—that we are interested in the scientific-moral and athletic achievement of other people on this planet. It is to be desired that the great contests between people in the future will be removed from the battlefield to the Olympic arena. This may be a fond hope, but we must pray that it is not too far distant. There are a great many things that this country does to stimulate international good will and international trade. Of these, are the world trade fairs in which this country has always participated. In this bill there is provision for the trade fair to be held in Belgium in 1959. If we can spend millions to show off our machines, why cannot we spend $4½ million to show off our muscles? It seems to me that one is just as important as another.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not heretofore authorized by the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 36, line 5, insert "(a)" immediately following "Sec. 701"; and immediately following line 7 on page 36 insert the following:

"(b) No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used for payment of any expert or consultant, or of any management engineering corporation, company, firm, or other organization, for the performance of any service relating to management or organization, unless the utilization and payment of experts or consultants and of management engineering corporations, companies, firms, or other organizations, is specifically authorized by law for the performance of such service."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment which I offered to the last appropriation bill and it was accepted by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], and the minority members of the subcommittee.

This is the amendment I propose to offer to every appropriation bill that is brought up hereafter. It simply provides that:

No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used for payment of any expert or consultant, or of any management engineering corporation, company, firm, or other organization, for the performance of any service relating to management or organization, unless the utilization and payment of experts or consultants and of management engineering corporations, companies, firms, or other organizations, is specifically authorized by law for the performance of such service.

I should think the chairman of this particular subcommittee and the minority members would be willing to accept this amendment in view of the experience they have had during the past year in which the State Department and USIA put on a number of employees, several hundred, without sanction of the committee. I should think they would welcome this amendment as conforming to their desires that people not be employed unless authorized by law.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure the Committee of the Whole will not seriously consider the pending amendment under the circumstances disclosed with regard to some of the areas concerned in this appropriation.

My good friend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is one of the hardest working Members of this House; everyone knows that. The distinguished gentleman from Iowa has been well known for his activities and votes in this House on the subject of economy. He offered this amendment previously to another appropriation bill. There may have been something to that, but this is not the kind of bill where this sort of limitation should preemptorily be adopted. We have already pointed out many instances where better management in the State Department is necessary. If the State Department and USIA proposed to spend a few thousand dollars to get some good advice from some good management people what would be wrong with that?

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. I would just like to say, Mr. Chairman, that the minority concurs with the statement just made by the chairman of the subcommittee, and I trust this amendment will be defeated.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the gentleman and also urge rejection of the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, the American people have been forced into their present situation whereby we are compelled to defend ourselves and help others who are willing to fight for their freedom. The role of defender of human freedom, a choice which we had to make, is costing billions of dollars each year. The cost of our activities in this regard comprises 63 percent of our total budget. The fundamental issue involved is war or peace. The Russian Communists seek world conquest. We want peace—not at any price but peace with justice and freedom for all.

The Communists are engaged in unrelenting warfare against all the people of the free world. Their warfare takes various forms, with emphasis upon propaganda warfare but not omitting armed aggression when the Communists feel that there is a 50–50 chance of winning. The Russians will not desist in this effort until they conquer the world or are themselves destroyed. That is a sad fact of life but nevertheless a fact of life which we must face up to.

It is now almost 10 years since President Truman made the historic decision to defend our freedom and the independence of other freedom-loving nations against the threat of Communist aggression. That decision has had a marked effect upon the history of the whole world. It also officially ended our uneasy alliance with the Russian Communists which was made during the world crisis which marked World War II.

We have pursued this objective for almost 10 years. The American people have made tremendous sacrifices to make possible programs in support of that objective. There are now unmistakable signs that this great effort is beginning to bear fruit. There have been revolutions in the Communist-occupied countries—revolts against the Russian masters who are the overlords of the Communist empire. There are clear signs that intense struggles are taking place within the Soviet Union. The people of the non-Russian nations are demonstrating again their discontent with communism and their contempt for the Russians whom they know as their exploiters.

Together with this it is obvious that there is dissension among the leaders of the Kremlin. They are confused—uncertain, but nevertheless unchanged in their determination to impose communism upon all the nations and people of the world. The Russians are well aware of the tremendous corrosion and human restlessness that is taking place throughout the entire Communist empire. The Russians are well aware that the people they enslave await only the opportunity to throw off their chains and assault their tormentors. To counteract this the Russians have made unfounded promises to give more freedom to the people, more opportunity for individual development, more recognition of the national demands coming up from all the nations within the empire. The men in the Kremlin have even attempted to blame Stalin for all the errors and miseries of life under communism. They have blamed Stalin for the almost endless list of crimes against humanity committed by the Communists during the past 30 or more years. The much publicized "de-Stalinization" campaign being talked about within the Russian empire is nothing more than an effort to find a scapegoat for the complete and dismal failure of communism to provide the decencies of life for the people it enslaves.

The leaders of the Kremlin are aware that unless changes are made, internal revolution is inevitable and each such revolution hastens the day of final collapse of their empire. Their greatest fear is that if they relax the hold of the police state over the people, total revolution of all the people will occur. This, then, is the great dilemma which now confronts the leaders of the Russian Communist conspiracy.

In the face of this compelling evidence, I am firmly convinced this is not the time to give the Communists a breathing spell—this is not the time for us to relax our worldwide campaign of truth.

It is generally recognized that the worldwide struggle between the evil forces of communism and the desire of all people for freedom and democracy is essentially one of ideas and ideals. This struggle involves the dissemination of ideas which reflect the social, economic, and political system of the free world. It also involves full exposure of the cruel realities of communism as contrasted with the rosy ideal painted by the theory of communism. Our campaign has been designed to counteract Communist lies about the American free way of life, the free enterprise system, and government of the people, by the people, and for the people. In summary, it has been recognized that the struggle for the world will be largely won or lost by the judicious and astute utilization of all the medias of mass communication to effectively carry freedom's story to all the people of the world.

Economy in the operation of the Federal Government is long overdue. There is no doubt in my mind that Congress can save the American taxpayers several billion dollars of the funds requested in the budget which the President sent to Congress a short while ago. Every Member of Congress is anxious to bring economy and efficiency into the operation of our Government. The question before us is where we can make substantial cuts and at the same time provide maximum security for our people.

I believe that the type of work which the USIA is by law and Presidential directive chartered to do is one of the essential elements necessary to prevent the conspiracy of communism from taking the breathing spell it so badly needs. The USIA is the agency of our Government which, by law, is charged with the responsibility of exploiting all the developments growing out of the effort of the Polish people to win their freedom and national independence and the all-out effort of the Hungarian people to win their freedom and national independence. If maximum exploitation is given to these two historic events and the confusion and uncertainty which grip the leaders of the Kremlin is also exploited, a powerful blow will have been struck for the cause of peace and freedom.

Again I say, this is not the time to give the enemy a breathing spell—now is the time to press forward our advantage and to reap the rewards which the great sacrifices of the American people over the past 10 years have produced. It is my hope that the USIA will intensify the campaign of truth and bring it to an ever increasing number of people throughout the world.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, 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. 6871), making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year 1958, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Is this the amendment that was adopted in the Committee of the Whole?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. 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. Under the order of the House made on April 11, further consideration of the bill must go over until tomorrow because there was an agreement that there would not be a rollcall on Monday or Tuesday.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight to file a report on House Joint Resolution 310.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on H. R. 6871.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDING SECOND LIBERTY BOND ACT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5520) an act to amend the Second Liberty Bond Act to increase the maximum interest rate permitted on United States savings bonds, with Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "3½" and insert "3.26."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill just considered.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, as it passed the House, H. R. 5520 would have increased the maximum permissible investment yield on savings bonds and savings certificates from 3 percent to 3½ percent per year, compounded semiannually. Additionally, the bill would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, to increase the yield on savings bonds bearing issue dates of February 1, 1957, or thereafter; and would authorize the Secretary, if he deems it a desirable policy to do so, to increase the interest rate on series E savings bonds maturing on February 1, 1957, or thereafter, for the period the bonds are held beyond maturity, up to the new permissible maximum investment yield fixed by the bill. The Senate amendment to H. R. 5520 fixes the maximum permissible investment yield at 3.26 percent per year, compounded semiannually.

As indicated in the Senate report accompanying H. R. 5520, the reduction from 3½ percent per year to 3.26 percent per year was thought necessary by the Senate because of the possibility of an expectation on the part of the public that the rate on yield on savings bonds would, in fact, be raised to 3½ percent, thus tending to reduce sales of the 3¼-percent bonds which the Treasury has announced that it will issue. The Senate report states further that reducing the limit to 3.26 percent expresses the opposition of the Congress to any increase in interest rates not absolutely essential in the interests of economic stability. I urge the House to concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill just considered.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I join my esteemed friend and chairman in his request that the House concur in the Senate amendment to H. R. 5520 relating to the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to establish a higher interest rate applicable to United States savings bonds.

It will be recalled that the administration had originally requested discretionary authority which would have placed an interest ceiling on Series E and Series H savings bonds at 4¼ percent. At the time of requesting this discretionary authority, the Treasury Department publicly announced the intention of making an actual rate of 3¼ percent applicable to bonds sold on and after February 1, 1957.

The Committee on Ways and Means in acting on legislation to carry out this Treasury request amended the proposal to establish a maximum discretionary rate of 3½ percent. While I supported this legislation when it was under consideration in the House of Representatives, I pointed out the objection to granting insufficient discretionary authority to the Secretary in this area. The essence of my principal objection is that when the margin of discretion is too closely related to the existing rate, the millions of American citizens who patriotically and prudently invest in savings bonds are denied a fair rate of return on their investment as established by the money market.

The Senate Finance Committee in its consideration of H. R. 5520 further restricted this margin of discretion by amending the bill, placing a maximum interest rate ceiling of 3.26 percent. Of course, the argument I offered against a 3½ percent rate can be even more forcefully applied to a 3.26 percent rate.

However, in the interest of dealing expeditiously with the immediate problem, namely, increasing the present rate to 3¼ percent, I have urged my colleagues in the House to act favorably on a motion to concur in the Senate amendment. This will enable the Department of the Treasury to deal effectively with the present situation and give our citizens a fair current rate of return on their savings-bond investments.

THE MISSING PERSONS ACT, AS AMENDED

Mr. TRIMBLE, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 237), Report No. 354, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5807) to amend further and make permanent the Missing Persons Act, as amended. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

NEW SCHOOL FINANCE BILL

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, since my return to Washington, I have given a good deal of study to the various proposals to help our States meet the tremendous task of housing our growing school population. I agree thoroughly with the President and others that we should grant emergency Federal aid to assist the States to meet this need. I also agree that the Federal aid should be temporary; that when the emergency is met the Federal Government should stop contributing to the support of local school systems. The alternative would be to promote an increasing dependence by our States and local school districts upon Federal financing. And there is no Member of Congress, I believe, who will not admit that this road leads to Federal control.

We must avoid this route at all costs. The question is how.

Before we can answer this question, we must determine what has caused the crisis in our schools in the first place. Why is it necessary for our schools to look to Washington for financial aid after all these years of meeting building and operating expenditures with local tax resources?

The cause is apparent. The Federal Government's tax burden is so great that our State legislatures find there are no tax resources left for State and local districts to tap. As long as this situation exists, we will have continued pressure for Federal aid. And it will be an irresistible pressure because the alternative will be to require the States to lower their education standards. Even if the people recognize that what they ask will eventually mean a loss of control over their school system, they will take that risk in preference to lowering educational opportunities for their children. I submit, Mr. Speaker, the people of the Nation should not have to choose between two alternatives as unsatisfactory as these two are.

Yet all of the legislative proposals I have seen to date require this choice. Each of them has a termination date, it is true. But the growing financial needs of an expanding public-school program cannot be terminated simply by passing a law. The withdrawal of Federal aid in 4 years or 5 will leave a budgetary gap in education programs of all of our States. And no means will be provided by any of the pending school aid bills to enable the States to make up this deficiency from local and State sources.

Mr. Speaker, I predict that unless we make it possible for the States and local school districts to meet their own needs when the expiration date of Federal aid arrives, Congress will extend the program. New legislation will be enacted and with as much justification as the legislative proposals we are considering in this Congress. The new schools that will be built with Federal funds will need new teachers to staff them, new desks to equip them, new maintenance expenditures to protect and operate them. How will these additional expenses be met from present tax resources of our States? What would the discontinuance of Federal aid mean to our schools at a time when all other costs are rising?

We all know the answer. Under such conditions, Federal aid cannot be discontinued. In all likelihood, it will be expanded. Along with that expansion will come Federal control. There is no alternative.

What is the duty of a member of the House Appropriations Committee or any Member of Congress who receives evidence that a local school board is misappropriating Federal funds or even just expending them unwisely? It is his duty to have this matter investigated. Duly elected board of education members would be called to Washington and questioned. An abuse of the program by one school district will result in a regulation to prevent similar abuses from recurring. Regulations carry with them the right to enforce them. Enforcement requires investigations. The Federal Government would have the right, perhaps the duty, to examine the spending policies and budgets of every school district in the Nation.

There is no way that we can grant Federal aid to education without attaching strings to it. Even the emergency legislation proposed by the President carries with it a measure of control. A perfectly germane amendment to his proposal would be to make any school board official liable for Federal prosecution if found guilty of using Federal school construction funds to build a house for the superintendent or himself. Certainly no one should object to such a reasonable provision. But it is Federal control. It is enforceable by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. Speaker, if this Congress is going to approve legislation giving emergency Federal aid for school construction, it should also provide some method by which the States could again assume their school costs when the Federal grants end.

Today I have introduced legislation to accomplish this goal. In essence, the legislation is a Federal tax reduction for general education purposes.

Briefly, the legislation I have introduced would grant a Federal income and corporation tax credit to individuals and corporations in States which will levy a one-half of 1 percent tax on taxable income for general education purposes. The tax credit—deductible from the amount of Federal taxes paid—would equal in all cases the amount the individual or business pays under the States' new levy. The legislation is not mandatory. It is permissive only.

But, of course, it would be an inducement to States to increase their taxes for school purposes—unlike a simple percentage return of Federal funds, which offers no encouragement to the States to put forth a greater effort on their own behalf.

My proposal is in keeping with the President's theory that any Federal program should stimulate greater State and local effort for support of schools.

The proposal has other advantages. It makes additional funds available for schools, but increases no one's taxes. What is paid to the State is deducted from taxes due the Federal Government.

It will not hurt the Government's budgetary system. Even if all States adopt the new tax, thereby qualifying their residents for a Federal tax credit, the overall loss to the Federal Government will approximate the annual appropriation provided for under Federal aid bills now under consideration. It requires no new bureau in the Office of Education. The only Federal expenditure would be an additional line on Federal income tax returns upon which the tax credit is entered and claimed.

There is another tremendous advantage to my legislative proposal. It allies the dedicated groups who recognize our school needs with those who would decrease the size of the Federal Government and decrease its revenue, rather than with those who favor a continued growth in Federal spending and taxing power.

Mr. Speaker, nearly every economic investigation of the relationships of government have stressed the need for returning some taxing power to our local governments and States in order that they could meet their own needs. This would be a long step in that direction and it would return to the States the ability to finance and improve their own school systems.

I earnestly commend its provisions to all who want to help our schools but not at the cost of local control over our school system.

PLIGHT OF THE BICYCLE INDUSTRY

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the serious position in which the domestic bicycle industry finds itself as a result of the increased flow of low-priced foreign bicycles into the United States. The tariff increase proclaimed by the President in 1955 has not provided adequate relief, and the American bicycle industry has felt it necessary to apply to the United States Tariff Commission for the imposition of an import quota.

