

tomorrow, there will be a limited morning hour. Senators may be recognized for the purpose of introducing bills, and they will be limited to statements of 3 minutes, at the conclusion of which the so-called civil rights bill will be laid before the Senate. I want all Senators to be on notice. I expect that will take place sometime around 12:30 o'clock. We shall suggest the absence of a quorum, and obtain a quorum, before the Chair lays the House bill before the Senate.

Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 19, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 18, 1957:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Roy Richard Rubottom, Jr., of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Albert James Robertson, of Iowa, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, term of 4 years expiring June 30, 1961.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Darrell O. Holmes, of Washington, to be a United States marshal for the eastern district of Washington for a term of 4 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 18, 1957

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Francis B. Schulte, chairman, social studies department, Reading Central Catholic High School, Reading, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Save this moment, O Lord, from being merely a gesture to custom or convention, and make it a real experience for each one of us in this place as we call upon Thee for guidance and for help.

O God of grace and God of glory, make us heed Thy presence in the business of this day.

May that presence give us the peace of a good conscience for our actions in conformity with Thy will. But grant us also the true blessing of a reproachful conscience if we should ever allow expediency to distort our vision.

May that same presence of Thine remind us of that forgotten and misunderstood virtue, humility. Let us always be humble enough to remember that as we rule, we really serve, and as we judge, we shall face judgment.

May our hearts burn within us with the fire you came on earth to kindle, burn for truth, burn for justice, burn for charity.

All this we ask of Thee, O God, through Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord, who lives and reigns with Thee in the unity of the Holy Spirit, God, world without end. Amen.

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

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

JUNE 18, 1957.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Desiring to be temporarily absent from my office, I hereby designate Mr. H. Newlin Megill, an official in my office, to sign any and all papers and do all other acts for me which he would be authorized to do by virtue of this designation and of clause 4, rule III of the House.

Respectfully yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
*Clerk, United States
House of Representatives.*

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1957

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the third reading of the bill (H. R. 6127) to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 111]

Balley	Hillings	Scherer
Baker	Holtzman	Simpson, III.
Beamer	Kean	Springer
Bentley	McConnell	Taber
Bowler	McGovern	Walter
Gray	McIntosh	Williams, N. Y.
Griffin	Machrowicz	Wilson, Calif.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 413 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1957

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state again that the unfinished business is the third reading of the bill H. R. 6127, the so-called civil-rights bill, which the Clerk will read by title.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, on a motion to recommit, for over 20 years it has been the custom for the minority leader to select the Member who shall make that motion. The leader has selected a member of the committee who is absolutely opposed to the bill. My parliamentary inquiry is, does he have preference over someone who would move to recommit with instructions but

who at the same time would not vote for the bill even if the motion to recommit should prevail? So I propound the inquiry whether a gentleman who is absolutely opposed to the bill, who led the fight for the jury trial amendment in the committee, would have preference over someone who would not vote for the bill even in the event a motion to recommit prevailed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair in answer to that will ask the Clerk to read the holding of Mr. Speaker Champ Clark, which is found in volume 8 of Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, section 2767.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Chair laid down this rule, from which he never intends to depart unless overruled by the House, that on a motion to recommit he will give preference to the gentleman at the head of the minority list, provided he qualifies, and then go down the list of the minority of the committee until it is gotten through with. And then if no one of them offer a motion to recommit the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Murdock], as the leader of the third party in the House. Of course he would have to qualify. The Chair will state it again. The present occupant of the chair laid down a rule here about a year ago that in making this preferential motion for recommitment the Speaker would recognize the top man on the minority of the committee if he qualified—that is, if he says he is opposed to the bill—and so on down to the end of the minority list of the committee.

Mr. MARTIN. Will the Clerk continue the reading of the section? I think there is a little more to it than that.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman desires, the Clerk will read the entire quotation. The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Then, if no gentleman on the committee wants to make the motion, the Speaker will recognize the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Mann, because he is the leader of the minority. Then, in the next place, the Speaker would recognize the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. Murdock. But in this case, the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. Murdock, is on the Ways and Means Committee, which would bring him in ahead, under that rule, of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Mann.

Mr. MARTIN. The Chair does not think that preference should be given to an individual who was going to make a motion to recommit and who was absolutely opposed to the bill?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not qualified to answer a question like that. The Chair in response to the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from Massachusetts will say that the decision made by Mr. Speaker Champ Clark has never been overturned, and it has been upheld by 1 or 2 Speakers since that time, especially by Mr. Speaker Garner in 1932.

In looking over this list, the Chair has gone down the list and will make the decision when someone arises to make a motion to recommit. The Chair does not know entirely who is going to seek recognition.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. POFF. I am, Mr. Speaker,

Mr. KEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I also offer a motion to recommit, and I, too, am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. In this instance the Chair finds that no one has arisen who is a member of the minority of the Committee on the Judiciary until it comes down to the name of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF]. He ranks the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KEENEY] and is therefore senior. Under the rules and precedents of the House, the Chair therefore must recognize the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF].

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. POFF moves to recommit the bill H. R. 6127 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the bill back forthwith the following amendment: Page 10, line 5, after the word "order" strike out the period, insert a semicolon and add the following: "Provided, That in all cases of contempt arising under the laws of the United States governing the issuance of injunctions or restraining orders in any action or proceeding instituted under this act, and the act or thing done or omitted also constitutes a criminal offense under any Act of Congress, or under the laws of any State in which it was done or omitted, 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.

"This proviso shall not apply to contempts committed in the presence of the court or so near thereto as to interfere directly with the administration of justice nor to the misbehavior, misconduct or disobedience of any officer of the court in respect to the writs, orders, or process of the court."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the wording of the motion to recommit is not germane to the bill. We have already debated the germaneness of the wording of this motion in Committee of the Whole. But, I have this additional observation to make, which was not made, as I recall, during the debate, namely, that this proposed amendment is to the act, where as it is inserted as an amendment to a section of the act. It is sought to insert this in part III of the bill only at page 10, line 5, but it purports to be an amendment to the entire act. We had a similar situation presented in the Committee in the consideration of this matter and the Chair ruled in Committee that because the wording was an amendment to the section, but was worded as an amendment to the act, that it was not germane. I urge that if the amendment were to the act, as it purports to be, it would have to be at some other point in the bill and could not be an amendment to the act in the middle of one of the sections of the act.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule.

This same question was raised in the Committee of the Whole on the same amendment. The very capable gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND], Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, overruled the point of order after having heard all the debate. The present occupant of the Chair, having read all of the debate and having heard most of it, reaffirms the decision of the Chair-

man of the Committee of the Whole in the consideration of the bill and, therefore, overrules the point of order.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 158, nays 251, answered "present" 6, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 112]

YEAS—158

Abbutt	Gary	O'Hara, Minn.
Abernethy	Gathings	Passman
Adair	Grant	Patman
Albert	Gregory	Perkins
Alexander	Gross	Pilcher
Alger	Gwinn	Pillion
Andersen,	Haley	Poage
H. Carl	Hardy	Poff
Andresen,	Harris	Polk
August H.	Harrison, Nebr.	Preston
Andrews	Harrison, Va.	Rains
Ashmore	Hays, Ark.	Ray
Barden	Hébert	Rees, Kans.
Bass, Tenn.	Hemphill	Rhodes, Ariz.
Beckworth	Herlong	Riley
Bennett, Fla.	Hiestand	Rivers
Bennett, Mich.	Hoffman	Roberts
Blitch	Huddleston	Robeson, Va.
Boggs	Hull	Robson, Ky.
Bonner	Hyde	Rogers, Fla.
Bow	Ikard	Rogers, Mass.
Boykin	Jarman	Rogers, Tex.
Bray	Jennings	Rutherford
Brooks, La.	Jensen	Scott, N. C.
Brooks, Tex.	Johansen	Seiden
Brown, Ga.	Jonas	Shuford
Broyhill	Jones, Ala.	Sikes
Budge	Jones, Mo.	Siler
Burleson	Keeney	Smith, Kans.
Byrd	Kilburn	Smith, Miss.
Chelf	Kilday	Smith, Va.
Chenoweth	Kilgore	Smith, Wis.
Clevenger	Kitchin	Spence
Cole	Knox	Taber
Colmer	Landrums	Teague, Tex.
Cooley	Lanham	Thomas
Cooper	Lennon	Thompson, La.
Cramer	Long	Thompson, Tex.
Davis, Ga.	Loser	Thornberry
Davis, Tenn.	McMillan	Trimble
Devereux	Mahon	Tuck
Dies	Marshall	Van Pelt
Dorn, S. C.	Mason	Vinson
Dowdy	Matthews	Watts
Durham	Miller, Nebr.	Weaver
Edmondson	Miller, N. Y.	Whitener
Elliott	Mills	Whitten
Evins	Morris	Williams, Miss.
Fascell	Morrison	Willis
Fisher	Moulder	Winstead
Flynt	Natcher	Wright
Forrester	Neal	Young
Fountain	Nicholson	
Frazier	Norrell	

NAYS—251

Addonizio	Breeding	Coudert
Allen, Calif.	Broomfield	Cretella
Allen, Ill.	Brown, Mo.	Cunningham,
Anderson,	Brown, Ohio	Iowa
Mont.	Brownson	Cunningham,
Anfuso	Buckley	Nebr.
Arends	Burdick	Curtin
Ashley	Bush	Curtis, Mass.
Aspinall	Byrne, Ill.	Curtis, Mo.
Auchincloss	Byrne, Pa.	Dague
Avery	Byrnes, Wis.	Dawson, Ill.
Ayres	Canfield	Dawson, Utah
Baldwin	Cannon	Delaney
Baring	Carnahan	Dellay
Barrett	Carrigg	Dempsey
Bass, N. H.	Cederberg	Dennison
Bates	Celler	Denton
Baumhart	Chamberlain	Derounian
Becker	Chiperfield	Diggs
Belcher	Christopher	Dingell
Betts	Chudoff	Dixon
Blatnik	Church	Dollinger
Boland	Clark	Donohue
Bolling	Coad	Dooley
Bolton	Coffin	Dorn, N. Y.
Bosch	Collier	Doyle
Boyle	Corbett	Dwyer

Eberharter	Krueger	Reuss
Engle	Laird	Rhodes, Pa.
Fallon	Lane	Riehlman
Farbstein	Lankford	Rodino
Feighan	Latham	Rogers, Colo.
Fenton	LeCompte	Rooney
Fino	Lesinski	Roosevelt
Flood	Lipscomb	Sadlak
Fogarty	McCarthy	Santangelo
Forand	McCormack	St. George
Ford	McCulloch	Saund
Frelinghuysen	McDonough	Saylor
Friedel	McFall	Schenck
Fulton	McGregor	Schwengel
Garmatz	McIntire	Scott, Pa.
Gavin	McVey	Scrivner
George	Macdonald	Scudder
Gordon	Mack, Ill.	Seely-Brown
Granahan	Mack, Wash.	Sheehan
Gray	Madden	Shelley
Green, Oreg.	Magnuson	Sheppard
Green, Pa.	Mailliard	Sieminski
Griffiths	Martin	Simpson, Pa.
Gubser	May	Sisk
Hagen	Meader	Smith, Calif.
Hale	Merrow	Springer
Halleck	Metcalf	Staggers
Harden	Michel	Stauffer
Harvey	Miller, Calif.	Sullivan
Haskell	Minshall	Talle
Hays, Ohio	Montoya	Taylor
Healey	Moore	Teague, Calif.
Henderson	Morano	Teller
Heselton	Morgan	Tewes
Hill	Moss	Thompson, N. J.
Hoeven	Multer	Thomson, Wyo.
Holifield	Mumma	Tollefson
Holland	Nimtz	Udall
Holmes	Norblad	Ullman
Holt	O'Brien, Ill.	Vanik
Horan	O'Brien, N. Y.	Van Zandt
Hosmer	O'Hara, Ill.	Vorys
James	O'Konski	Vursell
Jenkins	O'Neill	Wainwright
Johnson	Osmers	Westland
Judd	Ostertag	Wharton
Karsten	Patterson	Widnall
Kearney	Pelly	Wier
Kearns	Pfost	Wigglesworth
Keating	Philbin	Wilson, Calif.
Kee	Porter	Wilson, Ind.
Kelley, Pa.	Powell	Withrow
Kelly, N. Y.	Price	Wolverton
Keogh	Prouty	Yates
King	Rabaut	Younger
Kirwan	Radwan	Zablocki
Kluczynski	Reece, Tenn.	Zelenko
Knutson	Reed	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—6

Berry	Jackson	Steed
Hess	Miller, Md.	Utt

NOT VOTING—18

Bailey	Hillings	Machrowicz
Baker	Holtzman	Murray
Beamer	Kean	Scherer
Bentley	McCConnell	Simpson, Ill.
Bowler	McGovern	Walter
Griffin	McIntosh	Williams, N. Y.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Baker for, with Mr. Kean against.
 Mr. Utt for, with Mr. Hillings against.
 Mr. Steed for, with Mr. Machrowicz against.
 Mr. Murray for, with Mr. Holtzman against.
 Mr. Jackson for, with Mr. Williams of New York against.
 Mr. Berry for, with Mr. Beamer against.
 Mr. Hess for, with Mr. Simpson of Illinois against.
 Mr. Miller of Maryland for, with Mr. McConnell against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bailey with Mr. Bentley.
 Mr. Walter with Mr. Griffin.
 Mr. McGovern with Mr. Scherer.
 Mr. Bowler with Mr. McIntosh.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. MACHROWICZ. If he were present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

WAIVING PROVISION OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT IN BEHALF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the resolution (H. J. Res. 274) to waive the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 11, after "Giordano", insert "and."

Page 1, line 11, and page 2, line 1, strike out "and Mrs. Anna Hoczak Aumueller Cathey."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JEFFREY CHARLES MEDWORTH

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1454) for the relief of Jeffrey Charles Medworth, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jeffrey Charles Medworth, a British subject who was born in India, shall be deemed to have been born in Great Britain."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. THEODORE ROUSSEAU

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1359) for the relief of Mrs. Theodore (Nicole Xantho) Rousseau, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Theodore (Nicole Xantho) Rousseau shall be deemed to be within the purview of section 354 (3) of the said act."

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHELF. I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Delete the period at the end of the Senate amendment, substitute a comma therefor,

and add the following: "and to have had no nationality other than Rumanian prior to her nationalization as a United States citizen."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate amendment, as amended, was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**SENATE SALAD LUNCHEON,
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 19**

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, in 1912 my father planted one of the first avocado orchards in California. Today the avocado is one of California's most noble products.

So, it is a matter of special pride to me to be able to contribute to the Senate salad, which will be introduced at tomorrow's luncheon between 1 and 3 p. m. in the Senate District of Columbia Committee Room.

We Californians all appreciate a good salad and we think that the Members of this great body from other States will have a growing appreciation of salad if you find a few minutes tomorrow to come over and sample the Senate salad.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

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

PETER V. BOSCH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 189) for the relief of Peter V. Bosch.

Mr. VAN PELT. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

JULIAN D. DYCAICO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 407) for the relief of Julian D. Dycalco.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any statute of limitations or lapse of time, the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed (1) to consider and determine any claim filed under section 2734 of title 10 of the United States Code within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, by Julian D. Dycalco, of the Province of Pampanga, Republic of the Philippines, for compensation for the use of certain land belonging to him in the Republic of the Philippines by the Armed Forces of the United States during World War II and for damage to such land alleged to have been caused by the Armed Forces of the United States, and (2) to pay to the said Julian D. Dycalco, or to certify to Congress in accordance with the provisions of such section, the amount of compensation payable under such section to which he would have been entitled had such

claim been filed within the time and in the manner provided by such section.

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.

COL. BENJAMIN AXELROAD

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1008) for the relief of Col. Benjamin Axelroad.

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 Col. Benjamin Axelroad, Tullahoma, Tenn., the sum of \$2,799.50, as compensation for legal services performed and expenses incurred in assisting Chester H. Tuck, Mary Elizabeth Fisher, James Thomas Harper, and Mrs. T. W. Bennett, all of Tullahoma, Tenn., in the successful prosecution of their claims against the United States. Although the efforts of the said Col. Benjamin Axelroad contributed materially to the obtaining of evidence which led to the enactment of a private law for the relief of the above-mentioned claimants (Private Law 498, 83d Cong.), such private law prevented any payment to the said Col. Benjamin Axelroad out of sums appropriated in such private law: *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 the claim of the said Col. Benjamin Axelroad for such compensation, 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 read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANTOINE VELLEMAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1206) for the relief of Antoine Velleman.

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 Antoine Velleman, of Geneva, Switzerland, the sum of \$526.06. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of the said Antoine Velleman against the United States for compensation for services rendered by him as an instructor for the United States Army internees at Adelboden, Switzerland, from August 1, 1944, to September 15, 1944: *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 read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GILLOUS M. YOUNG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1492) for the relief of Gillous M. Young.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That Second Lieutenant Gillous M. Young, United States Air Force, retired, of San Antonio, Texas, is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of \$3,751.47. Such sum represents the unrefunded portion of the retired pay (originally totaling \$5,127.12) received by the said Gillous M. Young for the period beginning January 8, 1951, and ending February 28, 1953, while he was employed as an aircraft radio flight repairer at Kelly Air Force Base in Texas and was receiving compensation and retired pay from the United States at a combined annual rate in excess of that permitted by law. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this act.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Gillous M. Young, the sum of \$1,375.65. Such sum represents the portion of the retired pay received by the said Gillous M. Young for the period beginning January 8, 1951, and ending February 28, 1953, which he has already refunded to the United States by means of deductions from amounts otherwise due him: *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.

ANTONIO RANALLETTA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1634) for the relief of Antonio Ranalletta.

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 \$500 to Antonio Ranalletta, of 6 Alps Street, Rochester, N. Y., in full settlement of all claims against the United States as reimbursement for bond posted in his behalf: *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.

GEORGE W. ARNOLD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1861) for the relief of George W. Arnold.

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 relieve George W. Arnold, an employee of the Treasury Department, of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of \$1,707.50. Such sum represents the excess cost of shipping from Boston, Mass., to Paris, France, his personal and household effects over that authorized by Executive Order No. 9805.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "\$1,707.50" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,101.09."

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.

FRANKLIN INSTITUTE OF THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2058) for the relief of the Franklin Institute of the State of Pennsylvania.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Franklin Institute of the State of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., the sum of \$1,476.95. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Franklin Institute against the United States for reimbursement of amounts advanced by the said Franklin Institute to the Secretary of the Treasury in order to expedite the striking of 71 bronze medals commemorating the 250th anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin, which medals were authorized to be struck by the act entitled "An act to authorize the issuance of commemorative medals to certain societies of which Benjamin Franklin was a member, founder, or sponsor in observance of the 250th anniversary of his birth," approved August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 541): *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 2, line 8, strike out "in excess of 10 percent 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.

PHYLLIS L. WARE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2302) for the relief of Phyllis L. Ware.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

LUCY ROLANDONE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2592) for the relief of Lucy Rolandone.

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 \$2,500 to Lucy Rolandone, of Oakland, Calif., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, hospital and medical expense sustained as the result of an accident involving a Federal Communications Commission vehicle at the intersection of Williams and Clarke Streets, San Leandro, Calif., on June 14, 1942.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 11, strike out the period and add the following: "*Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MRS. HARRIET SAKAYO HAMAMOTO DEWA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2740) for the relief of Mrs. Harriet Sakayo Hamamoto Dewa.