Bicycle imports soared from 3.4 percent of total United States consumption in 1950 to 38.4 percent in 1954, when the serious injury to the industry was recognized by the Tariff Commission. The rise later reached 40.1 percent in 1956. In a recent report, the Bicycle Manufacturers Association lists the significant factors operating against the industry's recovery from the damage inflicted by these imports as follows:

SHIFT IN CHARACTER OF IMPORTS

The shift in the character of imports from lightweights to other type bikes, noted by the Tariff Commission in 1955, has been substantially accelerated. The latter takes the highest duty rate. It is significant that imports have increased the most where the duty has been highest. This clearly demonstrates

that the new rates have been no deterrent to foreign producers.

LOWER PRICED BIKES DISPLACE BRITISH

Another important change is taking place in the import market. The lower priced bikes of all types from West Germany, France, Austria, and the Netherlands are displacing the British as principal sellers in the United States. In this price tug-of-war, the British recently cut back their prices to 1954 levels and, for the first time, are selling American-styled bikes here.

NEW MIDDLEWEIGHT COPIED ABROAD

The determined effort of the American bike industry to regain its market through far-reaching technical improvements culminated in the introduction of the new-type middleweight bike in 1955. Vigorously merchandised, it caught the public's fancy. But even before consumer preference had been proved, the Germans copied the American models and sold them at lower prices here in 1955 and 1956. Foreign producers are now selling these American-designed machines in greater quantities and as their most popular models.

IMPORT PRICES CONTINUE DOWNWARD

A fourth aspect of the intensification of import competition is the continuing downward price trend of all types of foreign bikes, despite the 1955 tariff hike. The rising scale of wages and increased cost of materials have prevented American manufacturers from making similar reductions in their prices. Despite the practice of every economy to meet import competition, United States bike makers' margin of profit is either negligible or a complete loss. For several years this has been the price we've paid just to stay in business.

A constituent of mine writes that the bicycle manufacturer for whom he works formerly employed 3,000 people, but now that number is reduced to 700. The situation in which the bicycle industry has been placed is an outstanding example of what has happened in this country by reason of low tariffs. It is evident that if we are to protect our home industry, either the tariff must be substantially raised, or the number of bicycle imports must be limited. The bicycle industry feels that only an import quota can help correct the injury it has suffered.

DEDICATION EXERCISES OF THE EAST COAST FACILITIES OF TRACERLAB

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday I am attending the dedication exercises of the east coast facilities of Tracerlab, Inc. They have a very interesting facility in the Speaker's State of Texas. The principal speaker will be the Honorable STERLING COLE, an expert member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, who has done an enormous amount of work on this subject. I will be delighted to be there, and also because the laboratories are in the district of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE].

I would like to tell the Members, Mr. Speaker, of the work played by the women in the nuclear instrument industry. The following is part of a letter sent to me by Tracerlab, Inc., and also there is a release from the corporation:

TRACERLAB, INC.,
Waltham, Mass., April 12, 1957.

Hon. EDITH NORSE ROGERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: It is an honor indeed to have you present at our dedication ceremony.

* * * * *

The nuclear instrument industry, like so many others, is shorthanded, so women have come to play an important role here to help fill the gap, and many of them are doing jobs which would otherwise be done by men. Since the atomic-energy field is hardly 10 years old, it does not suffer from the rigid hiring-patterns of older industries and, as a result, women who can take responsibility and carry it out have been given a free hand. Much of our work in radiochemistry is done by women—women Ph. D.'s, women technicians, women laboratory assistants, women chemists. Our industrial relations director is a woman. Our crystal-growing laboratory, one of a handful of such operations in the whole world, is in charge of women. Much of our Geiger tube glass work is done by women. In addition, of course, the more traditional jobs of clerks, secretaries and others are filled by women. (I am sure you will be able to make comparisons with women in industry 10 years ago, or, drawing on your own experiences, show how today's situation is different from that of yesteryear.)

In a rapidly growing company such as ours, women have probably been offered more unique opportunities to achieve positions of leadership than in other companies. Our rapid growth has resulted in more promotions, but at the same time has made greater demands on the individual. A number of successful instances in which women have risen to the top here and are at the same time raising families or enjoying successful marriages is conclusive proof that today's woman is enjoying the freedom and equality she has long sought and has the full acceptance of management as a dependable reliable worker.

As I said above, I can only offer these as suggestions. If you would like additional thoughts, I would be glad to give them to you on the telephone or Thursday morning when you get here.

I might suggest that you may want to get here around 12:30 p. m., although the dedication ceremony does not begin until 1 p. m., in order to give the press time to talk briefly with you.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. STENZEL,
Public Relations Manager.

[Tracerlab, Inc., press release of April 17, 1957]

Peaceful applications for atomic energy are taking another giant step forward in the United States with the completion of the world's most modern plant devoted entirely to peaceful uses of atomic energy for Tracerlab, Inc., pioneer in this field. The $1,900,000 plant in Waltham, Mass., with 4 acres of floor space, confirms United States leadership in the world race to harness the atom. It will house Tracerlab's east coast laboratory, research and manufacturing facilities, and will be dedicated April 18 in brief ceremonies to be attended by National, State, and local officials, and many of the people who have contributed to the peaceful uses of the atom.

Formerly housed in seven separate locations in downtown Boston, where the company was established only 10 years ago with a half dozen employees, the new facilities house operations which last year turned out almost $12 million worth of X-ray and nuclear products to the world's medical, research, industrial, and chemical centers. Tracerlab, with some 800 employees, operates the world's largest commercial radiochemical facilities, has the broadest product line in its field—ranging from simple lead bricks for radiation shielding to complex process control systems using radioisotopes—and a complete X-ray equipment line, produced by its X-ray subsidiary, Keleket X-ray Corp.

President W. O. Faxon, commenting on the new plant, said: "It is predicted that the nuclear instrumentation market alone will rise to a total of $135 million by 1963 (compared to $10 million in 1955) in response to an accelerated reactor building program as well as to new applications for atomic energy uncovered by research now in progress. This building gives us under one roof the facilities we need to continue to keep pace with this tremendous growth.

"This one building will provide complete facilities for a number of varied working groups. Besides manufacturing and administration, 11 separate major chemical laboratories, many designed exclusively for radioisotope work, can be used for research and synthesis. In another part of the building engineering facilities have been set up for the special needs of industrial, X-ray and instrument groups whose work may be in textiles one day, rubber the next, medicine the third and so on through an ever-broadening range of applications."

To tell the story of how the peaceful atom has been put to work to save industry some $200 million last year, and to show some of the operations of this unique New England firm, product displays, plant tours and demonstrations of isotope applications will be held at the time of the dedication which will be witnessed by the invited guests, and representatives of radio, television, newspapers, and the trade press.

A highlight of the program will be an address by the Honorable STERLING COLE, Representative from the State of New York and member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, who will carry out the ribbon-cutting ceremonies by remote control using isotopes in a Tracerlab beta gage.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PASSMAN, for 30 minutes, on April 17.

Mr. HENDERSON, for 30 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. BRAY (at the request of Mr. CRAMER), for 15 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. FLOOD, for 1 hour, 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:

Mr. SIEMINSKI (at the request of Mr. LANKFORD).

Mr. LANKFORD.

Mr. SILER.

Mr. ROONEY to revise and extend his remarks in Committee of the Whole and include extraneous matter.

Mr. NEAL (at the request of Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. BRAY (at the request of Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. BYRD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SANTANGELO (at the request of Mr. ROONEY) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENTLEY (at the request of Mr. CRAMER) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BEAMER.

Mr. ALGER.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6870. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 812. An act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to price support for extra long staple cotton.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 17, 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:

746. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the Mercedes Division of the Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project in Texas, pursuant to section 9 (a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) (H. Doc. No. 152); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

747. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (5)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

748. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (1)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

749. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to Public Law 863, 80th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

750. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

751. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

752. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audits of Government Services, Inc., and the employee retirement and benefit trust fund of Government Services, Inc., for the year ended December 31, 1956, made pursuant to the request of the corporation; to the Committee on Government Operations.

753. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the annual report of the Attorney General of the United States of the activities of the Department of Justice for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 237. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 5807, a bill to amend further and make permanent the Missing Persons Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 354). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CANNON: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 310. A bill making additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1957, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 355). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE 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. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1520. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fusako Takai and Thomas Takai; with amendment (Rept. No. 352). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 308. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 353). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 6936. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose an import tax on natural gas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. R. 6937. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to provide that the Boards for the Correction of Military or Naval Records shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 6938. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against income tax for payments of taxes which are imposed by States for general educational purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H. R. 6939. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by an individual for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 6940. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to reimburse owners of lands acquired under the Federal reclamation laws for their moving expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 6941. A bill to amend section 1332 of title 10 of the United States Code to provide that retired pay shall be granted to certain persons; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H. R. 6942. A bill to amend the Professional Engineers' Registration Act of September 19, 1950, Public Law 789, by exempting electrical contractors and master electricians; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 6943. A bill to promote the welfare of the American Indian citizens of Minnesota, and to establish the Minnesota Indian Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PORTER:

H. R. 6944. 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. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 6945. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the celebration of the centennial birthday of Baker University, Baldwin, Kans., February 12, 1958; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 6946. A bill to extend rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 6947. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 6946. 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. FRIEDEL (by request):

H. R. 6949. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KNUTSON:

H. R. 6950. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act to enable producers of Irish potatoes and other nonbasic agricultural commodities to participate in the acreage reserve program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 6951. A bill to prohibit unjust discrimination in employment because of age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 6952. A bill to authorize the transfer of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SILER:

H. R. 6953. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose an import tax on natural gas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 6954. A bill to authorize the United States Court of Claims by its rules to create and to prescribe the functions and duties of trial and appellate divisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 6955. A bill to provide a vitalized and equitable reserve program for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 6956. A bill to provide for a suitable and distinctive lapel button which may be worn by veterans of the Korean hostilities; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 6957. A bill to amend section 1033 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 6958. A bill to provide that certain lands shall be held in trust for the Oglala Sioux Tribe in South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 6959. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with Federal and non-Federal agencies in the augmentation of natural food supplies for migratory waterfowl; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. J. Res. 310. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania:

H. J. Res. 311. Joint resolution establishing a United States Academy of Foreign Service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT: Memorial of the State Legislature of Oklahoma relative to the development of the coal industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE: Memorial of the 70th General Assembly, State of Illinois, approving and supporting the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the school segregation cases; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to compensation of postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 6960. A bill for the relief of John Baltrusaitis (Baltrusaitieni); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 6961. A bill for the relief of Walter H. Berry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL (by request):

H. R. 6962. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alston P. Coughlin, and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. R. 6963. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elba Haverstick Cash; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 6964. A bill for the relief of Maria Zaharis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 6965. A bill for the relief of Carmen Cruz-Sexton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 6966. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Avis M. Barnard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 6967. A bill for the relief of Branislava Jancetovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 6968. A bill for the relief of Velid Mehmed Dag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 6969. A bill for the relief of Luz Verdugo Campbell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H. R. 6970. A bill for the relief of C. A. Nolan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

207. Mr. BRAY presented a petition of Miss Grace A. Wright and 31 others, of the Methodist Home, Franklin, Ind., in favor of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising over the air or in the channels of interstate commerce, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Washington Report by Bruce Alger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 16, 1957

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, as a weekly service to my constituents I report most briefly the week's legislative and Congressional activities in which I participate. The following is the current report:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

The Department of Commerce and related agencies appropriation bill for 1958 was reduced $69 million (9½ percent) below 1957 expenditures and $218 million (25 percent) below the budget request. Savings thus far this year in six appropriations now total $1,039,000,000 (7.2 percent of $14,300,000,000). Really impressive savings—that is, cutting below 1957 expenses—are infinitesimally small. Government is still growing, more than the population increase, most discouraging. In the CAA portion of the bill air traffic safety will be increased with more radar control and personnel on the airways traffic lanes. The suggestion has been made that those aircraft using the airways could help pay the cost, thus relieving the taxpayer. We must decide soon—and the people are concerned—whether in many Government services we pay our way or charge it to Uncle Sam, and like the ostrich with head in sand, pretend it is not costing us, all the while demanding budget cuts.

The House passed the Export-Import Bank Act extending the expiration date 5 years from 1958 to 1963. The bank, financed by United States dollars, has made loans of $5,277,000,000 to 68 countries as aid to United States trade in manufactured and agricultural products. Charging interest sufficient to repay the Treasury 2¼ percent, the Bank has lost only $500,000 with $9 million in loans past due, and has paid its own expenses, which are 1.7 percent of gross income, while building a reserve of $435 million. This program has been one of the Government's more businesslike arrangements.

The amendment of Anglo-American financial agreement, the British loan, posed a real question. The Great Britain loan of $4,472 million requires a 50-year annual payment of principal and interest of $138 million with an option of canceling the interest portion (approximately $81 million) if certain trade and currency conditions prevail making repayment difficult. Now Britain wants to cancel this year's payment or work out a new agreement, hence this amendment. The amendment would set up a new formula permitting postponement of payment. Arguments for: (1) A better chance of our being repaid; (2) A needed ally needs help; (3) Secretary Humphrey favored it. Arguments against: (1) The $81 million interest payment was already in escrow in a United States bank, so Britain had the money; (2) a just-announced British tax cut of $280 million suggested they could pay (and we could cut our taxes); (3) over $8,000 million in economic aid plus untold billions in military aid had earlier gone to Britain; (4) we are in effect supporting Britain's welfare programs. The vote was divided without pattern, but it passed 218 to 167. I voted against it.

A trip by our Interstate Committee members through the United Aircraft plant building, the Pratt & Whitney aircraft engine and Sikorsky helicopter at Hartford and Bridgeport, Conn., added to our aircraft knowledge. The J–57 and J–75 jet engines being tested were regular infernos of power (a horsepower now roughly requires two ounces of engine weight, as blades whirl 11,000 revolutions per minute). The helicopter flights were magic carpetlike as we went almost straight up and down in traveling between airports. Shuttle services will soon be prevalent throughout the country. Igor Sikorsky was as interesting as his fabulous engineering reputation would suggest. He enthusiastically reminisced about his early helicopter, "A fine machine. Its only fault—it wouldn't fly." They fly now—all sizes and styles.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 8 carries a Dallas constituent's letter to a fellow Texas Congressman (which he then put in the RECORD), commenting on and approving the courage of the Member who opposes Federal handouts when, most tempting of all, the Federal money is for his own district. To this constituent, and many other Dallas

residents for recognizing the problem and commending me, my thanks. Yes, it is tough, and public understanding and approval are necessary.

General Twining, the new head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, joined several of us for breakfast this week. We listened and questioned him concerning defense plans. He stressed the three roads we are simultaneously traveling in military preparedness developing (1) conventional weapons, (2) nuclear weapons, and (3) guided missiles of all types. No wonder the expense.

Several items suggesting further legislative squabbles: The Postal Department-Congress struggle over increased money needs versus reduced service; foreign-aid money to be partially put in the military and removed from congressional scrutiny; Walter Reuther's "less work for more pay" announcement, completely overlooking the need for "increased productivity" only making it all possible (not Federal law or the bargaining table.)

Rooster Feathers in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 16, 1957

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, the word "cocktail" originally meant the rear end of a rooster. And the word's basic meaning right now could be expressed in the phrase, "Rooster feathers," according to the makeup of cocktail, rhetorically and in literal syllable.