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. Harriet Sakayo Hamamoto Dewa, Madison, Wis., the sum of \$5,381.04. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Dewa against the United States arising out of the confiscation and total loss of her sampan, the Itsukushima Maru, together with all the supplies and equipment thereon, which occurred while such sampan was in the custody of the Armed Forces of the United States between December 10, 1941 (when it was seized by the United States Navy off the coast of Oahu, Hawaii) and July 31, 1942: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the figures and insert in lieu thereof "5,280.62."

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.

HARRY AND SADIE WOONTEILER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2928) for the relief of Harry and Sadie Woonweiler.

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 Harry Woonweiler, of New York, N. Y., the sum of \$2,500, and to Sadie Woonweiler, of New York, N. Y., the sum of \$15,000. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Harry and Sadie Woonweiler against the United States arising out of an automobile accident which occurred on July 20, 1952, in Barranquilla, Colombia, in which the personal injuries sustained by the said Harry and Sadie Woonweiler were found to have been caused by the negligence of the operator of a truck owned by the United States Embassy in Colombia. No part of either of the sums 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 the claim settled by the payment of such sum, 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 amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the figures "\$2,500," and insert "\$500."

Page 1, line 7, strike out the figures "\$15,000," and insert "\$3,500."

Page 2, line 3, strike out "United States Embassy in Colombia," and insert "Inter-American Geodetic Survey."

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.

CLARENCE L. HARRIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2937) for the relief of Clarence L. Harris.

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 \$204.73 to Clarence L. Harris, of Little Rock, Ark., in full settlement of all claims against the United States. Such sum represents a refund of alleged excess cost in connection with the return of his household goods from Tripoli, Libya, North Africa, to Little Rock, Ark., pursuant to official travel orders directing permanent change of station during the month of September 1954: *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.

ALTON B. YORK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2935) for the relief of Alton B. York.

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 Alton B. York, Cottage Grove, Oregon, the sum of \$711.76. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Alton B. York against the United States arising out of personal injuries and property damage sustained by him on November 1, 1951, when the truck which he was driving was struck near Tacoma, Washington, by an Army cargo truck which had been negligently driven through a spotlight. Such claim is not cognizable under the Federal Tort Claims Acts because of the fact that the driver of the Army truck (an enlisted man of the Army) was using such truck for unauthorized purposes and was not acting within the scope of his employment at the time of the accident: *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 2, line 7, following the word "act" strike out the balance of the line.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MRS. GRACE C. HILL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3280) for the relief of Mrs. Grace C. Hill.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That Mrs. Grace C. Hill, of Joppa, Md., is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of \$371.81. Such sum represents the amount of certain alleged salary overpayment made to her in connection with a promotion on November 29, 1953, in violation of the so-called Whitten amendment. Such overpayment was made to her while employed by the Army Chemical Center, Maryland, entirely beyond her knowledge and control.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Mrs. Grace C. Hill, an amount equal to the aggregate of any amounts which have been made, or withheld

from or credited against sums otherwise due her, in complete or partial satisfaction of the claim of the United States for such refund.

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

HARRY GOLD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3309) for the relief of Harry Gold.

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 Harry Gold, Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of \$368.74. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Harry Gold against the United States for reimbursement of expenses incurred by him in traveling to Hawaii in February 1956, to bid on surplus goods as the invitation of the Secretary of the Army. Such invitation to bid was canceled by the Secretary of the Army but the said Harry Gold was not informed of such cancellation until after his arrival in Hawaii: *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 amendments:

Page 1, line 10, strike out "as" and insert in lieu thereof "at."

Page 2, line 3, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

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.

WILLIAM E. HEILMANN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3899) for the relief of William E. Heilmann.

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 William E. Heilmann, Hartly-Templeville Road, Post Office Box 87, Hartly, Del., the amount as certified by the Secretary of the Navy, which would have been paid to the said William E. Heilmann, as night differential pay for the period from February 15, 1942, to June 15, 1943, had application for such pay been filed on or before July 31, 1948, as provided by the act of July 31, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 9490): *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 amendments:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "(5 U. S. C. 9490)" and insert in lieu thereof "(60 Stat. 747; 5 U. S. C., sec. 951)."

Page 2, line 3, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

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.

RAMON TAVAREZ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4335) for the relief of Ramon Tavaréz.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

LESLIE A. BATDORF

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4541) for the relief of Leslie A. Batdorf.

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 \$500 to Leslie A. Batdorf, 625 North Second Street, Shamokin, Pa., in full settlement of all claims against the United States as reimbursement for bond posted for Gretel Parks (nee Weckler) on September 17, 1948: *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.

ORVILLE G. EVERETT AND MRS. AGNES H. EVERETT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5288) for the relief of Orville G. Everett and Mrs. Agnes H. Everett.

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

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

There was no objection.

MRS. EMMA HANKEL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5627) for the relief of Mrs. Emma Hankel.

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. Emma Hankel, Tacoma, Wash., the sum of \$150. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Emma Hankel against the United States for reimbursement of expenses incurred by her in connection with the burial of her husband, the late Henry W. Hankel (Veterans' Administration claim No. XC-1510422): *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.

FOUAD GEORGE BAROODY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6176) for the relief of Fouad George Baroody.

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 Fouad George Baroody, of 105 Main Street, Timmons-ville, S. C., the sum of \$500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of said Fouad George Baroody against the Government of the United States, in connection with the \$500 departure bond posted by the said Fouad George Baroody, on behalf of himself on approximately May 22, 1950: *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 2, lines 1 and 2, strike out "in excess of 10 per centum 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.

MRS. JANE BARNES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6621) for the relief of Mrs. Jane Barnes.

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 Mrs. Jane Barnes, of 385 Hawthorne Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., the sum of \$150, in full settlement of all claims against the United States. Such sum represents the statutory award of burial expenses of her son, Theodore R. Barnes, a veteran of World War II, which she did not receive within the 2-year period of the statute of limitations: *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.

MADAME HENRIETTE BUAILLON AND STANLEY JAMES CARPENTER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7014) for the relief of Madame Henriette Buailon and Stanley James Carpenter.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay, out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Madame Henriette Buailon, of 26 Rue Lucien Vallee, Petit Quevilly, Seine Maritime, France, the sum of \$2,241, in settlement of all claims for damages arising out of the death of her son, Andre Achille Buailon, as a result of an accidental shooting on May 4, 1945, in Zeitz, Germany; and to Stanley James Carpenter, of Solsbanksgatan 41, Goteborg, Sweden, the sum of \$256, in settlement of all claims for damages arising out of an incident in Unterammergau, Germany, on August 5, 1950, involving him and enlisted personnel of the United States Army.

Sec. 2. Notwithstanding any contract no part of the amounts 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 person who violates any provision of this section is guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than \$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.

LOUIS S. THOMAS AND D. GRACE THOMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7213) for the relief of Louis S. Thomas and D. Grace Thomas.

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 Louis S. Thomas and D. Grace Thomas, both of Deep River, Conn., the sums of \$2,000 and \$8,000, respectively, in full settlement of all their claims against the United States arising out of large expenses and serious injuries sustained by them when the automobile in which they were riding was struck by a Navy station wagon at Middletown, Conn., on or about May 9, 1946. The losses and serious injuries complained of and sustained by the said Louis S. Thomas and D. Grace Thomas at said time and place were the direct results of the grossly negligent operation by the Navy personnel of the Navy vehicle, the driver of which was asleep at the wheel. At said time and place the said Louis S. Thomas and D. Grace Thomas were free from any negligence which in any way contributed toward said accident and the resulting injuries therefrom. In actions brought on these claims under the provisions

of title 28 of the United States Code relating to tort claims, the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut decided on June 6, 1950, that it is without jurisdiction because the driver of the Navy station wagon was not acting within the scope of his office or employment: *Provided*, That no part of either of the sums 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 the claim settled by the payment of such sum, 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 amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$2,000" and insert "\$1,000."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$8,000" and insert "\$6,500."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

EDWARD NEAL FISHER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7554) for the relief of Edward Neal Fisher.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of all laws of the United States, Edward Neal Fisher, Effingham, Ill., shall be held and considered to have served continuously on active duty with the United States Army during the period beginning May 20, 1898, and ending May 2, 1899, both dates inclusive, and to have received an honorable discharge from such service.

Sec. 2. No benefits shall be payable by reason of this act to any person for any period prior to the date on which an application for such benefits is filed subsequent to 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.

PHILIP J. DENTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1446) for the relief of Philip J. Denton.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act are hereby waived in favor of Philip J. Denton, Loveland, Colo., and his claim for compensation for disability sustained by him as a result of disease incurred during the period beginning June 1, 1940, and ending November 30, 1945, while he was employed by the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, at Estes Park, Colo., shall be acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act if he files such claim with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Department of Labor, within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act are hereby

waived in favor of Philip J. Denton, Loveland, Colo., and his claim for compensation for disability sustained by him as a result of disease alleged to have been incurred during the period beginning June 1, 1940, and ending November 30, 1945, while he was employed by the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, at Estes Park, Colo., shall be acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act if he files such claim with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Department of Labor, within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this act: *Provided*, That no benefits shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act for any period prior to its enactment, except in the case of medical or hospitalization expenditures which may be deemed reimbursable."

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.

MICHAEL D. OVENS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4992) for the relief of Michael D. Ovens.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 202 (d) and 216 (e) of the Social Security Act, the minor child, Michael D. Ovens, shall be held and considered to have been legally adopted by Verne E. Ovens and Elizabeth H. Ovens, of Milwaukee, Wis., on February 20, 1954; and the said Michael D. Ovens shall be entitled to child's insurance benefits under such section 202 (d) on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of the said Verne E. Ovens, beginning with the month of August 1954, if he is otherwise qualified for such benefits and a new application for such benefits is filed by him or on his behalf within 6 months after the date of the enactment of this act. For purposes of the preceding sentence and such section 202 (d), the formal adoption of the said Michael D. Ovens effected by the said Elizabeth H. Ovens after the death of the said Verne E. Ovens shall not operate to prevent payment of such benefits to the said Michael D. Ovens or terminate his entitlement to such benefits.

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.

EGLIN MANOR, INC.

The Clerk called House Resolution 260. There being no objection, the Clerk read the House resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 3320) entitled "A bill for the relief of Eglin Manor, Inc.," together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with provisions of said sections and report to the House of Representatives at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact, including an analysis of the amounts included as the basis for the sum stated in the bill, and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal and equitable, against the United States.

The House resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAROLD GEORGE JACKSON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1179) for the relief of Harold George Jackson.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (9) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Harold George Jackson may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That the provisions of this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of 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.

ABRAM VAN HEYNINGEN HARTENDORP

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1701) for the relief of Abram van Heyningen Hartendorp.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That Abram van Heyningen Hartendorp, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 404 (c) 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 Abram van Heyningen Hartendorp shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

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.

TOHA BIN HADJI DULAH, HANNA REZMOVIC, SISTER EMMANUEL (MISS MARGARETE FU)

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 338.

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

Resolved, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Toha Bin Hadji Dulah, Hanna Rezmovic, Sister Emmanuel (Miss Margarete Fu), Loutfie Kalil Noma, Jael Mercedes, Maria Baricelli, Jan Kryla, Francisco M. Jegers, Mary Carmelita Ottolina, Emily Ting, Mosche Davidovitz, Frieda Davidovitz, Alice Selim Nakhla Fakhouri (also known as Denise Fakhouri), Filippina Huber, Erma Murer, and Antonia Martignetti, 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 Loutfie Kalil Noma. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this section of this act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enforcement 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. 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 Charles Blasi, Juan Pedro Garay-Muro, Arcadio Navarro-Savala, and Vartuhi Parsejian de Carpenter (also known as Rosa Carpenter). From and after the date of the enactment of this act, the said persons 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 amendments:

On page 1, line 5, after the name "(Miss Margarete Fu)", strike out the name "Loutfie Kalli Noma".

On page 1, line 6, after the name "Mercedes," insert the name "Simeon Krammer". On page 1, line 6, after the name "Jan Kryla," insert the following: "Balbina Kryla, Stanislaw Kryla, Maria Kryla".

On page 1, line 6, after the name "Jegers," insert the name "Raffaele D'Auria".

On page 1, line 9, after the name "Denise Fakhouri," insert the following: "Su-Ying Wong Kao".

On page 1, line 9, after the name "Filipina Huber," insert the following: "Lino Aguilon Reyes".

On page 2, line 2, after the word "fees" change the colon to a period and strike out the remainder of line 2, all of line 3, all of line 4, and the following language on line 5: "of the said act in the case of Loutfie Kalli Noma".

On page 2, line 17, after the name "Navarro-Savala," strike out the word "and" and insert the following: "Margarete Holdy, Ohan Evrenian, Vehanousa Evrenian".

On page 2, line 18, after the name "Rosa Carpenter)" strike out the period and insert the following: "and Agavni Balantzyan."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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.

PADBLOC CO., INC., AND HARRY G. LANKFORD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5183) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of the Padbloc Co., Inc., and Harry G. Lankford, of Wichita, Kans.

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 to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Padbloc Co., Inc., of Wichita, Kans., against the United States Government relating to the taking and use by or for the United States Government of packaging means developed and owned by the Padbloc Co., Inc., or Harry G. Lankford of Wichita, Kans., notwithstanding that such claim may be based upon tortious misappropriation, breach of contract sounding in tort, or unjust enrichment.

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.

IN BEHALF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 339) 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 the resolution 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 OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 340) to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the 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, Antonia Salazar, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sfc. Willie R. Love, 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, Sumiko Nakamura, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Lois Henderson O'Beccunas, a citizen of the United States.

Sec. 3. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A), 203 (a) (2) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Lurline Jackson, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of David A. Jackson, a citizen of the United States, and Mrs. Mable D. Minott shall be held and considered to be the mother of the said David A. Jackson.

Sec. 4. For the purposes of section 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Romeo (Casabuena) Celestial, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Vicente Celestial, a citizen of the United States.

Sec. 5. For the purposes of section 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor children, Jeanne May Sasaki, Pamela Joyce Suzuki, Dorothea Grace Itoh, Frank Louis Morita, and John Michael Takezawa, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born children of Jean M. Fuller, citizen of the United States.

Sec. 6. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Annetta N. Thalassinios shall be deemed to have been born in Canada.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, after line 2, insert a new section 3 to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor children, Henry Aleong Gonzales, Perline Aleong Gonzales, and Annette Aleong Gonzales, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Mrs. Vera Aleong Lorick, a citizen of the United States."

On page 2, line 3, strike out "SEC. 3." and substitute "SEC. 4."

On page 2, line 10, strike out "SEC. 4." and substitute "SEC. 5."

On page 2, line 15, strike out "SEC. 5." and substitute "SEC. 6."

On page 2, after line 20, insert new sections 7 and 8 to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. For the purposes of sections 203 (a) (3) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Antonio Murgia shall be held

and considered to be the minor alien child of Mrs. Giuseppa Murgia, a lawfully resident alien of the United States.

"SEC. 8. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Machie Yoshiyama, the fiance of Ralph Springer, Jr., 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 Machie Yoshiyama is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Ralph Springer, Jr., and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Machie Yoshiyama, 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 Machie Yoshiyama, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Machie Yoshiyama as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee."

On page 2, line 21, strike out "SEC. 6." and substitute "SEC. 9."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

VALIDATING A PATENT ISSUED TO CARL E. ROBINSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3877) to validate a patent issued to Carl E. Robinson, of Anchor Point, Alaska, for certain land in Alaska, and for other purposes.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That patent numbered 1447303, issued to Carl E. Robinson, of Anchor Point, Alaska, on October 11, 1954, for the north half north half of section 36, township 3 south, range 15 west, Seward meridian, is declared to be valid as of the date of issue.

SEC. 2. The act of August 1, 1955 (69 Stat. A87; Private Law 248, 84th Cong.), is hereby repealed.

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

EXCHANGE OF LANDS, APACHE NATIONAL FOREST, N. MEX.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 44) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to exchange certain lands in the State of New Mexico.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to Floyd McMahan and Annie Locket McMahan all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following-described tract of land (together with any improvements thereon), located within the Apache National Forest, N. Mex.: South half of the north half of the southwest quarter of the southwest

quarter, and the south half of the southwest quarter of section 34, township 5 south, range 18 west, New Mexico principal meridian; and the west half of lot 18, east half of lot 19, east half of the east half of lot 22, west half of the west half of lot 23, all in section 4, township 6 south, range 18 west, New Mexico principal meridian; containing 79.24 acres more or less; and to accept in exchange therefor a conveyance in fee simple to the United States by Floyd McMahan and Annie Locket McMahan of the following described tract of land (together with any improvements thereon) located in the State of New Mexico: Northeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 33, township 5 south, range 18 west, New Mexico principal meridian, containing 40 acres.

SEC. 2. (a) Prior to the consummation of the exchange authorized by the first section of this act the Secretary of Agriculture shall have an appraisal made of the parcels to be exchanged, and in the event that the property to be conveyed to the United States is of less value than the federally owned property to be conveyed under this act, the grantors of the property to be conveyed to the United States shall, as a condition to such exchange, pay to the Secretary, to be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, an amount equal to the difference in the appraised value of the respective properties.

(b) The appraised value of the federally owned property to be conveyed under this act shall not include any increased value resulting from the development or improvement of such property by the said Floyd McMahan and Annie Locket McMahan, or their predecessors in interest.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 5, strike out "79.24" and insert "79.34".

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.

MIDWEST CLAYPAN EXPERIMENT STATION, MCCREDIE, MO.

The Clerk called the 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.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the University of Missouri, without cost, the real property, together with the buildings and improvements thereon, constituting the United States Department of Agriculture Midwest Claypan Experiment Station located at McCredie in the county of Callaway, State of Missouri, which property is more particularly described as follows:

The east half of the southwest quarter of section 10, and 140 acres, more or less, being all that part of the southeast quarter of section 10 lying west of the center of the Fulton and Mexico road;

Also 14.90 acres being that part of the east half of the northeast quarter of section 10 lying south of the McCredie and Williamsburg road;

Also 1 acre, more or less, in the northwest corner of the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 11, being all that part

of the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter lying west of the Fulton and Mexico road;

Also about 1 acre in the southwest corner of the northwest quarter of section 11, being that part of said quarter section lying south of the McCredie and Williamsburg road and west of the Fulton and Mexico road;

Also all that part containing about 65 acres of the west half of the northeast quarter and of the east half of the northwest quarter of section 10 lying south of the McCredie and Williamsburg road;

All of the above-described property lying and being in township 48 north, of range 9 west, in the aforesaid State and county, and containing 300 acres, more or less. 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.

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.