Much has been said or written about the Washington cocktail party, or rooster feathers, as this function has been carried out during the past two decades, particularly after liquor became legalized and glamorized in President Roosevelt's first term. Now when a Congressman is invited out to rooster feathers in Washington and the function appears to be tied in with something he should rightly attend, he could always try to get there about the time rooster feathers is over. But if he gets in before the tail end of the rooster's tail, then he could very well hunt for some sparkling ginger ale or some good red tomato juice for a little honest nourishment while some of the remaining gigglers are closing up on rooster feathers with manifest evidence of drooping feathers and minus any remaining crow after too many ounces of Old Crow.

Sometimes a person may wonder about the historic background or early origin of rooster feathers. Did Nero start rooster feathers as he worked out his fiddling technique just before the occasion of the burning of Rome? Or did Pontius Pilate establish rooster feathers as he considered his final order of execution against the Saviour? Or did rooster feathers start much later, say when Benedict Arnold got some of his friends together during the last week before he carried out his predatory plot? Certainly George Washington had no rooster feathers party when he got ready to cross the Delaware in the hour of our country's great crisis. Neither did rooster feathers originate with Paul Revere in the early evening of the night of his famous midnight ride. It could never have been invented by Joan of Arc that evening before she rode out to deliver her people yonder in France in their time of great need. These last-named people were serious and effective patriots with sober and far-reaching objectives ahead of them. And none saw fit to have rooster feathers in the critical hours of those great undertakings and historic achievements.

Does a Representative or Senator or high governmental official really need rooster feathers to sustain him or entertain him in his times of wrestling with the problems of his day and age? The correct answer is no, of course.

Rooster feathers tends to make women silly and men belligerent.

Rooster feathers is a friend of frivolity and failure.

Rooster feathers is an enemy of all serious endeavor.

Rooster feathers has no ally in heaven but many good friends in hell.

Rooster feathers in Washington never gave America her greatness or strength or fame or continuity but is certainly an effective force to curtail all of these here at the very center of our country's heartbeat.

Errors in the Trial of Jesus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 16, 1957

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this is Easter Week. It is Holy Week. It is the time of the Passover, too. It is the most solemn week of the year.

People slow down. Strife ebbs. Stores close. People eat less. They think more.

It is a time meant for man to contemplate on the direction of life in relation to that of the Lord.

Easter Week gives man the time to turn back the pages of life and to review them in the quiet of his heart, asking strength to avoid in the future what might not read too well in the past.

Easter means many things to many people.

The question is, Could it mean more to the Congress and to the courts of the United States? Could the impact of Easter, let us say, cause the Congress and the courts to stay execution of any death sentence until the week after Easter? The week after Easter would be the only week in which a life could be legally snuffed out in our land.

This would give all pause for thought.

The question is, Would it have its proper influence on society, on Congress, and the courts?

Had this idea prevailed in the Holy Week 2,000 years ago, Pontius Pilate would not have washed his hands and the life of the Lord might have been spared. In spite of man, it was, anyway. The influence of that life thunders through time.

It might be well for us to review each year at this time, Mr. Speaker, errors in the trial of Jesus.

It is said that our Bill of Rights, scrupulously observed, guaranteed life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and that under our Bill of Rights the tragedy of 2,000 years ago could not be repeated today, or ever.

Errors in the trial of Jesus are said to be so well known that they need not be repeated here.

United States Naval Academy Nutritional Foods for the Brigade of Midshipmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 16, 1957

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy, and as a Member of a Congress which constantly and properly has an ear attuned to economy, I feel that Congress should be apprised of a program now underway at the Naval Academy which is designed not only to contribute to the welfare of the midshipmen, but to do so without adding to the costs of operating the Academy.

It has often been said that an army marches on its stomach; the same holds true, and even more so, for a growing young man being developed into a naval officer.

Admiral Smedberg, Superintendent of the Naval Academy, long has been concerned with the many complex problems involved in providing 4,000 calories a day of nutritional foods for the 3,600-man brigade of midshipmen at a daily ration of $1.35.

To assist in this problem, General Foods Corporation was asked by the Academy to loan the services of one of its four institutional dietitians, Miss Gerry de Mauro, to create nutritional salads and desserts with sufficient eye appeal and taste appeal that the midshipmen would eat these dishes with the same relish they apply to steak.

According to Commissary Officer Louis W. Le Forge, Jr., the result has been a contented brigade, a great reduction in the volume of food left on their plates—and lower costs. To cite only one example, Miss de Mauro showed the Academy cooks how to reduce the cost of each lemon meringue pie by 7 cents, and since 700 pies are devoured at a single sitting, this represents a substantial saving.

The personnel of the Academy certainly deserve commendation for the foresight shown in improving the physical well-being of the midshipmen. Miss de Mauro and General Foods rate a hand for donating their services to make this accomplishment possible.

The Federal Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILL E. NEAL
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 16, 1957

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, when the people of America in a nationwide movement spontaneously disapprove a Federal budget involving heretofore unheard of expenditures, Government administrators can draw but one conclusion. The hard-pressed taxpayer is out to get relief.

What the average American does not realize is how the Congress and executive departments have over the years, partly at the request of the people and largely through their indifference, legalized far-reaching Government functions calling for annual increases in employees and salaries as well as facilities for administration.

Now that the people have demanded the Congress reduce the budget, the Congress in turn is face to face with the embarrassing problem of trying to reduce expenditures for services and agencies created by its own ill-considered legislation. To cut out established agencies, even though they serve a small minority of our citizens, would severely test the judgment of members who directly represent these favored constituents and must look to them for reelection.

So when Government has become so all-embracing that social and welfare benefits, all regularly distributed to such a large percent of the population, get so numerous and so large, congressional efforts to cut the budget are severely limited, leaving only two approaches: first, cease hiring more employees, and second, postpone the authorization of agencies and projects until they can safely be executed—after our defense and overseas operations become less indispensable.

This plan, strictly adhered to, can bring about sufficient budget requirements to provide a tax cut for all our people.

But the big reductions, the ones that count, can come only through a judicious reappraisal of our commitments for national defense and foreign economic aid. In all these years if foreign-aid programs had succeeded in accomplishing what we expected, our present relations with nations of the world should be far more satisfactory and with much less danger to world peace than now appears.

We have seen former world powers, our allies, reduced to dependencies. We have witnessed formerly impotent nations, rising to the point of self-expression, assume the attitude of threatening nations, resorting to blackmail methods to throw their self-styled neutralism to the Communist cause unless we outdo their material demands, and we have seen the only other major world power successfully infiltrating smaller struggling nations which, by their very economic position, can never hope to become self-supporting and capable of resisting aggression.

In much of our foreign economic aid we are succeeding temporarily only because we have insisted on "upping the ante" and even there, because of the preponderance of have-nots, Communist infiltraters promising better things are steadily laying the groundwork for the eventful day when they can assume dominant control.

In areas such as these we cannot reject the possibility that aid in the form of armaments insufficient in amount and incapable of resisting aggression may in the end be turned against us in the final test of strength.

The time has come when the United States must look well to her own survival. Continued spending of our money and substance, accompanied by increasing inflation with its cheapening monetary system and a breakdown of Federal and industrial pension systems, can place the unsuspecting people of the United States in the position of the have-nots, when we, too, may fall to the communistic theory that only the state can successfully provide for us.

We cannot reasonably advocate scrapping either our defense budget of our foreign aid economic programs. But there is much waste in our defense operations which can be recovered. There are savings to be accomplished by elimination of duplications. There are untold economies to be made by application of commonsense and frugality in the administration of each branch of our Defense Establishment.

As to foreign economic aid, many important missions have practically completed the work originally assigned them. Instead of using downright pressure for new projects in governments to which they have been assigned, they should be ordered home. Aid of this nature should be well placed with every assurance on part of the recipient area that their own contributions will be faithfully complied with. The estimated cost of many of these projects is often increased manyfold by failure of the contract nation to fulfill its pledge.

How unrealistic can a people become? How far must fundamental rules of human behavior be sidestepped before truth and sanity reassert themselves to turn the tide of riotous, self-destroying conduct of our national affairs leading blindly into dissolution and bankruptcy?

The sprawling, spendthrift Federal Government for the first time in a generation is reading in no uncertain terms clear evidence that a major proportion of thinking Americans aroused over the questionable stability of their future welfare, are voluntarily proclaiming their conviction that as a nation we have reached the point beyond which it is dangerous to tread.

Never before has public criticism of a peacetime budget been so volatile, and never before have Members of Congress and department heads been more conscious of reactionary critics among their constituents. It is the most fortunate public demonstration of a democratic society this Nation has experienced in many decades. It is a solemn reminder to legislators and executives alike that overmanned Government, reckless spending, huge national debt, and a confiscatory tax system have reached the point of intolerance by the people whose substance is being confiscated without consent and dissipated with little or no accounting.

Little wonder—less than 30 years ago the total cost of Federal Government was less than the yearly interest payment on the national debt today. Our total debt, less than $20 billion, is now $275 billion, nearly $2,000 for every man, woman, and child. Social welfare has become costly, sure enough, but it takes only about 15 percent of our taxes. It is the military and foreign aid expenditures that create the real burden. And the deeper we become involved the less national security against Communist aggression and the nearer we seem to approach dangers of military involvement. The program is so big, so unwieldly, so devoid of permanent policy.

Only now are we beginning to realize how futile are our highly humanitarian dreams that young America can make over the world in its own likeness or that permanent allies and stanch friends are developed by bolstering bankrupt, tottering ruling cliques in lands where suppressed individuals have never been harmless to the world save when under strong dictatorial governments.

Let us ease away from sentiment and turn back to reality. Let us begin now to curtail our foreign aid.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 16, 1957

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article which appeared in the April 1957 issue of the American Legion magazine:

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

May I compliment the American Legion on its stand for sound Americanism. It is apparent that veterans, as a group who fought to retain freedom, stand ready to fight against any principles that would lose those freedoms. This is the reason that I am proud to have been a continuous member of the American Legion since our local post was chartered.

A symbol of this freedom fight is your continuous opposition to Federal aid to education. With many others I have been concerned about the excessive growth of our Federal Government and its attempts to assume too many functions that rightfully belong to the States and to local governments.

One such attempted usurpation of authority is this repeated effort to authorize the Federal Government to assume control of the public-school system. If this movement is permitted to grow, then too soon we can

expect Government schools with thought control instead of public schools with freedom of thought.

Equally important would be the effect on the several States and on local initiative. Our home State of Indiana (and I understand this is true of all of the States) has been able to supply all of the necessary classrooms without Federal aid. In doing so, millions of dollars have been saved for the taxpayers. Whenever any of our tax dollars travel from our home State to Washington, and then are returned back to us, these same dollars have shrunk to a small fraction of the original amount.

There are justified complaints on the size of the present proposed Federal budget. The proposal to provide Federal aid to schools would add to this burden. Thus, savings to the taxpayers should be a serious consideration.

JOHN V. BEAMER,
Member of Congress from Fifth District, Indiana.

Annual Congressional Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 16, 1957

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to insert the following press release dated April 15 regarding the results of my annual Congressional poll taken among the residents of my district:

PRESS RELEASE FROM THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSMAN ALVIN M. BENTLEY, EIGHTH DISTRICT, MICHIGAN

Congressman ALVIN M. BENTLEY, Republican, of Michigan, today released the results of his annual Congressional poll taken among residents of the Eighth Congressional District of Michigan. This year more than 13,000 questionnaires were answered and returned. Occupations of those replying were given as follows: Farmers, 2,296; workers, 3,292; business, 1,323; professional, 1,147; housewives, 88; office workers, 1,796; others, 3,070. The results of the poll are listed below:

1. I favor the following in a farm program:

(1) High price supports (9.3 percent) - 1,213
(2) Flexible supports (37.6 percent) - 4,896
(3) Soil bank program (32.6 percent) - 4,241
(4) No supports (24.4 percent) - 3,174
(5) Other (3 percent) - 390

(Farmers voted 37 percent for a soil bank program and 30 percent for no supports as their first choices.)

2. The following items in our national budget could best be reduced for more economy:

(1) National defense (12 percent) - 1,559
(2) Foreign aid (70.6 percent) - 9,188
(3) Veterans' benefits (18 percent) - 2,346
(4) Farm payments (31 percent) - 4,037
(5) Health and welfare program (14.5 percent) - 1,887
(6) Other (4.8 percent) - 621

(All groups put foreign aid first and farm payments second. Farmers voted 27.3 percent for cuts in their own payments.)

3. The Federal Government should help our schools as follows:

(1) Direct subsidies for teaching salaries (11.9 percent) - 1,545
(2) Grants to States for school construction (27.3 percent) - 3,556
(3) Loans to States for construction (33.0 percent) - 4,295
(4) Scholarships for colleges and universities (15.4 percent) - 1,999
(5) Assistance to lower interest rates on school bonds (41.3 percent) - 5,379
(6) Nothing (11.6 percent) - 1,514
(7) Other (2.6 percent) - 332

(All groups listed numbers 5 and 3 in that order as their first two choices.)

4. We need the following improvements in our Social Security laws:

(1) Lower retirement age for men and women (46.1 percent) - 5,997
(2) Allow increased outside earnings (59.8 percent) - 7,784
(3) Increase minimum benefits (30.9 percent) - 4,019
(4) Pay full benefits regardless of other pension income (38.9 percent) - 5,059
(5) Other (3.8 percent) - 499

(Workers voted 64 percent to lower retirement age but all other groups gave absolute majorities for increases outside earnings. Housewives voted for it 70.5 percent.)

5. Our immigration laws need the following changes:

(1) More immigrants permitted per year (4.2 percent) - 543
(2) Revise quota system to take care of oversubscribed countries (16.1 percent) - 2,093
(3) More liberal provisions for adopted children (31.3 percent) - 4,078
(4) Other (6.2 percent) - 812
(5) No change in present law (29.0 percent) - 3,770

(For the most part, all groups voted evenly between numbers 3 and 5. Apparently the only change that receives any support is to facilitate entry of orphans and adopted children.)

6. The Post Office Department needs:

(1) Higher postal rates (27.8 percent) - 3,618
(2) Increased salaries for postal workers (21.4 percent) - 2,787
(3) To be run on a business basis (50.3 percent) - 6,542
(4) To be operated only as a public service (27.4 percent) - 3,566
(5) Other (3.5 percent) - 451

(All groups substantially endorsed the principle that the Post Office Department should be run like any other business.)

7. In the field of labor legislation, I favor:

(1) Government-supervised secret strike ballots (38.1 percent) - 4,959
(2) Permission for secondary boycotts (3.5 percent) - 460
(3) Antimonopoly legislation against unions (39.9 percent) - 5,186
(4) Investigation of union trust funds (58.0 percent) - 7,542
(5) Repeal of Taft-Hartley Act (11.7 percent) - 1,517
(6) Compulsory union shop in all States (7.2 percent) - 931
(7) Other (3.3 percent) - 430

(Workers voted as follows: (1) 35.3 percent; (2) 4.5 percent; (3) 31 percent; (4) 55.1 percent; (5) 19.7 percent; (6) 13.5 percent.

(The vote for No. 4 might have been larger if answered after the recent teamster investigations in Washington.)

8. We should have helped the Hungarian uprising as follows:

(1) Send troops (3.7 percent) - 480
(2) Send weapons (11.9 percent) - 1,546
(3) Send food and clothing only (37.2 percent) - 4,840
(4) Admit all refugees (5.1 percent) - 664
(5) Press for U. N. police force or other U. N. action (60.4 percent) - 7,861
(6) Nothing (6.5 percent) - 849
(7) Other (2.1 percent) - 278

(All groups appear to regard the Hungarian problem as strictly a United Nations affair and believe that our assistance should be confined to charity and relief supplies.)

9. Do you think we should have stronger civil rights legislation on a Federal basis or let the States handle their own problems?

(1) State (52.2 percent) - 6,790
(2) Federal (30.7 percent) - 3,996
(3) Other (2.4 percent) - 317

(All groups gave a slim majority to the principle that the question of civil rights is primarily a State problem.)

10. If prices and wages continue to rise we should:

(1) Impose price and wage controls (43.5 percent) - 5,665
(2) Investigate unions and corporations alike (63.8 percent) - 8,307
(3) Have tighter credit controls (31.6 percent) - 4,107
(4) Do nothing (2.1 percent) - 279
(5) Other (2.7 percent) - 357

(Almost all groups listed Nos. 2 and 1 in that order as their choices. Workers voted 66 percent for No. 2 and 48 percent for No. 1. Business voted 65 percent for No. 2 and 40 percent for No. 1. Only the professional people endorsed credit controls over price-wage controls.)

Congressman BENTLEY expressed his deep appreciation to all persons replying to his questionnaire and promised to reply personally to all letters and comments which accompanied the answers even though the number might mean a delay of several months for some.

St. Lawrence Seaway Tends To Increase Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 16, 1957

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, our increased budget is caused by a number of factors, not the least of which is the tendency of cost estimates to be unrealistic and unreliable. The St. Lawrence Seaway project offers a good example of how estimates on multimillion dollar projects often prove untrustworthy.

For more than a half century there has been a strong demand by many groups for the construction of canals and locks which would open the St. Lawrence River and the Great Lakes to more shipping. During my first term in Congress I was a member of the Public Works Committee which for several months heard testimony on the St. Lawrence seaway project. Groups favorable to it naturally magnified its value and minimized its cost. Both political parties sponsored it. It was apparent to me that the cost would far exceed the estimate, and I stated this publicly. Lobbyists for this project, who were many and well paid and experienced in their profession, attacked me for my statements.

During the 2 years I was on the Public Works Committee, the bill was not reported out of that committee. It became law, however, in 1954. The cost of those parts of the project which the United States will build was estimated to be $66,815,000. Now the cost is estimated

to be $133 million and an additional authorization is being asked of Congress. Frankly, it is going to cost far more than this. The cities on the Great Lakes ports are requesting Government authorization to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars for the deepening of their harbors in order to accommodate ships of deeper draft.

At the time of the drive to get public backing for the building of the seaway, it was represented that Indiana and most of the other States would be greatly and directly benefited by this project. It was also stated that the toll charges would pay for the canal and so the St. Lawrence seaway would cost the American people nothing. It is now admitted that if tolls are set high enough to pay for the project they will discourage traffic and be self-defeating. We can have high tolls and little traffic, or low tolls and heavy traffic; but the total revenue, in either case, will not meet the yearly costs if the seaway is to be self-liquidating as it was approved. Funds to make up any deficit can only come from one source—the Federal Government.

The person in charge of the drive to get the authorization of the St. Lawrence seaway was N. R. Danielian, a hard worker and one of the most capable lobbyists I have known. During the time I was a member, great pressure was brought to bear on the Public Works Committee to approve this project. Interested parties held meetings in the Seventh District to create support for it. They told Seventh District voters how cheap this project would be, the great benefits the district would derive from it, and how it would pay for itself. Now the people are realizing the cold facts. I will now quote Mr. N. R. Danielian, president, Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, and chairman, Users Committee on St. Lawrence Seaway Tolls. This is the same man who was the chief lobbyist for the project. I am quoting from a speech made by Mr. Danielian in Cleveland, Ohio, on April 5, 1957:

Thus, one of the first misconceptions we must set aside is that this new waterway will bring a bonanza to everybody by and of itself, just because it is there. It will bring great advantages if and to the extent that it lowers transportation costs. Will it do that?

The answer should be definitely "Yes" in the Great Lakes coastal areas, such as the north shore of Ohio * * * for most goods, Pittsburgh, as of now, would still find it cheaper to trade via Baltimore; Cincinnati probably so. Columbus and Dayton and Youngstown may be marginal.

Because such a wide belt across New York, western Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan and Illinois is marginal as between the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence tributary area and east and gulf coasts, the level of tolls will have a definite effect upon amount of traffic through the seaway and commercial activity in the Great Lakes ports.

As for the tolls from the seaway paying its costs, he stated:

If any attempt is made to set tolls so high as to collect $28 million a year from the users right off the bat it will as surely dry up traffic as I stand here, and there will be neither traffic nor revenues commensurate with expectations.

On the basis of present-day cost estimates, it will require over $28 million to meet the annual requirements, an increase of some 75 percent over 1954 estimates.

Yes, the cold facts are now coming to the American people. The St. Lawrence seaway will only directly benefit a small area. Its costs will be many times its original estimate. Its tolls will not pay for its construction and maintenance.

I do not question that the seaway will be beneficial to some. Perhaps the seaway is even worth its cost. Perhaps the American people would have backed this project even if they had known the true facts, but the sad part is that the estimated cost was misleading. Incidentally, cost estimates for the Canadian share of the project have also risen sharply. Why have the costs risen? Partly, construction costs are higher than they were a few years ago. Partly, the increase is due to changes and additions made in the plans. Nevertheless, it is typical of how projects once approved expand and become more costly and force increases in Government spending.

Statement of Hon. Robert C. Byrd Before Senate Committee on Banking and Currency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 16, 1957

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of our colleagues the following statement which I presented on April 12, 1957, to the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency during the recent hearings on area assistance and redevelopment:

STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT C. BYRD, PRESENTED TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRODUCTION AND STABILIZATION OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. Chairman and honorable members of the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization, I appreciate and am grateful for the opportunity to appear before this subcommittee to present testimony in support of the bill, S. 964, which has been introduced by the distinguished Senator from Illinois, for the purpose of establishing an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas. Specifically, the areas to be benefited are those urban and rural areas that have been experiencing continuing low income, and continuing unemployment and underemployment—areas in which local initiative and enterprise cannot be drawn upon to alleviate the economic distress.

As the Representative to Congress from West Virginia's Sixth District, I can vouch for the urgency and justification of the program of assistance proposed under the Douglas bill. In my opinion, the measures proposed in this bill will displace the despair, the want, and the suffering overtaking the many unemployed areas in my State.

The bill, in brief, would accomplish the following:

1. Creation of an area redevelopment administration, under the supervision of an administrator, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Authorization to administrator for establishment of local and regional committees.

2. Assistance to industrial areas which have had unemployment of not less than (1) 12 percent of labor force for preceding 1-year period, (2) 8 percent for 15 months in preceding 18-month period, or (3) 6 percent for 8 months in each of preceding 2 years.

3. Assistance to rural areas having largest number and percentage of low-income families and a condition of substantial and persistent unemployment or underemployment.

4. Loans: Administrator to make loans for financing (a) purchase or development of land for industrial usage; (b) construction or rehabilitation of plants or facilities; (c) purchase of machinery or equipment. Loans shall bear interest at 0.5 percent per annum, shall not exceed 75 percent of total project cost, or extend beyond 40 years. Authorization of $100 million for industrial redevelopment loans and $100 million for projects in rural redevelopment areas.

5. Public facility loans and grants:

(a) Authorization of $75 million to administrator for public facility loans. Such loans shall not exceed 75 percent of aggregate cost with interest equal to rate paid by administrator on funds obtained from the Secretary of Treasury, plus 0.5 percent per annum.

(b) Authorization of $50 million to administrator for making grants for public facilities if funds not otherwise available.

6. Authorization of $4.5 million to administrator for technical assistance to redevelopment areas.

7. Declaration of policy to be followed by governmental agencies to award procurement contracts to redevelopment areas.

8. Housing and Home Finance Agency authorized to use slum clearance and urban renewal projects in redevelopment areas for industrial and commercial rebuilding without regard to existing residential requirements for such projects.

The necessity and need for legislation to carry out the program outlined above has been succinctly stated by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in reporting out similar legislation during the 84th Congress. That committee, in its report on July 12, 1956, stated (S. Rept. No. 2555, p. 2):

"More than 10 years ago Congress recognized the continuing responsibility of the Federal Government to utilize its resources in order to establish conditions which would assure that maximum employment, production, and purchasing power would prevail throughout the United States. It did so through the enactment of the Employment Act of 1946 (Public Law 304, 79th Cong.).

"Nevertheless, a large number of communities within the United States have failed to share in the prosperity that has generally prevailed throughout the country during recent years. Regardless of the cause, the fact is that many labor market areas have been classified as suffering from substantial labor surpluses continuously since 1951, when the Labor Department stated its current labor market classification system. During most of this time the rest of the Nation enjoyed economic growth, prosperity, and stability."

The findings made by the committee are reflected in many areas within my State of West Virginia. Because today our Nation as a whole is experiencing full employment and economic prosperity, we are prone to disregard or to be indifferent to the fact that some areas of our country have been facing the problem of continuous unemployment because of the loss or decline of a major industry. While the term, "depressed local labor market," is comparatively new, the existence of such markets, however, has been a problem recurring many times in our American economy. For example, the ghost towns arising from abandoned mines are a

well-known part of the history of our West. The plain and simple difference, however, is that today there are so many factors that go to make up the economic climate of each and every labor-market area. The local methods resorted to in the past cannot always be employed today to resuscitate an economically distressed area.

Since the early days of World War II, the Department of Labor's Bureau of Employment Security has been studying labor-surplus areas. As you know, the Bureau surveys at bimonthly intervals 149 major labor-market areas—each consisting of a central city or cities and the surrounding territory within a reasonable commuting distance. The area takes its name from the central city or cities, but may have many other communities within its boundaries. Each major labor-market area has at least a central city with a population of 50,000 or more. These 149 areas account for about 33 million nonagricultural wage and salaried workers—nearly 70 percent of the Nation's total. The Bureau also reports on smaller areas in a special listing. These are the areas with a labor force of not less than 15,000, of which the nonagricultural employment must be at least 8,000.

Since May 1955 the 149 major areas surveyed by the Bureau have been grouped into 6 major labor-supply categories, according to the relative adequacy of labor supply. Nineteen of the major labor-market areas are today confronted with labor surpluses, and 57 smaller areas at the beginning of the year were classified as having a relatively substantial labor surplus.

In my State of West Virginia, our capital, Charleston, is classified as a major area of substantial labor surplus, and classified as smaller areas are Beckley, Fairmont, Logan, Point Pleasant-Gallipolis, Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs, and Welch. The population of West Virginia in these labor-surplus areas numbers 787,400—or 39 percent of the entire population of the State. The 1 major and 6 smaller labor-surplus areas in the State cover 15 of its 55 counties. All these areas have been continuously included in the Department of Labor's labor-surplus classification since March 1954 and some, since March 1952. Over and above these specified areas, there are many other areas of labor surplus in West Virginia. The labor force in these areas does not come within the classification set by the Department and, therefore, such areas are not surveyed by the Bureau of Employment Security. The reason for the labor surplus in West Virginia can be traced to the long-depressed coal-mining industry.

The facts responsible for the decline of the coal industry are well known, and since World War II various Congressional bodies have made studies of the condition of the industry. The findings and reports of these studies have only confirmed the known existence of the factors responsible for the industry's decline. The important factors, for example, have been the dieselization by the railroads, the imports of huge quantities of residual oil, and mechanization in the coal industry itself. The following tabulation shows production and employment in West Virginia's bituminous coal industry since 1947, the peak year in coal production:

Year	Short tons	Average number of men working daily
		Thous.
1948	168,862	131.7
1949	122,610	120.0
1950	144,116	117.5
1951	163,310	118.9
1952	141,713	108.9
1953	134,105	92.1
1954	116,251	71.3
1955	139,168	70.4
1956	155,507	75.8

Although the figures on employment in West Virginia's coal mining areas show an increase for 1956, the employment picture is not bright. The seriousness of West Virginia's employment problem is emphasized by the fact that from 1950 to 1954 while the population of the United States increased by an estimated 6.3 percent the population of West Virginia declined by an estimated 2.9 percent.

As of June 30, 1956, the total number of persons in West Virginia receiving commodities on welfare, as certified by the State department of public assistance, was 250,136, exclusive of school lunches, institutions, and summer camps. In January of this year the number of persons eligible for such commodities was 209,556. In February the number increased to 214,526. In other words, almost 11 percent of the population of my State is keeping body and soul together by means of Government surplus food.

In my opinion, these facts are convincing proof that the methods and practices employed thus far have failed to alter the continuing economic distress prevalent in the areas that will be reached if the legislation here under consideration is enacted.

I am not unmindful of the objections to this proposed legislation—a principal one being that the measure characterizes an act of the welfare state. Such objections are without merit. Do we not have many Federal domestic program with economic or social objectives, for which we make provision each year in our appropriations? Permit me to name a few: the price-support program; the agricultural-conservation program under which farmers are paid for compliance with specified practices; the Sugar Act program—most of the cost of which consists in payments to cane and beet producers who meet specified conditions; the rural-electrification program; farm ownership loans. There are aids to business, such as assistance to air navigation, grants-in-aid for airports, airmail subsidy payments, the President's fund under the Defense Production Act of 1950 for loans and other costs in financing an expansion of productive capacity for strategic metals. There are aids to veterans in the form of compensation and pensions, education and training, and hospital and medical care. There are loans and grants for housing construction and for slum clearance and urban renewal projects. There are grants to the States for public assistance and administrative costs; for maternal and child welfare; for programs of public health service; for highways; for school-lunch programs.

The direct beneficiaries under many of the above economic and social programs are limited in number and small in comparison to our entire population. This fact has not served to lessen or obscure the responsibility of the Federal Government to provide these necessary forms of assistance. The legislation here under consideration is no less important than any of the above programs.

In my opinion, the problem is one of such importance as to warrant the establishment of a single agency to coordinate all the Federal aids that may be called upon to assist and support local efforts. A single agency will encourage, strengthen, and assist local efforts. The needs of the distressed area can be better evaluated through a single agency, with the result that the necessary assistance will be coordinated so as to effectuate the greater national interest, in keeping with the Employment Act of 1946, which states: "It is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to coordinate and utilize all of its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining maximum employment."

It appears to me that the comprehensive program envisaged under the Douglas bill will do much to stimulate local efforts.

I particularly give my endorsement to the provisions for assistance to rural redevelopment areas. So far as farming in West Virginia is concerned, for the most part the farms are too small to provide a satisfactory family income. Insufficient capital and the topography of the State make impractical the use of many labor-saving devices, and many farm families are necessarily dependent upon some off-farm employment. I receive many letters from constituents in rural areas who are not able to take advantage of the existing farm-loan programs because their farms are not large enough or are not sufficiently productive to provide the necessary security for such loans. The Douglas bill will overcome many problems in these areas, and it will permit the needed economic improvements so long necessary in the many small rural communities of my State.

I might also direct your attention to the disheartening experiences of other persons who have written to me concerning their applications for small-business loans to undertake new business ventures aimed at improving the local economic situation. Their requests have been turned down simply because an unemployed mining town is not the kind of security upon which money is loaned.

I am in favor of the proposed provision urging Federal procurement agencies to award contracts in redevelopment areas. The Senate Committee on Education and Public Welfare called attention in its report of July 12, 1956, to the effectiveness of the ODM manpower policy No. 4, which was announced in 1952 for the purpose of focusing attention on the desirability of awarding contracts in surplus-labor areas. The report points out that for the first 9 months of the fiscal year 1956 the total volume of supply procurement contracts placed in areas with surplus manpower totaled $2,700,000—not even 1 percent of the total volume of supply procurement contracts.