PROPERTY IN MASSACHUSETTS TO WOODS HOLE YACHT CLUB

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6623) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States in Massachusetts to the Woods Hole Yacht Club.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior shall convey to the Woods Hole Yacht Club, Woods Hole, Mass., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property described in section 2, upon the payment to the United States by such yacht club of the fair market value of such property, as determined by the Secretary, within the 2-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this act. In determining the fair market value for the purposes of this act the Secretary shall not include the value of improvements constructed on such property by such yacht club during the period of the lease referred to in section 2. The money received from the conveyance authorized by this section shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 2. The property referred to in the first section was leased from the United States by the Woods Hole Yacht Club for the 25-year period beginning on January 1, 1935, under authority of Private Law 341, 73d Congress, approved June 25, 1934 (48 Stat. 1430), being that portion of the property owned by the United States at Penzance Point, or Long Neck, Woods Hole, and more particularly described as follows:

Side A, from boundary mark in direction 224 degrees 14 minutes 45 seconds true, a distance of 90 feet, which comes to high-water mark; side B, from boundary mark in direction 111 degrees 14 minutes 45 seconds true, a distance of 215 feet; side C, from easterly end of side B in direction 190 degrees 29 minutes 15 seconds true, a distance of 74 feet, which comes to the high-water mark; side D, from the southerly end of side C in a westerly direction along the irregular high-water line to the southerly end of side A and including the rocks lying offshore.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, notwithstanding any other provision of law and upon determination by the Administrator of General Services that the property described in section 2 of this act is surplus to the needs of the Government, the Administrator of General Services shall convey to the Woods Hole Yacht Club, Woods Hole, Mass., subject to such terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions as may be determined by the Administrator of General Services to be necessary to protect the interests of the United States, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property described in section 2, upon the payment to the United States by such yacht club of the fair market value of such property, as determined by the Administrator of General Services, within a 2-year period beginning on the date the property is determined to be surplus. In determining the fair market value for the purposes of this act the Administrator of General Services shall not include the value of improvements constructed on such property by such yacht club during the period of the lease referred to in section 2. The money received from the conveyance authorized by this section shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

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.

RENOUNCE RIGHT IN CERTAIN LANDS IN MONTANA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1319) to renounce any right, title, and interest which the United States may have in certain lands in Montana.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States hereby renounces any right, title, and interest to lots 5 to 12, block 25, Graves second addition, Harlowton, Wheatland County, Mont., which it may have obtained under the last will and testament of Edwin A. Patterson, of Harlowton, Mont., who died on May 12, 1954.

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.

RIGHTS TO REMOVE TIMBER FROM ACQUIRED UNITED STATES LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7522) to authorize the extension of certain rights to remove timber from lands acquired by the United States.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to provide time sufficient for the acceptance thereof by the Secretary of the Interior under the act of March 20, 1922, as amended (16 U. S. C. 485, 486), in exchange for authority from the Secretary of Agriculture to cut and remove not to exceed an equal value of national forest timber, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to extend for a period reserved by it in deed dated September 20, 1957, the right of the McCloud River Lumber Co. to cut and remove merchantable timber reserved by it in deed dated September 20,

1932, situated on those parts of northeast quarter northeast quarter, southwest quarter northeast quarter, west half southeast quarter section 12, township 39 north, range 2 west, Mount Diablo meridian, north and west of the McCloud River (further identified as land exchange survey No. 331), which reservation is set forth as an exception in deed from Shaw Lumber Co. to the United States dated February 20, 1941, and recorded on page 30, volume 120, official records of Siskiyou County, Calif.

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.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 114]

Andresen,	Hillings	Prouty
August H.	Holtzman	Reece, Tenn.
Bailey	Kean	Scherer
Baker	Keeney	Simpson, Ill.
Beamer	Knox	Taylor
Bennett, Mich.	McCarthy	Ullman
Bentley	McConnell	Wigglesworth
Bowler	McIntosh	Williams, Miss.
Celler	Machnowicz	Williams, N. Y.
Dawson, Ill.	Meador	Willis
Dooley	Murray	
Griffin	Porter	
Haskell	Powell	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 390 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7221) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 478)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7221) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 7, 11, 12, 13, and 26.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, 6, 18, 19, 20, 27, 29, 30, 32, 34, and 36, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,215,776"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 5, 8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 16, 17, 21, 22, 23, 25, 28, 31, 33 and 35.

CLARENCE CANNON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
JOHN TABER,
BEN F. JENSEN,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
CLIFF CLEVINGER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
LISTER HILL,
STYLES BRIDGES,
LEVERETT H. SALTONSTALL,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7221) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

CHAPTER I

Department of Agriculture

Amendment No. 1: Inserts heading.

Amendment No. 2: Reported in disagreement. It is the intention of the managers to offer an amendment which will make \$4 million available through June 30, 1958. This amount includes funds to reimburse the President's Disaster Relief Fund which is available to meet emergency needs of this type where specific appropriations have been exhausted.

Amendment No. 3: Deletes language proposed by the Senate appropriating \$25 million for emergency range conservation. The funds for this purpose were not agreed to since policies and procedures have not yet been worked out to insure that the money expended will result in the improvement or protection of cover on the land as contemplated by the law.

Amendment No. 4: Inserts heading.

Amendment No. 5: Reported in disagreement. It is the intention of the managers to offer an amendment which will provide \$11,500,000 for emergency feed and seed assistance. This amount includes funds to reimburse the President's Disaster Relief Fund which is available to meet emergency needs of this type where specific appropriations have been exhausted.

Amendment No. 6: Authorizes \$26 million for farm ownership loans as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER II

Panama Canal Company

Amendment No. 7: Deletes language proposed by the Senate appropriating \$1 million for the Panama Canal bridge.

CHAPTER III

Department of Defense—Military functions

Amendment No. 8: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER IV

American Battle Monuments Commission

Amendment No. 9: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER V

Independent offices

Amendment No. 10: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 11, 12, and 13: Delete language proposed by the Senate relating to the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Fund.

Amendments Nos. 14, 15, and 16: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER VI

Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 17: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 18: Authorizes \$283,000 for resources management, to be derived by transfer, instead of \$133,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates \$15,000 for the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER VII

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Amendment No. 20: Amends language of the House relative to hospitalization and medical care as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER VIII

Public works

Amendments Nos. 22 and 23: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER IX

Department of State

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates \$750,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$500,400 as proposed by the House and \$1 million as proposed by the Senate. The conferees do not approve of the use of any appropriated funds for official residence allowances for deputy chiefs of missions or for medical benefits for dependents.

Department of Justice

Amendment No. 25: Reported in disagreement.

Funds appropriated to the President

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates \$1,300,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER XI

Legislative branch

Amendments Nos. 27 through 34: Insert items for the Senate as proposed by the Senate. Of the foregoing, amendments 28, 31, and 33 are reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 35: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER XII

Claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments

Amendments Nos. 36 and 37: Insert reference to Senate Document and appropriate \$4,215,776 instead of \$4,437,896 as proposed by the Senate. The amount agreed to is \$222,120 less than proposed, due to the

elimination of the judgment set forth in Schedule C of Senate Document No. 38.

CLARENCE CANNON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
JOHN TABER,
BEN F. JENSEN,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
CLIFF CLEVINGER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the conference report, the statement of which has just been read from the desk, there are 15 amendments in technical disagreement, mere formalities, and 2 amendments in material disagreement, 1 on flood insurance and the other on the stockpiling of strategic minerals, notably tungsten, which must be disposed of following adoption of the report.

I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] such time as he may require.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, as far as the conference report is concerned, I do not desire any time; it is as good as we can get.

I would like to say, however, that if we could get rid of all the amendments except the two in disagreement before we take them up, we would get along a little easier.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON. In compliance with the suggestion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], I ask unanimous consent that amendment Nos. 15 and 17 be considered last.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. I ask unanimous consent that amendments Nos. 8, 9, 10, 14, 21, 22, 23, 25, 28, 31, 33, and 35 be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the amendments, as follows:

Senate amendment No. 8: Page 6, line 16, insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
Military personnel

"For an additional amount for 'Military personnel,' \$27,444,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Procurement and production,' Army."

Senate amendment No. 9: Page 7, line 13, insert:

"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)."

Senate amendment No. 10: Page 8, line 11, insert:

"CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

"For the purpose of determining the beginning date of the annuity under the Civil Service Retirement Act of any survivor of a Member of Congress who dies subsequent to April 1, 1956, and prior to the effective date of the Civil Service Retirement Act Amendments of 1956, such amendments shall be deemed to have taken effect on April 1, 1956,

but no such annuity shall commence by reason of the enactment of this section prior to the date of such enactment."

Senate amendment No. 14: Page 9, line 18, insert:

"OPERATING EXPENSES, FEDERAL SUPPLY SERVICE

"The limitation under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1957, on the amount available for expenses of travel, is increased from '\$120,000' to '\$130,000.'"

Senate amendment No. 21, page 14, line 24, insert:

"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 arrive, 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."

Senate amendment No. 22: page 19, line 7, insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Southeastern Power Administration

Operation and maintenance

"For an additional amount for 'Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration', \$35,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration', fiscal year 1957."

Senate amendment No. 23: page 20, line 8, insert:

"RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL

Construction, general

"That portion of title III of the Act of July 2, 1956 (Public Law 641, Eighty-fourth Congress, 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 \$2,000,000 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 protection shall be made and the Secretary of the Army shall acquire such land and improvements if all of the landowners, except Lester G. Larson, the heirs of Louis Morin, Junior, and the heirs of A. Desjarlais, on or before September 15, 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 208 C of the Buford-Trenton project, Williams County, North Dakota, according to the recorded plat thereof of 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 and 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, Junior, 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 the 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."

Senate amendment No. 25: Page 23, line 10, insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

"Legal activities and general administration
"Salaries and Expenses, United States Attorneys and Marshals

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals,' not to exceed \$300,000, to be derived by transfer from any appropriation available to the Department of Justice for the fiscal year 1957."

Senate amendment No. 28, page 28, line 14, insert "For payment to Jean K. McCarthy, widow of Joseph R. McCarthy, late a Senator from the State of Wisconsin, \$22,500."