The facts set out above are some of the reasons why I feel that the Douglas bill or similar legislation must be enacted now if we are to meet the problem of labor-surplus areas. I sincerely hope that this subcommittee will consider the matter favorably.

The U. S. S. "Randolph"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 16, 1957

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, on April 11, 12, 13, 1957, in connection with Congressional duties, I, together with 8 Congressmen, inspected the aircraft carrier U. S. S. *Randolph* and observed air operations. The trip was very informative, illuminating, and inspiring. It left us with the feeling that our naval defenses are in competent hands and that our future is being provided for.

The orientation cruise began on Thursday evening after Congress recessed when we were conducted by Capt. Robert McElroy and Comdr. F. A. Manson to the Anacostia Airport and traveled by Convair to Jacksonville, Fla. After an inspection of the naval airbase there, we were flown on Friday morning by a COD aircraft to the U. S. S. *Randolph* about 70 miles off the coast. Landing on a carrier with a sudden stop was a new experience.

I believe that a history of one of our aircraft carriers, a description of what I observed and my reactions may give the

same pleasure to my colleagues and our citizenry as I received.

The U. S. S. *Randolph* is a recently modernized 31,000-ton aircraft carrier with a new angled flight deck, enclosed hurricane bow, new deck-edge elevators and other improvements. The carrier possesses almost unlimited range and enormous striking power. Her air group is capable of seeking out and destroying any force which a potential enemy can muster in the air, on or under the sea. The chief function of the *Randolph* is to carry, launch, and handle aircraft quickly and effectively. Capable of achieving speeds in excess of 33 knots and carrying between 80 and 100 aircraft, the *Randolph* is a forceful argument against aggression of war.

The carrier with a length of 895 feet and breadth of 199 feet with its complement of 2,500 men and officers is under the experienced command of Capt. Daniel F. Smith, Jr., of Pittsburg, Tex. The officers are courteous, experienced, and efficient. The men, sailors, and mechanics with whom I had the opportunity to mingle and talk admire their captain and they enjoy good morale. Their only "beef" at this Congressional inspection tour was the requirement to exercise extraordinary care to keep themselves and the ship spotless and neat. My talk with several of the enlisted men and officers revealed a high regard for their superiors and a satisfaction with their daily chow. What they missed most of all was their absence from their families and loved ones. In addition, they complained that to deny them the benefits of the GI bill upon separation from service was unfair.

This carrier bears a great name which dates back to the Continental Navy and Revolutionary War. Named after Peyton Randolph, patriot and statesman from Virginia, this present flattop was constructed in Newport News, Va. She was launched in 1944. Her speed was the keynote. The *Randolph* was launching planes only 4 months after being commissioned, a feat believed to be without precedent in big carrier history. During World War II, the *Randolph* joined Adm. Marc Mitscher's famed task force in the Pacific and supported the landing of troops on Iwo Jima. The *Randolph* also saw action as a unit of Admiral Halsey's 3d Fleet in the final battle against the Japanese.

Since 1953, when she was modernized, she has conducted operations throughout the world, in Gibraltar, in Salonika, Greece, in Genoa and Naples, Italy, and in July of 1956 when the State of Israel was forced to invade Egypt to protect herself, the U. S. S. *Randolph* stood ready and her aircraft provided air cover and surface and air reconnaisance for the evacuation of United States nationals from Alexandria. She patrolled the area for 30 days to protect the United States interest.

Now the U. S. S. *Randolph* is off the Florida coast providing the training grounds for pilots of jet planes, the Navy Cougars and of twin-engine A. J. Savage. To see these young cadets qualify by bringing down these fast and big planes on an angled deck of a moving carrier within a distance of 500 feet is breathtaking. If it is a difficult task in daylight, it is more so in darkness. The cadet fliers demonstrated their skill not only in the daytime but also at night. As a plane approaches the deck, hearts beat as fast as the moving jets. The question in the spectator's mind is will he land or will he overshoot? If he approaches too high or too low, the pilot is warned off by the signalman and the plane roars by. If he is within range and the landing hooks are down, the pilot makes his attempt to lay her down. Nerves of steel and pinpoint precision are needed. As the speedy Cougar or the twin-engined 50-foot-wide A. J. Savage settles on the angled deck, I breathed a sigh of relief and satisfaction. After the arresting cable brings the plane to a screeching halt, the plane is guided to the catapult, shot off into the blue and the process is repeated until the flier has completed at least 6 successful day landings. Upon completion of the final landing, everyone knows that another boy had become a man and joined the legion of qualified Navy pilots in America's defense. As night fell, these fliers were required to prove that they were skilled enough to land their planes on the angled deck under these conditions. No signalman was there to guide. The only help that these men had were the lights outlining the deck, their training, and their God. The only way to believe this performance is to see the operation. It baffles the imagination. Coordination and expert handling are required of the pilot, flight crew, and signalmen. A single mistake may bring disaster, death, or destruction. No serious accident took place and all cadets qualified except two who were overanxious and as a result were directed to fly back to Pensacola Airbase for further training and a new tomorrow.

As a safety measure in event of an accident, we had as a constant overseer a helicopter called "the Angel" and one destroyer. In the evening, two destroyers stood ready to do rescue work. They were almost called into action when one of the heavy planes after an apparently successful landing went a little too far and its left wheel toppled in the catwalk nets. A hundred Lilliputians tugging and pulling finally lifted the Gulliver onto the deck once again with very little damage to its structure. It was a close one.

Whatever questions we visiting Congressmen asked were supplied quickly and if not known, answers were obtained. To Lt. Comdr. Robert Reeve of New Jersey who spent numberless hours answering my naive questions and those of my colleagues and who pointed out the features of the angled deck, the arresting wires, the catapults, the twin-engine A. J. Savage, the Cougar, the control tower called the Pri-Fly, the radar system, and the "meatball," I can express only my appreciation and thanks. His attention and guidance will never be forgotten. With men like Lieutenant Commander Reeve, Captain McElroy, Commanders Manson and McNella who possess the practical, technical, and tactical knowledge, our country has very little to fear.

The work being done on the U. S. S. *Randolph* which thrilled me and earned my admiration is not unrecognized by the Navy. In 1955, this carrier won two of the Navy's highest honors: one, the Atlantic Fleet's coveted battle efficiency E, and the other the Chief of Naval Operations aviation safety award. The latter award was for the ship's outstanding safety record and commendable efforts in preventing aircraft accidents. This is a record that the *Randolph* can justly be proud of.

All I can say after this 3-day inspection tour is "Hail to the U. S. S. *Randolph*, its men, and its command."

The Landmarks We Defend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 16, 1957

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, it is a privilege for me to ask unanimous consent that the masterful address delivered by my honored and distinguished colleague [Mr. RUSSELL], before the 66th Continental Congress of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution in Washington last night, April 15, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Entitled "The Landmarks We Defend," this address is a forceful summation of our cherished American heritage which should be read by every citizen of our country.

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

THE LANDMARKS WE DEFEND

(Address of Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, 66th Continental Congress, the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, April 15, 1957)

Madam president general, delegates to the 66th Continental Congress of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, ladies and gentlemen:

It is indeed a high privilege to be permitted to address this distinguished gathering. The Daughters of the American Revolution stand in the very forefront of this Nation's great patriotic organizations. Their contributions to the preservation of our ideals and institutions are valuable beyond computation.

You have recognized the fact that a people without sentiment are poor indeed. In periods when some have considered it fashionable to scoff at pride as a venal sin, you have courageously sought to create and instill pride of our heritage in our youth, indeed in all of our people. You have realized that our country would be safe so long as our increasing population revere and respect the works of those men whose vision, efforts, and sacrifices enable us to enjoy the richest legacy of freedom the world has ever known.

Those who have insisted that our Constitution is outmoded or that this sacred document is a sort of political accordion to be expanded or contracted with the changing moods of men who temporarily hold power have met with unrelenting opposition from your great organization.

The numerous resolves that you have approved over the span of many years demonstrate that you are confirmed in the faith

that our national charter, the Constitution of the United States, means exactly what it says and that no man nor set of men can ever twist or distort it for their purposes without endangering all that we hold dear. As the years have come and gone you have consistently rallied to protect the landmarks our fathers have set, whether they were under direct attack or threatened with undermining by a cunning process of nibbling and erosion. In short, you have worked at citizenship.

The system we have evolved under a Constitution which guarantees the rights and liberties of every American citizen has brought us greater blessings than any people have ever enjoyed. We call it the American way of life. It has enabled us to progress and go forward—to develop—to invent—and to accumulate—to such a degree that the civilization we enjoy has become the envy of the world.

This priceless heritage was not easily won. It cannot be cheaply defended. It will not be easily preserved.

These are dangerous days that demand that those who love liberty recognize and prepare against any force that is likely to destroy that heritage.

The most obvious threat to the security of the United States is the armed might of the Communist conspiracy with its nerve-center located in the Kremlin. Cracks may appear in the Iron Curtain. Rulers may come and go, deified today and denounced tomorrow, but the ultimate objective of the Communist conspiracy remains unchanged. They still seek to dominate and rule the entire world. We know enough about this ugly system to realize that this would mean the destruction of every element of human dignity. No amount of wishful thinking can alter this brutal fact.

We know that without regard to the needs or wishes of the masses of their people, that a despotic power is largely devoting the great resources of the Soviet controlled world to the building of military might. They maintain vast armies. They have built the second largest navy of the world with incomparably the largest fleet of submarines afloat. Only the foolish would blind themselves to the fact that the Soviet has made disconcerting progress in fashioning the new and effective vehicles designed to deliver terrible nuclear weapons. Shamefully we must admit that the Soviet developments in the atomic field were greatly expedited by the treason of those who either partook of our hospitality or enjoyed our citizenship. The unprecedented peacetime efforts by the Soviet Union have done much to close the gap of our leadership in these engines of vast destruction. For many years we have relied on our preeminence in this field for the maintenance of world peace.

We must constantly recognize that we are confronted by a foe who knows little and cares less about the principles of honor and decency we have been taught to respect. The only language that he understands is the language of strength. The only way to prevent a war so destructive as to stagger the human imagination is to maintain American military might. Come what may, cost what it must, the United States must maintain superiority in atomic weapons and in the ability to deliver them. If our people are informed as to the magnitude of the stakes, I do not for a moment doubt that they are willing to make any sacrifice necessary to maintain superior strength in this field. There is no other way to salvation.

Another constant threat to our institutions of freedom is the Communist-directed effort to undermine those institutions by infiltration and internal subversion. Some of the committees of the Congress have exposed many of the ramifications of this phase of the Communist conspiracy. Your great organization has consistently supported every effort to reveal and stamp out this Communist threat. The Federal Bureau of Investigation works ceaselessly to ferret out agents and traitors who seek to sell this country to our enemies. The prosecutions following these exposures have brought about an awareness of the insidious nature of this danger.

We recognize that the diabolical forces in the Kremlin constantly conspire to find ways and means to plant its agents upon us. The Congress, through legislative enactments, has demanded a careful screening of all aliens who seek admittance to our land. We have sought to make sure that our generosity in making our country a sanctuary for the oppressed shall not be abused.

The heart of America goes out to every victim of tyranny and oppression in foreign lands. However, we will never be able to overthrow the Communist conspiracy by the process of admitting to our country all of those who seek to escape Red tyranny. Common prudence also dictates that we take every precaution to make sure that our national compassion for those in distress is not developed into a gateway for a Communist Trojan horse.

Most of our fellow citizens are fully awake to the danger posed from without by armed Soviet might and from within by Communist subversion. At great cost we seek to maintain the means to protect our way of life and our institutions of free government. We seek to keep loyal Americans on guard to defend us against both of these dangers.

Let me speak to you about a third threat to our constitutional system and to the rights and liberties it seeks to assure. There is another danger confronting us which is far more insidious than even the Communist conspiracy of subversion. This danger is ever present but always difficult to recognize. It often comes in appealing guise, confusing and deceiving many whose love of country is unquestioned. It is a creeping disease which, if not arrested, will surely result in the death of the system which has enabled us to achieve our greatness.

I refer to the grave threat which is posed by big government, undue concentration of power. We must arrest the prevailing trend towards shifting all of the functions and powers of the States into the control of a completely centralized, all-powerful Federal Government. The rights filched from the several States must be restored.

The Founding Fathers well knew the corrupting and tyrannous effects of highly centralized government. They were not only students of history. They had endured tyranny. They knew that the shores of history were littered with the wrecks of great civilizations that had risen to greatness but had deteriorated and crumbled to dust when all of the power of government over the people became concentrated in one pair of hands. They were familiar with the axiom which history had proved before Lord Acton, that all power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely. Knowing that individual liberty could not be maintained in a government of men, they sought with a wisdom almost beyond human understanding to assure that the liberties of their descendants would be forever protected by a government of law. Thomas Jefferson expressed this determination when he declared, "In questions of power let no more be said of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution."

The very genius of our system of government is found in the careful division of power to rule our people. The Founders believed that the exercise of the functions of government should be kept as close as possible to those who were governed. They therefore fashioned a Federal Government of limited powers, with the rights of the several States and of the people fully reserved and protected by the National Charter.

The exercise of the powers over the people allotted to the Federal Government were further divided. They were distributed between the executive, the legislative, and the judicial branches of the Federal Government. To assure the perpetuity of American liberty, they established the most marvelous system of checks and balances ever brought forth from the minds of men.

Those wise patriots realized that the problems of government confronting each of the States would not be exactly the same. They knew that as the several States in their own way approached their own solution for any problem, each State would serve as a laboratory of government. In the processes of trial and error or trial and cure, the experiences of one State would serve as a guide to the others without the danger of injury that simultaneous application to all might bring.

So great was the faith of the Founders in the system of divided powers that each of the Original Thirteen States likewise embraced this system. The State functions were divided between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches. To keep the government close to the governed, counties and other subdivisions were vested with those functions which most directly affected the people in their everyday life. All placed their faith in a government of law and sought to eliminate any possibility of a government of men.

It has been a long time since those who live on American soil have felt the chafe of the chains of tyranny. So many generations have enjoyed the blessings of unchallenged liberty that we have become prone to take them as much for granted as the air we breathe or the water that we drink.

Millions of loyal American citizens have been so engaged in the everyday business of making a living for their families that they do not realize how far down the road to centralization we have already traveled. The approach to one big government has not been made by spectacular leaps. The process has been insidious, but it has gone a long ways. The whittling process has gone so far that it threatens to reduce the several States to mere geographical boundaries or administrative areas of Federal departments. The transferral of the proper functions of the States or their subdivisions to the administrative control of Federal bureaucrats in Washington has been done in many ways. A series of decisions by Federal courts have wiped out a number of rights and privileges which the States have exercised since the birth of our Republic. They do much to extend the process of centralization.

Cooperation between the Federal Government and the States and their subdivisions has long been a part of our system. In recent years, however, some of the legislative proposals that are called Federal aid are almost a sort of bribery to tempt local government to surrender their control over local functions in return for money from the National Treasury.

A small but active group of self-styled intellectuals have dedicated themselves to the task of centralization. Most of them honestly believe that national state socialism is better for us than the system devised by our fathers. They abhor a free enterprise economy and would have the Government of the United States possess the power to control the activities and the lives of all of our people. Unmindful of the lessons of history, they would place America's future in a supposedly benign and all-powerful Federal Government.

This group is too small to be effective were it not for the carelessness and indifference of unthinking millions. Mankind has ever been plagued by the chimerical illusion that it is possible to get something for nothing. We have our millions who seek and accept alleged free benefits for their States and communities from a generous White Father

in Washington in return for the surrender of the priceless right of local self-government. It is understandable that the people of foreign countries who have seen how prodigal we are with our expeditures on the foreign-aid program would believe that dollars grow on trees in the District of Columbia. However, the most obtruse American taxpayer on this day which is the last day for the payment of Federal income taxes must be painfully aware that this is a foreign illusion.