Senate amendment No. 31, page 28, line 20, insert "There is hereby established within the contingent fund of the Senate a revolving fund which shall consist of (1) the unexpended balance of the appropriation 'Contingent expenses, Senate, stationery, fiscal year 1957,' (2) any amounts hereafter appropriated for stationery allowances of the President of the Senate and of Senators, and for stationery for use of committees and officers of the Senate, and (3) any undeposited amounts heretofore received, and any amounts hereafter received as proceeds of sales by the stationery room of the Senate. Any moneys in the fund shall be available until expended for use in the same manner and for the same purposes as funds heretofore appropriated to the contingent fund of the Senate for stationery, except that (1) the balance of any amount appropriated for stationery for use of committees and officers of the Senate which remains unexpended at the end of any fiscal year, and (2) allowances which are not available for obligation due to vacancies or waiver of entitlement thereto, shall be withdrawn from the revolving fund."

Senate amendment No. 33, page 31, line 5, insert "Not to exceed \$25,000 of the amount of \$60,000 under the heading 'Capitol Buildings' continued available for the fiscal year 1957 in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1957, for the installation of 2 additional elevators in the Senate wing of the Capitol, is hereby made available for expenditure without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, for repairs and improvements to the 2 elevators in the Senate wing located adjacent to the 2 additional elevators, and is continued available until June 30, 1958."

Senate amendment No. 35, page 32, line 10, insert:

"GENERAL PROVISION

"Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the unexpended balances of appropriations for the fiscal year 1955 and succeeding fiscal years which are subject to disbursement by the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall be withdrawn as of June 30 of the second fiscal year following the year for which provided. Unpaid obligations chargeable to any of the balances so withdrawn or appropriations for prior years shall be liquidated from any appropriations for the same general purpose, which, at the time of payment, are available for disbursement."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and concur therein.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 9, 10, 14, 21, 22, 23, 25, 28, 31, 33, and 35 and concur therein.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the pending blanket motion of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] includes, with regard to amendment in disagreement No. 21, a motion that the House recede from its technical disagreement to this amendment of the Senate No. 21, and concur therein.

I am sure that the House will unanimously agree with the action suggested by the gentleman from Missouri and adopt the Senate language with regard to the Foreign Quarantine Service, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This language provides for the payment of overtime services of employees of the Foreign Quarantine Division of the United States Public Health Service without cost to the taxpayers, and will permit the clearing of ships at our ports after 6 o'clock in the evening and on Sundays and holidays.

In unanimously agreeing to the language contained in amendment of the Senate No. 21, the conferees were also in unanimous agreement that nothing should be done to disturb the long-established practice affecting officers of the Customs and Immigration Services insofar as overtime services and reimbursement by the parties requesting such overtime services are concerned. The practice, as carried out by these two agencies, is one that is equitable to the Government, to the employee, and to the third party. It is the opinion of the conferees that an extension of this practice to quarantine officers of the Public Health Service would be consistent with this long-established equitable principle that has been in effect for many years and comprises a formula that has been practical and satisfactory at great savings to the taxpayers.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: On page 3, line 2, insert:

"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, \$15,000,000: *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."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: "Strike out the sum of '\$15,000,000', named in said amendment and insert in lieu thereof '\$4,000,000, to remain available through June 30, 1958.'"

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 5: Page 4, line 8, insert:

"DISASTER LOAN REVOLVING FUND

"Not to exceed \$15,000,000 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 (63 Stat. 81, 88)."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of '\$15,000,000' named in said amendment, insert "\$11,500,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 16: Page 10, line 3, "Notwithstanding" insert the following: "For an additional amount for 'Inpatient care', \$2,000,000, of which \$1,450,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'General operating expenses', fiscal year 1957, and \$550,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'outpatient care', fiscal year 1957: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "For an additional amount for "In-patient care", \$1,000,000, of which \$725,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "General operating expenses", fiscal year 1957, and \$275,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Out-patient care", fiscal year 1957: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement, Senate amendment No. 15:

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 15: On page 10, line 1, insert:

"HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

"Office of the Administrator

"Federal Flood Indemnity Administration
"Payment for flood indemnity operations

"For payment of compensation for services rendered by private organizations and persons pursuant to section 13 (a) of the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 1078), for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks and public agencies as authorized by section 13 (b) of said act, \$14,000,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BOLAND moves that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 15.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division on the question.

The SPEAKER. The question is: Will the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, this amendment and the motion which I offered to recede and concur in the Senate amendment embraces the \$14 million necessary to get the Federal flood insurance program off the ground. Those who were in the Chamber on May 7 will recall that in the third supplemental appropriation bill the committee struck out the \$50 million which was requested by the FFIA, and I moved the amendment on the floor of the House at that time to restore \$14 million in order that the program could get started.

At that time, Mr. Speaker, I said that the question before the House is not whether or not we want a flood insurance program. The question before the House was whether or not we wanted that program to get started, because the issue of whether or not this Congress wanted a flood insurance program was well settled back in July 1956, when this

House and the other body voted overwhelmingly for a flood insurance program recommended by the President of the United States and also recommended in the several bills which were filed by a great many Members of this body and in the other body. At that time, last July, this House and the Senate voted overwhelmingly in favor of a flood insurance program.

Now, it is impossible to have a flood insurance program unless we implement that program with the necessary funds, and that is precisely what this amendment will do. All we ask is that this House agree with the Senate in restoring the \$14 million to the Federal Flood Indemnity Administration. This amendment was defeated on May 7 of this year in this House, 127 to 97, by a teller vote. The bill went over to the Senate and the Senate put this \$14 million back into the bill and put it back in overwhelmingly.

I would like to call the attention of the Members of this House to the debate that occurred on May 7 in which the argument was made against the program on the basis that it would mean another \$5 billion of Federal funds outlay, consisting of \$3 billion plus \$2 billion more on presidential approval. I would like to deal directly with that argument, because some of my colleagues might have been influenced by that argument on the floor at that time. To begin with, there is no likelihood that the Government would ever be called upon to pay that amount of money in any one policy year. It should be remembered that the \$3 billion or \$5 billion represents the total authorized amount of liability in force, and to my mind the statement that this amount of liability in force must be paid off in any one year is contrary to the fact, and I think the facts will prove it.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Is it not also true that the program today is even more important than it was when you first introduced your amendment, in view of the recent floods and the disasters that have struck different sections of our country?

Mr. BOLAND. The gentleman is right. This condition is not confined to New England. The only reason more New Englanders got on the floor May 7 in defense of this bill is because we have lived with floods longer than anybody else in this Nation. The fact of the matter is that recent events show that this is a problem that is common to the entire United States, not only New England but the west coast, the north and south Atlantic coasts, the middle Atlantic coast, Kansas, Iowa, South Dakota, Missouri, Oklahoma, Texas. All over the United States there is a demand for this kind of insurance, for this kind of program, so that the little man who is unable to get insurance might be able to insure his property, either his dwelling or the contents of his dwelling, for \$10,000 coverage. That is all we ask for. This is the kind of coverage that is not available generally in the insurance in-

dustry, and they have shied away from it, as the distinguished chairman has said. They have shied away from it, because it will be an expensive program, and the Federal Government will pay all the loss. That is precisely what we said when this bill was debated. At that time we said the losses would be paid by the Federal Government, and this is an opportunity to put the Federal Government into the insurance business on a plane on which it ought to come in, because this is a cooperative basis. On this basis the private insurance companies will write all of the insurance and the administration of it will be supervised by the Federal Government. That is precisely the manner in which we ought to get this started.

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

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman if these insurance policies could also cover such items as fences and crops on farmlands in the event of floods.

Mr. BOLAND. No. In my opinion it would not cover crop losses, unless there was a washaway of the soil by the water. It would be possible there.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman thinks it would cover a washaway of the soil. Would it cover fences and outbuildings on farms?

Mr. BOLAND. My information is that it would cover outbuildings, barns, and so forth.

In the debate in the House on May 7, the argument was made against the program on the basis that it would mean another \$5 billion outlay of Federal funds, consisting of \$3 billion, plus \$2 billion more on Presidential approval. I would like to deal directly with this argument because some of my colleagues might have been influenced by such a statement.

To begin with, there is no likelihood that the Government would ever be called upon to pay that amount of money in any one policy year. It should be remembered that the \$3 or \$5 billion represents the total authorized amount of liability in force and to make the statement that this total liability would have to be paid off in any 1 year is contrary to the fact, and I will prove it.

First, the \$3 billion will be spread nationwide on a basis related to the exposure in the various 14 different rating areas and there is no likelihood that there would be total losses under all policies in all parts of the country at the same time. The entire approach which has been developed by the FFIA has been to spread the risk nationwide and not concentrate the coverage in one particular flood area.

Second, the FFIA has built into the program certain safeguards in addition to those set forth in the statute. They are as follows:

The amount of insurance which can be sold to any person or corporation is limited to \$250,000 and to \$10,000 on a dwelling and its contents.

The contract itself will be for 1 year, noncancellable with the premium payable in advance. There will be a 30-day

waiting period before the effective date—purposely adopted to avoid insuring risks when the storm warnings go up, and cancelling policies when the storms have passed over.

In addition to a number of exclusions, the contracts will contain a \$500 deductible plus 5 percent of the remainder of the loss.

Most losses arising under the contracts will in all probability be partial losses, and the amounts payable will fall below the face amount of the policies. Consequently, the total amount of \$3 billion authorized by the statute, representing the maximum face amount of the contracts issued, is not and reasonably should not be assumed to be the measure of the Government's exposure.

By selling the contracts nationwide, we believe sufficient spread will be obtained to minimize losses. The rating treatment is based on major river basins, and experience shows that all river basins do not suffer damaging floods in any one year.