Any money that the Federal Government spends on functions which properly belong to the States and their communities must come in the first instance from the people of these States and communities. Federal bureaucracy takes a toll from every tax dollar it touches. Those who are enticed with the idea of free money from Washington will eventually find to their sorrow that they are paying yearly increasing costs in dollars and cents for the privilege of giving away the right to govern themselves.

The 9th and 10th amendments to the Constitution, designed to limit the powers of the Federal Government and protect the rights of the States and the people, were once considered the keystone of our system. Due to a series of recent decisions by the Federal judiciary, they have now been rendered almost ineffective.

It would have been impossible to have convinced the authors of the Constitution or of the Bill of Rights that a Federal court would ever hold that a sovereign State was powerless to enact and enforce laws against Communist subversion which occurred within its borders. Those men would have been shocked by the mere contention that any local subdivision of government was without power to rid themselves of a teacher, chosen locally to instruct and guide their children, paid with local tax funds, because he sought the refuge of the fifth amendment.

These decisions, as well as others that could be enumerated, are destructive of local self-government. Such crippling attacks upon the rights of the States make meaningless our once proud boasts of an indissoluble Union of indestructible States. State power cannot survive many more such disastrous and degrading blows. If our dual system is once destroyed, how long will the individual rights and liberties of the American people survive?

There is considerable national agitation today over measures pending in the Congress that are euphoniously labeled civil-rights bills. The titles of these bills appeal to the American people. Every American is in favor of more and bigger and better civil rights. An examination of what these measures really do immediately raises the question as to whose civil rights and what constitutional rights are involved. They raise the issue of how far you may go in infringing upon the civil rights of all of our people in the attempt to establish doubtful civil rights for the benefit of one group by force bills. High-handed and drastic legislative action in this field must be weighed well in the light of its effect upon the rights of the States and upon the sum total of the liberties of all of the American people.

Some of these bills are destructive of the integrity and rights of the several States as entities of government. They could be used to deny the elemental rights of individual American citizens guaranteed by the Constitution. By a cunning plan to make the Federal Government a party to civil causes growing out of acts now punishable as crimes against either State or Federal law, these bills would deliberately bypass and annul sacred and inherent individual rights specifically spelled out in the Constitution. American citizens could be punished and jailed without due process by resorting to civil proceedings and contempt citations tried in star chamber sessions.

The right of trial by jury before being sentenced and punished is the proudest boast of Anglo-Saxon justice. It is considered the shield and buckler of the liberties of free men wherever the English language is spoken. Even before Magna Charta was wrung from an unwilling King John at Runnymeade, men of our race had spilled their blood for the right of a public jury trial by their peers. For many centuries Lord Jeffreys and his Star Chamber have been held in odium for perverting judicial power into an instrument of oppression and tyranny. If free born American citizens can be thrown in jail for indefinite or unlimited terms by this perversion of process at the caprice of a Federal judge enjoying life tenure by appointment, we will no longer have a government of law. Our most sacred rights will be the plaything of a government of men.

Let no lover of liberty anywhere be deceived by the specious argument that the unprecedented powers of this bill will be applied only in one section of the country. If enacted, they will be a threat to the most sacred constitutional rights of every American citizen. Such proposals are repugnant to the system which has brought us to greatness. They would employ the methods of the despised police state of totalitarian regimes.

There is no condition in this land of ours that can conceivably justify the wholesale sweeping aside of constitutional rights. Our Constitution wisely provides that the United States shall guarantee to every State of this Union a republican form of government. If there be a single State where a republican form of government is denied, the Federal power may be legally applied. There is no valid reason for general Federal legislation that will further degrade all the States and State institutions. There is no cause whatever to impeach the laws, the procedures, and the officials of all of the States and in the process so twist our system as to eliminate the guarantee of due process of law which has heretofore protected every one of our citizens. If this be done in the name of civil rights, it will be a crime more heinous than any ever committed in the name of liberty.

The President of the United States is duly chosen by the people to serve in the most exalted office of the earth. No President of the United States, even in time of dangerous crisis, has ever possessed any such powers over the lives and liberties of the American people as these bills propose to vest in an appointed Attorney General.

The American system rejects the idea that any one man, however wise or impartial, should be permitted to govern by intimidation and injunction and jailing his fellow citizens for contempt. What self-respecting patriot will willingly agree that any official under any circumstances could designate him to be the first to be stripped of his constitutional rights to a fair trial before being jailed? Our forebears did not endure Valley Forge or face death on a hundred battlefields in the war for independence for any such tortured concept of freedom.

The heart of our country is still sound, and the spirit of patriotism still lives. American youth have again and again shown the heroism of old in their country's service. We still have the genius and capacity to meet and overcome any threat to our freedom and to our institutions.

All of us must work harder in the discharge of every duty of citizenship. Our age is complex and requires greater vigilance as the price of liberty. We must constantly guard against the evil consequences of carelessness and indifference. We can seek no greater reward than to have another generation study and consider the period in which we live and say, "Our American heritage and the landmarks of our Fathers were safe in their hands."

Address by Hon. William F. Knowland, of California, Before Daughters of the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 16, 1957

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address I delivered last night before the 66th Continental Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

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

ADDRESS BY UNITED STATES SENATOR WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, 66TH CONTINENTAL CONGRESS OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, CONSTITUTION HALL, WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 15, 1957

The Daughters of the American Revolution have notably contributed to the preservation of our spirit of patriotism without which our Nation would not have arisen from the flames of the revolutionary war nor survived the intervening years.

In this year 1957 we need to rededicate ourselves to the American Constitution and our free way of life.

America is still the authentic revolution. The flame of freedom which was struck at Concord and Lexington still is an inspiration to the enslaved behind the Iron Curtain.

But it is also an ageless lesson that no outsiders can win independence for a people though they may give material assistance. The subjugated must be willing to pay the price in blood and resources to gain their own freedom.

We do recognize, however, that when freedom is destroyed anywhere in the world a bit of freedom is destroyed everywhere.

Other nations have been or now are larger in land area, in population, and in natural resources. Yet they have not been able to give to their people the freedom and the standard of living Americans have enjoyed.

As important as is the productive capacity of our Nation and its military strength, these are not the factors which alone could preserve our freedom or enable us to maintain a free world of free men. The inner strength of America has not been its great cities, its huge industrial plants, its extended transportation systems, or its variety of natural resources.

The factor which made America an inspiration to the rest of the world grew out of our Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and the spiritual values which the founders of our Republic recognized and by which they were guided.

We have recognized that there was a higher moral law to which governments were also accountable. We have humbly acknowledged the divine inspiration which made and preserved us as a nation.

We have read of and been inspired by the action of George Washington kneeling in prayer during the dark days of Valley Forge and of Lincoln doing the same during his lonely vigil in the White House during the darkest days of the Civil War.

This Nation of ours has grown from a weak colony of 3 million on the Atlantic coast to a great power of 170 million people, the most productive nation the world has ever known.

The priceless ingredient for our people has been our constitutional form of government, which guarantees our religious, personal, and economic freedom.

The incentives furnished have constantly opened new horizons.

In this atmosphere Americans of each generation have sought to leave to their children a better land than they themselves found, not just better in a material way but in the educational and cultural developments that make for better family and community life.

New inventions in various industrial fields and the tremendous potentials of the peacetime developments of atomic power are bound to challenge us for many years into the future.

Instinctively we know that human freedom is a greater force than tyranny.

We also instinctively know, though at times our allies and our own Government may for expediency forget, that there are some things in life which cannot be compromised.

Nations can die while delegates talk. Last year the General Assembly of the United Nations passed 10 resolutions in 76 days of debate. All that while freedom was being strangled to death in Hungary. With callous indifference the Soviet Union placed itself above the higher moral law of God as well as above its obligations under the United Nations Charter.

No international organization can long endure with a double standard of international morality.

Are the obligations and the mandates of the United Nations to be applicable to the democratic nations but not to the totalitarian powers? To the law abiding but not to the outlaw nations? To the small and weak countries but not to the big and strong? What kind of justice is this? Are we building on quicksand? What kind of a foundation is this for constructing a system of international law and order based on justice?

We serve no useful purpose if we hide the facts. To the contrary by ignoring them and failing to seek remedies, we may endanger the safety of this Republic and free men everywhere.

For many decades the men in the Kremlin have preached the doctrine that the free world contains the seeds of its own destruction.

It is far more likely, I believe, that the Communist world contains the seeds of its own destruction.

Hungary was but the latest in the indications that, even under totalitarian police rule and the brainwashing of a whole generation, the spark of freedom still lived and was capable of lighting a fire that endangered the whole monolithic structure of Communist tyranny.

After the Hungarian experience how much reliance can the Soviet Union place in the armed forces of the other captive nations if freedom is ever within their reach? How can they have faith in Communist indoctrination when young students were the leaders of the Hungarian rebellion?

Within the past 10 days, the rulers in the Kremlin have sought to intimidate Norway, Denmark, Greece, and Iceland.

The Soviet Union has not changed its long-term strategic objective: the destruction of human freedom everywhere.

They will be relentless in seeking to destroy our institutions. Fortified by our faith in God, we must be determined that our way of life will be preserved.

Hungary has also taught the world that unless an independent government or revolutionary movement can function for several weeks or months it is difficult for outside friends to assist.

Had the British redcoats crushed the first American rebellion in a week and captured the leaders (as happened in Budapest) there would have been no time for France and our other friends abroad to come to our aid.

Sooner or later there will be another Hungary. Will the free world be better prepared to strike a blow for freedom? Will the United Nations be prepared to do more than talk and pass 10 resolutions?

It may come this year or next in Bulgaria, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Eastern Germany, Albania, North Korea, China, Poland, or in Hungary again.

Indeed it may even come in the Soviet Union where the people of Russia were the first victims of the godless Communist tyranny.

During the week Nagy was the legal head of the Hungarian Government what a difference it might have made if the United Nations had sent in observers; if based on the first United Nations resolution the friends of freedom abroad had sent the Freedom Fighters bazookas and grenades rather than more resolutions of sympathy.

Or is the policy of the United Nations and the free world now to be that we will throw water on the embers of freedom and revolt against tyranny and that we will finance Communist economic and political systems so that the slaves will be more content with their masters?

For several years the United Nations has discussed the freedom of colonial people in Asia and in Africa. These are and will continue to be important questions until equitable solutions have been reached. The Asian-African bloc of neutrals shows great solicitude.

Why, however, has there been a strange silence in the United Nations relative to the destruction of freedom in Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia? Here is a clear-cut prima facie case of the violation of its international treaties of friendship and nonaggression by the Soviet Union. Here is a clear case of the unilateral incorporation of three independent nations as provinces within the U. S. S. R. Here we find three nations that were once free which are now in Communist captivity. Yet here the silence is almost deafening.

Will the General Assembly take further action in the Hungarian case to back up its 10 resolutions or will an effort be made to create a zone of silence so that relations with the Soviet Union will not be embarrassed? Is justice for Hungary to be blinded and gagged as well? Is the conscience of the world that was so thoroughly aroused in October and November to be complacent and satisfied in April and May? If the Security Council meets on the Mid-East question this month or next will the Hungarian issue be raised or be forgotten?

These are questions which free men will be asking and enslaved people who want to be free will be waiting for the answers.

It was Lincoln who said: "Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation. * * * We, even we here, have the power and bear the responsibility. In giving freedom to the slave we assure freedom to the free. * * * We shall nobly save or meanly lost the last, best hope of earth."

Annual Dinner of the Amen Corner of Pittsburgh, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 16, 1957

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the Amen Corner of Pittsburgh, Pa., includes in its membership many of the leading business and professional men in the tri-State area of which Pittsburgh is the center. Each year it holds a dinner with a program devoted to the discussion of matters affecting the national welfare. Saturday night, April 6, 1957, the 31st of such meetings was held.

This annual dinner also honors the retiring president of the organization. This year the president, Mr. Walter Schulten, an outstanding industrialist and civic leader of Pittsburgh, was so honored.

The speakers this year were the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and myself. All of the addresses placed emphasis on the high cost of government and the course we must take to maintain the economic stability of the United States. Unfortunately, we cannot have printed the speech of the able Senator from Ohio, because he spoke from notes and did not have a written address.

I feel that these speeches are of interest to the general public, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Genesis of the Amen Corner, the address of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and my remarks on that occasion.

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

GENESIS

The Amen Corner is not a club. Don't forget that.

It is something that just happened, and, without rhyme or reason, might happen in any well-regulated wide-awake, self-respecting urban community.

It happened to Pittsburgh in 18—let me see—well, as far back as the memory of this scrivner runs, debates to the contrary notwithstanding, there has been about town a coterie of boon companions, men of many minds, without regard to race, creed, politics or previous condition, who have gathered nocturnally, quite haphazardly, at some place of convenient rendezvous, to discuss as the spirit moved them, any subject under the rising or the setting sun, and, without let or hindrance, apply to the arts forensic any system of logic or reason, which, the individual in his sovereign right, might elect.

Membership in the Amen Corner is one of the difficult mysteries of the day. There is no set formula and no rules of procedure are made to guide the ambitious tyro who would have his name inscribed on the roster of membership. Indeed, the only information on this head which is available is that to gain the open sesame one must be a one hundred percent man. In truth manhood is the acid test which the Corner prescribes, apparently in secret, for one never knows when, if, or how, he is to become a member until some day he is slapped on the back, hale fellow-like, and is told that he is an "Amener."

That's the simple, frank process, but, like the higher degrees in some of the fraternities, the reason why one has been elected is never disclosed.

"Many are called but few are chosen" seems to be quite literally the maxim of this unique fraternity of good fellows.

The progenitor of "The Corner" was called "The Steps" and its place of concourse then was at Liberty Avenue and Sixth Street.

One dark night some scalawags, out of tune with that splendid spirit which preserves the best traditions and usages of an epoch, wantonly and without ruth, moved "The Steps" to make room for the ignoble

and sordid march of progress—moved them no one knew whither.

Up to Grant Street to the offices of one of the group, the fathers of the Amen Corner trekked and metaphorically pitched their tent.

Not long thereafter this same iconoclastic march of progress—to be exact, in the fall of 1915—the William Penn Hotel offered a rendezvous which the dispossessed members of "The Steps" grasped with an appreciation of the hospitality extended, in a way that warmed the cockles of the heart of the genial Boniface.

"Come over to the William Penn," said he, "and meet in a corner of the lobby."

So, they came, and out of "The Steps" there evoluted The Amen Corner.

On its roster, as active or honorary members, are ambassadors to and from the Old World, Governors, Senators, Judges of all the courts, clergymen, lawyers, business men, politicians, literatti, artists, actors, musicians, and notables in greater or lesser degree in nearly every profession, vocation, and avocation.

Many brilliant prandial functions have marked the history of The Amen Corner. Annually the president is honored with a testimonial dinner. That's why we are here tonight.

But nightly, and now daily since it has its own spacious quarters on the club floor of the Wm. Penn Hotel—the real zest of membership in The Amen Corner may be judged from the casual gatherings and the open discussions that animate them.

Controversies rage on every conceivable subject. Questions are never settled. That's too much to expect from "men of many minds."

But though the disputation may work itself into the velocity of a typhoon-or the heat of argument may rise to the temperature of Hades, and, the end of the day may leave some sorely tried tempers and furniture may be a bit awry, the day after dawns with the same sunny skies breaking through Pittsburgh's changeful atmosphere, and the same happy, smiling faces and the same warmth of handclasps all around, that prevailed before the last argument.