As indicated previously, losses may be lower than the amount paid by the policyholders alone and, conversely, may exceed that amount. In our opinion, over a period of years, with progressive rate adjustments, the premium income from policyholders should be equal to or above what we can reasonably expect to pay out in claims settlement.

The underwriting and distribution of the contracts will be controlled so that there will be no undue concentration in any one area. Rates will be adjusted rapidly to changing conditions, especially in areas of high exposure.

By controlling rates, underwriting, and distribution, I expect to modify the subsidy downward with the hope that it would ultimately reach zero. If this program is to be absorbed into the private insurance market, as intended by the Congress, the rate must be adequate, without any contribution from the States or Federal Government.

To take the argument of those opposed to this motion that you measure the amount of loss by the insurance in force and then assume that that is the liability that would have to be paid off in any 1 year would mean that no insurance company could exist. The fact is that no insurance company ever deals with the total liability in force. The only figure that is meaningful is the average annual losses a company will be called upon to pay and then obtain sufficient premium income for that purpose, and that is what the FFIA program is designed to do. The experts who have been dealing with this program have placed the figure of \$90 million as the maximum liability that the Government would be called upon to pay in losses in any 1 year and the rates are based on this figure.

One of my distinguished colleagues referred in the debate of May 7 to the fact that in 1951 flood losses in the Kansas City area amounted to \$2½ billion and then made the assumption that if \$2 billion of these losses were covered under the program, or even \$1 billion, the Government, after the collection of pre-

miums, would have to pay out of the United States Treasury \$900 million for that 1 flood alone. Again, those opposed to this motion are dealing with false assumptions. The \$2½ billion to which they refer takes into account all types of losses and as I have already indicated, this flood insurance would be spread nationwide and there could not be a concentration of this amount of liability in any one area. Secondly, much of the properties that go into making up the \$2½ billion would not be insured under exclusions in the insurance contract itself. Thirdly, the maximum liability on any 1 property is fixed by statute at \$10,000 on dwellings and \$250,000 on commercial properties, and there are deductible provisions, all of which would reduce the total amount of losses payable by the Government. In addition, not all persons in any flood area will be holders of policies. Indeed, it has been stated by those opposed to this motion that the premiums are so high that not many people would purchase it anyway.

Congress wisely provided that this was to be an experimental program with a 5-year maximum period. Those opposed to the motion, in recognition of this experimental measure, have stated that the FFIA should continue to study the program another year and use up the \$325,000 remaining out of the original appropriation of \$500,000. In my judgment, to continue to study this program further would be a waste of time and money. The best abilities available in the private insurance industry and in Government have developed this program after almost 10 months of diligent, conscientious, and continuous work and study and, in their opinion, it is now ready to be given a trial by actually offering the product to the American public at the prices that have been determined upon. The only real test of whether this program or any other is feasible is the market place, and while the agency could continue to study various aspects indefinitely, we will never know whether or not the program is sound and marketable unless and until it is given a field test by actual sale of policies. In addition, all insurance, and in fact, all new business ventures must develop experience upon which to predicate prices, distribution, and acceptability, and the only way that can be done in this new venture is by actually offering the contract of insurance publicly. The insurance industry has made it abundantly clear that if the Federal Government develops experience, which they are unable to do, and this experience establishes the feasibility of this type of insurance, they would then undertake to offer such coverage to the American people on a private-enterprise basis, which is the ultimate result this Congress had in mind when it passed the legislation less than 1 year ago.

I therefore urgently recommend this House to authorize the \$14 million by appropriation in order that we can give this program a fair trial and achieve the results which were intended by offering to the American people some measure of self-protection.

Mr. Speaker, I include an editorial from the Washington Post of June 17, 1957:

IMPERILED FLOOD INSURANCE

The move to deny all funds for flood insurance merits a high place on the list of strange actions taken in the name of economy. Last year Congress appropriated \$500,000 to set up the Federal Flood Indemnity Administration. In 1955 the country's losses from floods had mounted to about \$1 billion and Congress was almost unanimous in its decision that something must be done to minimize these losses to citizens and to relieve the Government of heavy demands for the relief of flood victims. Now the flood-insurance system is ready to operate, but the House voted to deny it the necessary funds.

What has happened to change Congressional sentiment in this fashion? One factor is the reduction of flood losses last year, although they are again high in 1957, and another is the economy wave. As the flood-insurance program is not yet in operation, some legislators appear to have concluded that it can be slashed without taking anything away from anybody. Well, that may be good politics, but it involves a flagrant disregard of the public interest.

One absurd argument that is being made against the program is that it would mean another \$5 billion outlay of Federal funds. Actually the FFIA is authorized to write insurance totaling not more than \$3 billion, which could be raised to \$5 billion upon authorization by the President, but this would create only insurance liability. The FFIA has set up a schedule of flood-insurance rates, covering 14 different zones, with the aid of commercial rating specialists. People in danger of floods would buy this flood insurance from commercial firms with the Government merely underwriting the venture because no private company is in a position to do so. Some losses might be incurred, but it is absurd to talk as if the \$3 billion liability were an expenditure.

For the first time this system would enable people living in areas of flood danger to contribute to their own protection. That is in accord with the general American pattern. The net effect might be to reduce demands upon the Government in flood emergencies and thus produce savings instead of added expenditures. Certainly a system that offers such potential advantages to the Government as well as to flood victims should not be abandoned without a trial.

House conferees who have been fighting this program will take their disagreement with the Senate conferees to the House floor today. That will give an opportunity for second thinking. In our opinion, the House should candidly recognize its error and accept the \$14 million the Senate wrote into the third supplemental appropriations bill to put the system into operation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the issue before us is whether the House conferees are to recede on their disagreement with Senate amendment No. 15 to the third supplemental appropriations bill—H. R. 7221. This would restore \$14 million to the Federal Flood Indemnity Administration. I am speaking in favor of restoring that sum.

This issue was before this House on May 7. But in spite of the lengthy discussion we had on the flood insurance item at that time I don't think the

Members had an opportunity to understand the real issues. There was some confusion on this item because of errors of fact that came forth during the heat of the debate. If we are to deal intelligently with this matter, those errors must be corrected.

Let me add that this is not an academic question of keeping the RECORD correct—although that is a factor. These errors of fact are preventing people all over America—my constituents included—from getting protection against flood losses which this Congress authorized in the past session.

By way of background, the President asked in his budget message for \$100 million to make the flood insurance program operative. Subsequently, the administration cut its estimates in half and the actual request was for \$50 million.

The Federal Flood Insurance Act, which we enacted last year by an overwhelming majority, authorizes the Government to insure \$3 billion worth of property, and another \$2 billion with the authorization of the President. By normal insurance standards this is a small underwriting authority. Many individual fire and casualty companies insure greater valuations of property.

The Government will use normal private enterprise channels to market and service this flood insurance and it will pay the insurance companies for their actual costs—and nothing more. For this purpose, it is estimated the Government will need \$14 million. That is the item we are considering today.

Let us be clear on that. The \$14 million we are now considering—which was restored in the appropriation by the Senate—is not for the Federal Flood Indemnity Administration to hire employees, or to pay rent or to do any of the other things that contribute to enlarging the Federal establishment. It is to pay for the services of the private insurance people who will be performing a valuable service for the Government—in place of Government employees.

Some Members have implied that the insurance companies will make money on this arrangement. That is not so. The companies have agreed to sign contracts with the Federal Government whereby they will perform these functions at no profit, no overhead, and will not even charge for administrative costs. The net effect is that Frank Meistrell, Commissioner of the Federal Flood Indemnity Administration, has an option on the services of the entire American insurance industry at cost. He will pay for these services if and when they are used. I challenge anyone to suggest a more efficient and economical way to do this job.

If you have a piece of property and you want to insure it against floods, the Government will estimate the rate. If the estimate is \$1 for \$100 of insurance, the property owner will pay 60 cents and the Government will pay 40 cents. The 40 cents is the subsidy which was mentioned on the House floor during the past debate. The subsidy money does not go to the insurance companies as a Member suggested. It goes into a disaster insur-

ance fund—along with the property owner's 60 cents of premium payment—and this money will be earmarked as loss reserves. This premium money and subsidy money can be used only for one purpose: Payments of loss claims.

Where will the Federal Flood Indemnity Administration get the subsidy money for the disaster insurance fund? By borrowing from the Treasury.

The borrowing authority is provided in the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956. I had to look to be sure. During some of the debate on this floor on May 7 it sounded for all the world like this agency had been caught sneaking into the Treasury through some legal loophole. But no, here is the authorization in the act we passed in this body. The act gives the agency the right to borrow—and I quote—"an amount not exceeding \$500 million (or such greater amount as may be approved by the President)."

A distinguished Member of this House, a man whose ability we all respect—had this to say during the heat of the May 7 debate:

One section says that the amount of insurance that can be outstanding at any one time is a small, paltry sum of \$5 billion. So I presume that any good administrator would limit the amount of Treasury borrowing to a cool \$5 billion. And how often? Every 12 months. Five billion dollars every 12 months. Now think about that.

I did think about that and I was shocked to think that a distinguished Member would make such a statement on the floor of this House.

True, the agency can insure \$3 billion worth of property and another \$2 billion with the authority of the President. True, if there are losses in excess of premium income the agency will borrow to pay claims.

But do you know that in any large disaster only a percentage of the victims carry insurance? Do you know that most people under insure? The Government's flood-insurance policies only permit \$10,000 coverage on a home and \$250,000 on commercial property. Do you know that every policy will carry deductible provisions where the insured must pay the first \$500 of his loss plus 5 percent of the remainder of the loss? Do you know that zoning provisions in the act give the agency the right to refuse to write insurance in an area if there are no zoning laws to keep people out of the way of floods?

Enough on the misstatements. I want to use the rest of my time to advise the House on the implications of the vote today. We are voting here on the life or the death of the flood-insurance program.