The Role of the Congress in the Preservation of Free Enterprise

(Address by United States Senator Andrew F. Schoeppel, Republican, of Kansas, at the 31st annual dinner of the Amen Corner, Pittsburgh, Pa., on April 6, 1957)

It is a pleasure to be with you in Pittsburgh tonight—the city aptly referred to as the Renaissance City of America, the great metropolis with the Golden Triangle.

Many of your fine leaders, from all walks of life, have contributed to this great enterprise, prominent among them being Walter F. Schulten, one of the outstanding industrialists.

He has interested himself, as you know, in the great civic advancement of your city, and is to be congratulated for his splendid accomplishments.

It is always a pleasure for me to meet with business leaders to discuss some of the problems which confront the Congress of the United States in preserving the free enterprise system which you represent and symbolize.

The 531 individuals who constitute the Congress, 96 Senators and 435 Representatives, are the board of directors for the American people. We are responsible for determining the policies of what has become the biggest business on earth.

As in most corporations, boards of directors have no administrative responsibilities. In the Federal Government, executive responsibility is the province of the President.

The American people—170 million of us, with only 7 percent of the world's population—enjoy the highest standard of living of any country on earth.

We have only 6 percent of its land area, yet we account for 40 percent of its production of goods.

We generate 45 percent of its electric power.

We have 60 percent of all the telephones in use, and more than 75 percent of the automobiles.

The other side of the coin is, of course, the fact that 93 percent of the world's population has far less of the good things of life than do our own citizens.

With the bulk of the world's resources available to them, they should be able to do more for their own people without depending on the American taxpayer.

People from many lands visit America to see our factories, our farms, and to study our productive processes. Our Government fosters these exchanges, as we believe that others can benefit through the application of our advanced technology and scientific developments to raise their own living standards.

I support these efforts. However, I am disturbed that so many who visit our industrial plants leave our shores without finding the key to America's well-being and strength.

They believe that our progress can be transplanted to other lands by capital grants and the application of technical know-how.

They have failed to grasp the fact that the accumulation of capital in the United States, as well as our technical superiority, is based on a unique system of relationships between private citizens and their governments. These relationships are derived from the spiritual and moral concepts which our Founding Fathers wrote into our Constitution.

They are the basis for a competitive capitalistic system, which today protects the free world from atheistic communism.

I believe in this system, and none of us should hesitate to voice our belief that this is the most productive system man has devised.

The United States Information Agency has sent an exhibit to many countries to explain our American system described as "the people's capitalism." This is a good phrase. We have no classes in America.

Here in Pittsburgh your industrial society provides one of the best exhibits in the world to show the success of this system. Many of your neighbors are at one and the same time workers for, investors in, and customers of the same firm.

The distinguishing feature of each of these relationships is the fact that they are based on the voluntary decisions of individuals.

We in the Senate must make sure that its growth is fostered by the development of sound fiscal and monetary policy.

Any one can buy or sell a share of stock in any listed American corporation.

You can seek any job for which your abilities qualify you.

You are free to spend your income as consumers to satisfy your personal wants and express your individual preferences.

This voluntary system based on free individual choice is the unique feature of "the people's capitalism."

The Congress of the United States, your board of directors, promises to protect these rights for all our citizens, which rights have been handed down to us by our forefathers.

These freedoms are possible only because individuals have the right to own private property. The productive tools in America belong to the people and not to their Government.

In recent years we have heard a great deal about the fifth amendment. Every one here is familiar with the fact that it protects individuals from self-incrimination.

Some of you perhaps are not aware of the fact that it also provides the basic security for private property. This amendment, a part of our great Bill of Rights, provides that private property cannot be confiscated without due process of law, nor can it be acquired for public use without just compensation.

From our earliest days as an independent country, we have believed in private enterprise.

It is an article of faith that every individual should be free to develop his God-given talents and to enjoy the fruits of his own labor.

Our country has prospered greatly because of these basic fundamental beliefs.

Our Constitution protects freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and the freedom to petition one's Government.

These freedoms have fostered intellectual development, the spirit of scientific inquiry, and the willingness to explore the unknown, which underlie our great scientific and industrial accomplishments.

Let me remind you that our scientific developments come from the efforts of individuals. We believe in the dignity and importance of every individual.

Let me discuss our current concern with lobbying in terms of the freedom guaranteed in the Constitution to petition one's Government.

I am reminded of an article written in 1935 by Raymond Moley, who is truly an elder statesman in the field of political journalism. Mr. Moley wrote:

"Lobbies about which we are hearing so much these days are an inevitable aspect of republican government. They fill a need created by modern economic life, which is a mesh of many interests. If we recognize these interests as legitimate, we speak of them as interests.

"If we do not like them, we call them in an italicized voice interests. If we hate them and are fighting them, we call them big, special, or vested interests. But interests they are, and they multiply, overlap, and conflict."

It is the admitted responsibility of the Congress and the Senate to prepare and pass upon the ground rules under which these overlapping and conflicting interests compete with each other.

We should run no risk that our deliberation turn into a Roman holiday for the benefit of sensational journalism, and referring to the general area of the activities which we call lobbying, I would like to again quote Mr. Moley: "It is difficult to indict a method which in its essence is the ancient right of petition in a modern dress."

Regarding this right of petition, there is a traditional policy in Washington which every American citizen critical of lobbying should know and understand.

On nearly every entrance door in the Senate Office Building there is a sign which reads, in effect: "Come in. You are welcome."

Were the sign ever to be removed, dictatorship would get its first toehold on the Republic of the United States of America.

Those among our population who in their lack of information condemn the practice of business lobbying as a sinister influence in our public life would be astonished to discover that the widely-publicized groups referred to as the power lobby, the oil and gas lobby, the steel and chemical lobbies, etc., are relatively unimportant compared to other groups.

These other groups are the farmers, the veterans, the labor unions, and others whose activities are usually considered to be exclusively in the public interest, instead of in the private interest.

These citizens would be still more astonished to make the discovery that the biggest of all lobbies are the departments of the Federal administration: The Army, the Navy,

the Air Force, the Post Office, the State Department, the Treasury Department, Foreign Aid, and its associated lobbies.

As to the actual day-to-day operation of Washington lobbies, I do not know a single Senator or Representative who does not value the data and information emanating from these offices.

The public which, unfortunately, is preoccupied with the more sensational aspects of lobbying, does not know that one single, well-written, time-saving analysis is more influential over Congressional action than a dozen offers of special favors, free dinners, or elaborate cocktail parties.

Our system of government is founded on the concept that those who govern do so with the consent of the governed. This concept, in turn, rests on the fact that our citizens own private property, not only homes and personal possessions, but the tools of industrial production.

They can live and support their families regardless of whether their political views are attractive to those in power.

When the United Nations was established in 1945, one of its first acts was to establish a Commission on Human Rights.

Our Government supported the work of this Commission, as we wished to foster universal recognition of the guaranties enumerated in our Bill of Rights, including the right to own private property.

You will be interested to know that your Government, in the councils of the United Nations, has attempted unsuccessfully for 11 years to secure recognition of the private ownership of property as a basic human right.

What is even more disturbing is that fact that in 1952 a resolution was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly which, in effect, condoned the right of countries to nationalize private property without compensation. Only four countries, including the United States, voted against the adoption of this resolution.

As we turn the pages of history we can find no instance in which a war of aggression was started through the legislative actions of a free people. Under our Constitution, only Congress can declare war.

It is inconceivable that we would ever debate a program for an aggressive attack on anyone.

The danger to world peace arises from the fact that in so many countries decisions which determine the course of history do not rest with the elected representatives of free people, but are in the control of individuals who have dictatorial powers over the manpower and resources of their countries.

Permanent progress toward achieving a world in which more of our energies can be directed toward fulfilling the desires of our own people for a more satisfying life, rather than in colossal military expenditures, requires that other countries achieve systems of government in which the aspirations of individual citizens will have a more important place.

The people living behind the Iron Curtain, if they understood our way of life and if they controlled their own destinies, would never vote to make war on us. Our danger lies in the actions of their leaders who have kept the truth about our economic system from their own citizens.

It is because I believe so strongly that the spread of our system of private competitive capitalism would not only help others to raise their living standards, but would remove the threat of nuclear warfare, that I feel we must further a better understanding of our economic system throughout the world.

Every foreign study group which visits the United States must learn that the real secret of our progress lies in the fundamental freedoms which we enjoy.

Until the right to own private property is established as a human right, every citizen will always be subject to the arbitrary actions of those who control the economies of countries where the people are not free to express their own wishes.

Furthering respect for private property will advance the economic well-being of other countries. What is even more important, it will enable us to reduce our own military burdens.

In the months ahead the Congress of the United States must determine the character of our foreign-aid program. Its size, duration, and method of operation will affect the future of our own economy.

Because of the impact foreign-aid expenditures have on the Federal budget and, hence, on industries' tax burden, the Congress will give this program careful scrutiny.

Last year the Senate authorized an extensive study of the present program. The Committee on Foreign Relations has secured assistance from a number of private groups representing different points of view. Their work is now being published by the committee in a series of reports to guide the Congress in its deliberations.

President Eisenhower also established a committee to examine this problem. He appointed Benjamin Fairless, one of your most distinguished citizens, to serve as chairman.

Last month the committee's unanimous report was made public by the President. It strongly urges that we stimulate private investment, rather than depend on Government grant aid. Let me quote from the report:

"Foreign investment of private capital is far more desirable than investment by Government; and during the past fiscal year it appears that there was approximately $3.7 billion of new, private United States investment abroad. Such investments provide much more than capital to the cause of economic development, for they carry with them the initiative, the managerial skill, and the technical aptitude which have proven of great worth to the American economy.

"Moreover, private capital does not constitute a drain on the taxpayer. Indeed, to the extent that private capital can proceed, the burden on the American taxpayer can be reduced without impairment of that economic development of the free world which is so essential to the realization of American aspirations.

"Beyond that, private American capital can join more easily with private capital in other countries than can Government investment.

"We believe, therefore, that the United States Government should increase its efforts to make known, both at home and abroad, the productive contributions and possibilities of private capital. This can and should be done by our diplomatic missions and by friendship and commerce treaties. In our opinion, this effort has not been pursued, thus far, with the vigor that the obvious benefits of such an undertaking would justify" (p. 8).

Obviously, private investors are not going to send their money abroad unless they feel that the countries receiving their capital will not arbitrarily nationalize it or discriminate against it because of its foreign origin.

However, in spite of all that we can do to further private investment, the Fairless committee realizes that our Government must continue to make some direct grants and loans for many years into the future.

The Congress must decide whether grant aid should be administered by our own Government or through the United Nations.

There are two schools of thought on the subject of foreign grant aid. The first, which is supported by the Fairless committee, and which I endorse, believes that governmental assistance financed with your tax dollars should be given primarily to those countries which are willing to take the necessary political, economic, and military measures to safeguard their own freedom against the only aggressive force in existence in the world today—international communism.

The second school of thought, which has many supporters, believes that foreign economic development financed by the American taxpayer is a noble end in itself. The adherents to this philosophy believe that we should support the establishment of a new specialized agency within the United Nations, to be called SUNFED.

The initials stand for Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development.

The reasons for adding the word "Special" to the title of this agency are that without the "S" the initials would read "UNFED," and this is not an appealing word.

Walter Reuther is one of the strongest advocates of SUNFED. He has suggested that our Government pledge an annual contribution of 2 percent of our gross national product to such a fund. This would mean additional expenditures of more than $8 billion of tax dollars.

Establishment of SUNFED would encourage underdeveloped countries to develop along socialistic lines, as they would not feel any compulsion to create the necessary internal conditions to attract the funds of private investors. I am, of course, opposed to such an increase in our foreign-aid expenditures. However, I am even more concerned with the direction the program would take, if the funds were contributed to such an agency.

Any such international organization supplying grant aid would be directed and operated by individuals from many countries in the United Nations whose economic philosophy would range from an adherence to our system of private competitive enterprise to socialism, communism, and every form of economic organization which might lie between the two extremes.

Experts and technicians who are exponents of socialism and communism would be sent into many underdeveloped countries. Yes, they would bring capital and technical training, but I am sure they would not bring the one priceless gift we could give these countries—namely, an understanding of the basic principles of human organization which underlie not only our material well-being, but are responsible for the political freedom which makes each of us rejoice in our United States citizenship.

I am very happy that the Fairless committee in its report to President Eisenhower unequivocally said, and I am again quoting: "The contributions of other economically advanced nations to the task of providing external assistance to nations in need should be actively sought. But it does not appear that there is need for yet another worldwide bureau, such as the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development, for the distribution of grant economic assistance" (p. 11).

Mr. Fairless, as the chairman of this presidential commission, has performed a great service for the United States and toward the advancement of the private enterprise system to which he contributed so much in his work as a business leader here in Pittsburgh.

Let us now turn our attention to some of the domestic concerns which confront your board of directors, the Congress of the United States.

I have stressed the necessity of preserving freedom for every individual to express his views, and to live his life according to his own dictates as long as he does not infringe on the similar rights of others.

In our present industrial society, there is a definite need for free labor unions. The labor movement can play an important part in advancing our concepts of freedom.

The Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 provides that a union, which is certified as a bargaining agent for a majority of the employees in any establishment, shall represent all the employees in collective bargaining negotiations and in the handling of any grievances with the employer.

The Congress provided that union-shop agreements not prohibited by State or Territorial law could be executed by unions and employers. Unions contend, with some justification, that they want all members of the bargaining unit to contribute toward the benefits all the employees receive from the activities of the union working as their agent.

The Congress in 1947, when the Taft-Hartley Act was written, regarded the rights and obligations of labor unions in terms of their traditional function as representing their members in dealing with their employers and not as political parties. Recently it has become obvious that in some respects some unions regard themselves as political parties.

I would never infringe on the political rights of any group. I do not object to unions engaging in politics. However, I do feel that any political action by a union must be truly voluntary. No union which participates in politics should be allowed to negotiate a union shop agreement and force all its members to contribute to a political campaign.

The results of the last election clearly show that many union members did not carry out the wishes of their union leaders in the privacy of the polling place. These members, in effect, were forced to contribute dues under a union shop agreement to pay for a political campaign in opposition to their own political beliefs.

More recently, the select committee investigating racketeering under the chairmanship of my friend and colleague, Senator MCCLELLAN, has revealed that funds collected on a compulsory basis through union shop agreements, allegedly for political purposes, actually were used for the private gain of a few unscrupulous and, I am sure, unrepresentative union officials.

One task which this Congress must undertake is the amendment of the Labor Management Relations Act so that every union may be given the choice of whether it wishes to operate as a political party or as a trade union.

If it chooses to become a political party it should enjoy the immunities of the first amendment, but lose the right to negotiate union shop agreements.

On the other hand, if it wishes to confine itself to acting as a bargaining agent for its members and not engage in any political activity, it should be permitted to negotiate union shop agreements under State and Territorial law. I know we cannot continue our present course of fostering compulsory membership in political parties. This was the technique of Mussolini and Hitler. It is fascism, and not Americanism.

For many years I have been a member of the Select Committee on Small Business. I sought this assignment as I believe that if our economy is to prosper, today's small businesses must be encouraged to grow into the big business units of tomorrow.

We must constantly revitalize the ranks of our business leaders with newcomers of ability and energy. Every American glories in the achievements of your pioneer industrialists—Andrew Carnegie, Henry Frick, and Andrew Mellon.

They started with nothing but new ideas and a few dollars, which they had saved before the tax collector made saving so difficult.

They gave this community new industries, supplying employment to hundreds of thousands of your fellow citizens. To be sure, they earned large profits, but these profits are small in comparison with the benefits the consumers of our country received from their purchase of the products created by their efforts.

Under our system, the consumer of America really receives the profits from any industrial endeavor.

In recent years it has been more difficult for small business to succeed and move forward. I have been disturbed that so much of the work of our Small Business Committees has been directed to attacks on big business rather than to the development of measures to further the growth of our smaller firms.

One proposal advanced to assist small corporations is to reduce the normal tax on the first $23,000 of corporate profits.

It has great merit, and I support it. However, it only partially solves the problem. We must remember that many of our smaller firms are either individual proprietorships or partnerships. They will only be helped by reducing our personal income tax rates.

If a small business shows a profit of $25,000 and this profit represents a return of 5 percent on invested capital, the stockholders must have invested a half-million dollars. Most small businesses are owned by only a few stockholders.

A family, or two or three individuals, have risked all their assets in a venture.

I wonder whether those who speak with feeling about the small business concern whose profits total only $25,000 have the same solicitude for the stockholders with assets of at least $500,000. Yet, we are talking about the same people.

Under our present personal income tax laws rates in the top bracket reach 91 percent, and it is becoming more and more difficult for individuals to accumulate funds for investment. We can do a great deal to help small business by making it possible for individuals to once again save capital from their current income.

This will accomplish more than attacks on big business or the establishment of new Government programs to loan funds to small business. Loans cannot be repaid unless equity capital can be substituted for Government debt.

The Congress must reexamine our tax structure so that it will produce the maximum possible revenue without depriving individuals of the incentive to establish and expand new businesses. Present tax rates were established under the previous administrations, and many of them are designed to punish success rather than to raise revenue. This is a luxury we can no longer afford.

In view of the large expenditures which our Government must make for years to come it is essential that taxes be levied with due regard to the fundamental economic principle of diminishing returns. Any tax rate which is set so high that it discourages new investment and hence produces a smaller net revenue for the Government than would a lower rate is completely indefensible.

The subject of taxes invariably requires an examination of appropriations. The Congress is considering the budget for the fiscal year 1958 which will start July 1. President Eisenhower has recommended the largest peacetime budget in our history. The greater portion of this budget is dedicated to our defense and foreign-aid activities.

I can assure you that the Congress will examine these items closely, and we will endeavor to effect every possible economy without jeopardizing the security of our country.

In the last analysis the domestic items included in the budget reflect the demands upon the President and the Congress by the people of America. We must reverse the trend to ever-larger Federal budgets if we are to preserve our system of private enterprise.

This can only be done if every community leader assumes a personal responsibility to see to it that demands are not made upon the Federal Government for services which could be better performed either by private enterprise or by the States and local communities.

The Atomic Energy Act was amended in 1954 so as to make it possible for private enterprise to devote its resources to the development of this new great force. Here in Pennsylvania at Shippingport you will shortly be producing electrical energy from the atom on a commercial basis.

I can see no reason for the Federal Government to compete with private industry in the development of peaceful uses for atomic energy. Yet, proposals are repeatedly made which would ultimately require spending billions of tax dollars to place the Government in the utility business in competition with private industry. We must resist these measures which would not only tend to produce a collectivist economy, but would add ever-increasing burdens on our taxpayers.

The 83d Congress authorized the disposal of the Government's investment in synthetic rubber plants to private industry. This transfer has been completed.

The Government is out of this business, and properties valued at hundreds of millions of dollars have been added to the tax rolls of our States and local communities. There is much more to be done in getting the Government out of business. The Government is still the country's largest insurer, its largest lender, its largest tenant, its largest holder of grazing land, its largest warehouse operator, its largest shipowner, and its largest truck-fleet operator.

If the Government withdraws from businesses which can be undertaken by private industry, we will place billions of dollars of additional property on State and local tax rolls and at the same time we will increase the revenue of the Federal Government by their sale of these properties.

All funds realized from the sale of these properties should be dedicated to a reduction of the national debt. The increased local revenues will make it easier for the States and local governments to build schools and perform other necessary community services themselves, instead of seeking Federal assistance in Washington.

As an illustration of how we can apply new approaches to complex economic problems, let me mention briefly Public Law 480 of the 83d Congress, providing for the sale of our agricultural surpluses for foreign currency.

This law also permits bartering surplus agricultural commodities for strategic materials which are placed in our military stockpile where they add to our national security.

The foreign exchange derived from these transactions is used to pay necessary expenses of our Government in foreign countries. Some of the funds have been lent back to the countries purchasing these commodities for economic development.

This program has two features of interest to all taxpayers.

First, it disposes of surplus agricultural products. Appropriations for agricultural programs, a large domestic item in the budget, can be reduced drastically when we are no longer burdened by surpluses which overhang the market and depress agricultural prices.

The second feature of this program of interest to you is that it does not require current funds from the taxpayers. The money for the acquisition of these commodities has already been spent.

In disposing of them we reduce storage charges, we secure needed foreign currency for Government purposes, we acquire strategic materials, and we contribute to our foreign-aid program, which would again otherwise probably involve the expenditure of additional tax dollars.

This Congress will undoubtedly extend this program for an additional year. Programs of this type can be utilized to maximize the benefits to all our people from every tax dollar spent.

As a former governor, as well as a legislator, I am concerned with the problems of education.

We must improve our educational programs, if we are to keep pace with the Russians who have placed great emphasis upon the training of scientists and engineers. You cannot train scientists in our great schools of technology without first providing the applicants for the freshman class with an adequate foundation in mathematics and in the basic sciences.

I find that in many cases our secondary schools have broadened their curricula so as to include so many subjects that it becomes a difficult task to find adequate revenue to pay all the specialized teachers this program requires.

Furthermore, those who are qualified to teach science and mathematics will not accept the salaries normally paid schoolteachers, as they have opportunities to work at their specialties in private industry.

Our communities must reappraise their educational programs. We must make sure that we are doing the best possible job in teaching the fundamentals. We must eliminate some of the frills that our school budgets cannot afford so that we can pay better salaries to those teachers who have a real background in the subjects they are teaching, as well as the teaching qualifications.

This task cannot be undertaken by the Federal Government. It is one of the jobs which I hope that you will do in your local communities.

The future of our country is in the hands of those who are now in school.

It has been a great pleasure for me this evening to review some of the issues which concern us in Washington. The preservation and development of a private enterprise economy both at home and abroad is the most important task before the Senate today. You, as citizens, are stockholders in the greatest business on earth.

In my limited time I could touch on only a few of our problems. I can assure you that your board of directors, the Congress of the United States, regardless of party, and your Chief Executive, are working together to advance the interests of this great Republic.

Big Spending or Economy—You Must Decide

(Address by United States Senator Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at the annual dinner of the Amen Corner, in the Penn-Sheraton Hotel, Pittsburgh, April 6, 1957)

Of all the great powers in the world the United States is the only one where the people still control the Government.

This significant fact of modern history is the foundation upon which was built the structure of American freedom.

It is given impressive expression in the preamble to the Constitution which declares that "We, the People * * * do ordain and establish this Constitution of the United States."

That concept of government gave force and effect to the principle set forth in the Declaration of Independence that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

If that ideal is to survive—if we are to continue to control our Government—our people must recognize that we have responsibilities as well as rights.

History teaches that it is a heavy responsibility to live as free men. Great nations have gone down to destruction because their people allowed control of their government to slip from their hands. The great powers of the past failed when the people started to depend upon government and not upon themselves. The result has always been extravagant spending, a crushing burden of taxes and debt and eventually the loss of freedom. They passed out of history as completely as if they had been destroyed by invading armies.

The record of the past shows very clearly that freedom cannot long be retained by a people who ignore or evade their responsibilities. That means that we must all accept a personal share of responsibility for keeping our Nation strong, secure, sound, and solvent. We must all take part in government. We must become interested and active in politics—not merely from a partisan standpoint—but as a patriotic contribution to the public welfare.

You men assembled here tonight are leaders in business, industry, and in the professions. You are vitally interested in building the economic strength of this important area and of the Nation. Therefore, the situation in our country, as it relates to Government spending, taxes, and debts should be a matter of great concern to you—and I am sure it is.

I am sure that you are all seriously disturbed over the alarming increase in the cost of government at all levels, local, State, and Federal, during the last quarter of a century.

Let us look at the figures.

In 1932 the people of the United States paid $6,375,000,000 for local government. That cost is now $26,230,000,000.

For State government in 1932 we spent a total of $2,028,000,000. Now the States are spending at the rate of more than $11 billion a year.

The cost of operating the Federal Government in 1932 was $5,125,000,000. The current budget calls for the expenditure of nearly $72 billion.

Now, if we add up these figures we find that the overall cost of government has jumped in 25 years from $13½ billion to $109½ billion, an increase of more than 700 percent.

Now let us look at the debt, which is a mortgage on the future of every man, woman, and child in the United States.

The bonded indebtedness of local government, which was $16,680,000,000 in 1932, is now above $33 billion.

The debt of State government has grown from less than $3 billion to $11 billion in the same period.

The Federal Government debt shows the most startling increase—from $19½ billion in 1932 to the present debt of more than $274 billion.

The total Government debt has gone up from $30 billion to more than $318½ billion, an increase of more than 700 percent.

In addition, many States and local subdivisions have created authorities to finance various types of construction and other public works by the sale of bonds. For example, in Pennsylvania the debts incurred by State and municipal authorities have reached a total of nearly $2 billion.

One illustration of the increase in the cost of government is that the Federal Government proposes to spend $14 billion a year for welfare programs as compared with a little more than $3 billion 10 years ago.

Unfortunately we are continually taking on new projects and new spending programs which grow bigger and more expensive year after year. Local government, with hat in hand, goes to the State for handouts. The State government, with hat in hand, goes to the Federal Government for handouts—the so-called grants-in-aid. Even our big cities are bypassing the States and go directly to Washington for financial assistance. And to raise the money the Federal Government has two courses to pursue—higher taxes or bigger debt.

The time has come when each level of government must stand on its own feet. Otherwise it will not be long before all government will be controlled at the national level. Each grant of Federal funds carries with it a measure of Federal control. That control never lessens. It always increases.

The time has come when we must look ahead with extreme care before we take on new projects.

Two of the greatest men in our history had something to say on this subject.

Washington said this to Lafayette: "It is a part of the military art to reconnoiter and feel your way before you engage too deeply." This was stated when Lafayette was urging some reforms for France.

Abraham Lincoln said in a letter to a friend: "I hope to stand firm enough to not go backward, and yet not go forward fast enough to wreck the country's cause."

The automobile gives another illustration of watching both the past and the future. It has a mirror which gives a view of the road in the rear, while the driver has a perfect view of the road ahead.

The careful driver sees both the rear and the front.

Let us not move too rapidly in government until we survey the road of the past and carefully reconnoiter the road to the future. Let us not lose sight of the dangers that lie ahead.

One of the greatest dangers to national stability is inflation. Inflation is suggested by many economists as a cure for certain economic ills, but it is only a shot in the arm.

Inflation, high taxes, deficit governmental finance, big government debt and big centralized government have destroyed more nations than invading armies. It will destroy more countries than the most terrible bomb that could be invented.

Before it is too late, let the American people take over, because it is still our Government. The people still have the power to control.

Let us bear this in mind. No nation, regardless of how rich it may be in natural resources, can live and pay taxes which destory initiative and the private-enterprise plan of economy. Many are now advocating things which tend toward socialism: public power, restricting the right to work at the job of our choice, centralization of government.

The free-enterprise economy plan has done more to advance our living standards and our cultural and spiritual attainments than all our vast natural resources.

There are many systems of government that advocate some form of socialism. Let us look at some of the results.

After 40 years, the Soviet type of communism has produced a living standard only one-tenth as high as that of the United States.

The so-called Swedish welfare state has produced a living standard only one-third as high as the United States.

In England, where nationalization of basic industries has continued for 12 years, the living standard is about one-half what it is in the United States.

Many of the Founding Fathers who were interested in the independence and freedom of the individual feared that our Government, unless most carefully and economically administered, would fall, of its own weight, within 200 years. Time is moving rapidly. It's our Government. Let us look it over. If we are spending too much for government let us have the courage to make corrections.

One of the principal reasons for the alarming rise in the cost of government is the constant demand from organized pressure groups who have no regard for the welfare of our Nation or its future.

They demand appropriations of public funds for their pet projects, for new and expanded functions of government, for sectional advantage and for every conceivable form of spending. Some do not hesitate to threaten political reprisals unless their proposals are given immediate and favorable attention.

That same sort of pressure must now be exerted in support of economy. If we are to achieve government at lower cost we must develop a demand for economy so strong and so insistent that no one in the executive or legislative branches of government will dare to ignore or oppose it.

It must be supported by business associations, chambers of commerce, service clubs, labor organizations, farm groups and welfare and educational societies. It must have the driving force of an aroused public opinion, so strong and so powerful that it will be irresistible.

As I said in the beginning of my remarks—in the United States the people still control the government. Therefore the battle to cut the cost of government must begin with you.

Big spending or economy—you must decide. And I have complete confidence that you will make the right decision.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 17, 1957

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

O Thou ruler of all nature, in the blue beauty of the soft spring skies and the blossoming wonder of the awakening earth we come, this week of the passion, reverently following the wounded footprints of that servant of all as He goes on to die. We give Thee grateful thanks that in His death is life for all mankind. In that face may we see anew the might of love, the royalty of self-giving, the majesty of meekness.

At this altar of prayer, steady our spirits with the realization that back of all the dark tragedy of these bewildering days there is a permanent good, the blue sky above the clouds, to which we must be loyal if our lives are to be saved from frustration at last.

God the all-righteous One, man hath
defied Thee:
Yet to eternity standeth Thy word;
Falsehood and wrong shall not tarry be-
side Thee;
Give to us peace in our time, O Lord.

In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 16, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 16, 1957,

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that on April 16, 1957, the President pro tempore had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 6870) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 93. An act for the relief of Dominic Paul Steinhauser (Hiroshi Tsuruda);

S. 687. An act for the relief of Stylianos Lecomples;

S. 696. An act for the relief of Alecos Markos Karavasilis and his wife, Steliani Karavasilis; and

S. 797. An act for the relief of John Leary.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5520) to amend the Second Liberty Bond Act to increase the maximum interest rate permitted on United States savings bonds.

The message further announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 310) making additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1957, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 812. An act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to price support for extra long staple cotton;

H. R. 71. An act to prohibit the payment of pensions to persons confined in penal institutions for periods longer than 60 days;

H. R. 3035. An act to provide a temporary extension of certain special provisions relating to State plans for aid to the blind;

H. R. 4686. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1958, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5520. An act to amend the Second Liberty Bond Act to increase the maximum interest rate permitted on United States savings bonds; and

H. J. Res. 126. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State Sixth International Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 310) making additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1957, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, for the purpose of considering the new reports on the Executive Calendar.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be nc reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated, beginning with the "New Reports."

UNITED NATIONS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Donald Vaughn Lowe, of New Jersey, to be a representative of the United States of America on the Transport and Communications Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Gerald A. Drew, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Haiti.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ROUTINE APPOINTMENTS IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry routine appointments in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask uanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, they will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, these nominations are confirmed.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

FREDERICK J. LAWTON

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Frederick J. Lawton, of the District of Columbia, to be a Civil Service Commissioner for a term of 6 years, from March 1, 1957.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

CHRISTOPHER H. PHILLIPS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Christopher H. Phillips, of Massachusetts, to be a Civil Service Commissioner