The House previously passed this appropriations bill providing no funds for the Federal Flood Indemnity Administration. The Committee on Appropriations advised the agency to use the balance of money appropriated last year—some \$300,000—to continue studies on the problem. But that money previously appropriated is for use only in the current fiscal year. It has not been reapropriated. So the agency dies at the

end of this June. And so does the flood insurance program. And so do the hopes of my people and millions of others along the eastern seaboard, in the Ohio Valley, the Mississippi-Missouri Valley, in Texas, Oklahoma, and the west coast.

These Americans are asking only for the right to buy insurance protection from flood losses. They can get charity—the Red Cross is wonderful at that. They can get Federal handouts—the Federal Government disburses millions of dollars in relief to disaster areas.

But they do not want charity and they do not want relief. They want to pay for what they get.

But Members of this House stand up and say "No. You can't pay enough for this insurance to make a profit. So we are not going to sell it to you. There have been floods for a thousand years and there will be floods for another thousand. Too bad for you who get hurt. But no profit, no insurance."

I urge the Members to vote instructions to our conferees that they recede from their disagreement with Senate amendment 15 and restore \$14 million to the flood-insurance program.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I call attention to the fact that within a few weeks this House will have before it a special insurance bill in relation to peacetime atomic energy reactors, which will involve about \$500 million. We may have to do that in order to inspire this activity; yet we shall probably find that those who oppose this \$14 million appropriation will vigorously fight for the passage of that bill. And I probably will favor the bill, recognizing the practical situation that exists in connection with peacetime reactors. On the other hand, it seems to me that we should not make fish of one and flesh of another.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I agree with the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] on the fine fight that he has made on this issue. Also I compliment the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON]. When the amendment was on the floor previously, I spoke in favor of it. I am in support of the amendment now and I hope that this House will adopt it.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I should like to have the gentleman emphasize the point that there is no question about the fact that the losses will never run up to \$3 billion or \$5 billion. I think that was the point that was made in the

House on May 7 that impressed the House more than any other argument. The fact of the matter is that the risk will be spread all over the United States and that the risk will be allocated in particular river basins; and that the amount of the premiums that will be paid will be paid according to the type of risk that the Government will insure. So I say that there is no possibility of the Federal Government ever being called upon to pay anything like \$3 billion or \$5 billion in losses.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Is it not also true that this is the first time those who are frequently stricken by floods will have the opportunity to pay toward indemnity for some of their own losses?

Mr. BOLAND. This is the first opportunity that has ever been offered. I think it is a good opportunity to give these people a chance to get some relief. This is a good way to stop the relief and rehabilitation that the Federal Government pours into disaster areas. I think this is a good way to save money. It is a good way to save tax money because every time there is a disastrous flood of course there is a large number of losses taken for tax purposes.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I think the gentleman is making a very good point, because actually this is a program which in the long run could save money. When any disaster occurs on any large scale Uncle Sam comes in and picks up the whole tab. Here we have an opportunity to give the people themselves a chance to participate in that program.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman. I thank also all of those Members of the House from the many, many States involved on both sides of the aisle for the tremendous amount of assistance being given us in this effort.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCUDDER. The gentleman is making a constructive statement on this very necessary program, if we make insurance available for flood disaster I believe that a substantial number of policies will be issued and should give a reasonable spread of coverage throughout the potential flood areas. The premiums income, without a doubt will come from all areas subject to floods which will build a reserve to cope with many of the normal losses. Should flood insurance be available and a loss occurs the demand on the Federal Government would be lessened because they would have had the opportunity to buy insurance and the Government would not have the implied responsibility to assist in an emergency. Nobody sympathizes too much with a person who neglects to protect his property by taking out fire insurance. So if you have insurance available there will be little reason for people not insuring, the

money the Federal Government puts up will be small as compared to the premiums paid by the property owners, I believe this program assisted by the Federal Government can be developed into an actually sound program and will eventually revert to private enterprise.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Does not the gentleman think this should be consistent with the argument of those who say the Federal Government should get out of the business of direct grants wherever possible? Is it not a fact that here at least to some degree as never before there is an opportunity for people to help pay indemnity?

Mr. SCUDDER. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will agree to the motion to recede and concur in this amendment. As has been said already, this is insurance in which individuals will have an opportunity to participate.

Last year when this House passed a bill creating the Flood Indemnity Administration it was fully understood by everyone that this would mean that the Federal Government would have to spend some money. But let us not forget that each time we have a disaster the Federal Government spends a lot of money, because we are all in the same position, we all feel full of sympathy for the individuals who are suffering these hardships.

I have said in the past and I repeat now, those of you who have not lived through a flood have no idea of what it actually is. I say to you it was my experience in 1955 to go through that terrific nightmare that struck my district so forcefully. I shall never forget it, and I hope I never again have the same experience.

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

Mr. FORAND. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I refresh the memory of the Members of the House that only within the past several weeks a number of places in Missouri were visited with floods, also Kansas and a wide area of Texas and Oklahoma, so this is not a sectional problem, it is a national problem. May I also call attention to the fact that the Federal Flood Indemnity Administration has set up a schedule of flood insurance rates covering 14 regions.

Mr. FORAND. There is absolutely no question about what the gentleman says. It is the truth. We must also keep in mind the fact that the insurance companies have shied away from this type of risk. There is nobody that wants to take this type of risk except Uncle Sam, who should in view of the fact that all of the taxpayers of the country, if they do not contribute through the flood insurance program to the relief of the people affected by floods, will do it through their contributions to the Red Cross or through the President's emergency fund. They will do it in one way or another. Yet, the poor individual

who is hit is the person who has to rely on charity whereas here you give him the opportunity to recover at least a part of his loss through insurance for which he has contributed in part.

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

Mr. FORAND. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. I want to join with the gentleman in his urging the House to adopt the Senate amendment and give the people of the Nation an opportunity to protect themselves with a form of insurance that private industry does not offer. No insurance company offers this kind of insurance. Furthermore, this is not a local problem. We have seen, recently, Texas as well as many other States suffering from devastating floods. I certainly hope the House will give the people of the United States an opportunity to have this insurance and to give this insurance program a trial. If it proves successful, then it can be turned over to the private insurance companies. If it is not successful, then we will cancel it out.

Mr. FORAND. The gentleman is absolutely correct in his observation, and I thank him.

Mr. BONNER. This is a fair request to make of the House.

Mr. FORAND. The point for us to remember is that the Congress recognized the necessity for this last year.

Mr. BONNER. Yes; and the House passed it by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. FORAND. That is correct. The House passed this bill last year. Now we have been spending money to set up this program. The program is about ready to go, but if the plan does not have blood in its veins, it just cannot live.

Mr. BONNER. This is simply providing something to implement the program.

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

Mr. FORAND. I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. Unlike most of my colleagues, I would be interested in seeing a "Flood" in my district at least every second year.

Mr. FORAND. The gentleman has one all the time.

Mr. FLOOD. But apart from that point, in the northeastern part of Pennsylvania 2 years ago we were struck by a devastating hurricane and floods and many of the people there, based upon the action of the House last year, are anticipating the setup to execute this program. I certainly concur with the efforts of the gentleman in introducing the amendment.

Mr. FORAND. Before my time runs out, I would like to call the attention of the Members to a newspaper clipping which has just been handed to me. The news story is entitled "Tornado Drops Out of Driving Rain, Destroys 25 Homes in Texas Town." It is as follows:

TORNADO DROPS OUT OF DRIVING RAIN, DESTROYS 25 HOMES IN TEXAS TOWN

OLTON, TEX., May 24.—A sneak tornado smashed down out of a driving rain here today to destroy 25 homes—1 twister of more than 20 that boiled across west Texas.

A hundred homes were damaged by another at Tahoka.

State police reported 1 person missing and 3 injured here when the twister wiped out the Negro and Latin-American sections. Rubble was being searched tonight for more possible victims.

The tornadoes broke out shortly before noon and marched across upper Texas until late afternoon.

They raged from Amarillo, in the heart of the Texas Panhandle, as far south as Midland, 240 miles south of Amarillo.

In north central Texas—at Fort Worth and Denton—flash floods from rains, of more than 8 inches in places, drove additional homeowners fleeing for safety.

It was the 37th day of violent weather in Texas, which began April 18. An estimated 64 or more persons have died this spring in the State from tornadoes, floods and lightning. Property loss has been estimated as well in excess of \$100 million.

At Tahoka, 30 miles south of Lubbock, the tornado hit shortly after 1 p. m. At the small community of Wilson nearby it blew away 5 or 6 houses, and moved over Tahoka.

In Tahoka proper, it damaged about 100 structures, stripping off roofs, destroying garages and other light buildings. The storm at Tahoka was preceded by a deluge with hail the size of baseballs.

At Hereford, about midway between Lubbock and Abilene, an approaching tornado almost caused panic. Streets were cleared in 30 minutes. At least 4 traffic collisions occurred as residents scrambled for safety, and 1 man was injured in a traffic accident.

At Denton overnight rains of 8.02 inches sent Pecan Creek on a rampage. More than 50 families were driven from their homes.

Early today, the second deluge in 2 days soaked water-weary Fort Worth, forcing hundreds from their homes again. Police patrolled the area, rousing residents about 2 a. m. with sirens.

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

Mr. FORAND. I yield.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I compliment the gentleman on the fine statement that he has made. I want to tell him I am in utter accord with this legislation. However, I do not believe tornado insurance as such is included in this flood-control measure, but I am still for it because tornado insurance is purchasable now from the regular stock companies along with fire, lightning, windstorm, and so on.

Mr. FORAND. But the tornadoes bring the floods.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. And losses from floods are not insurable.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to speak in favor of the flood insurance amendment. It is one of the features of President Eisenhower's great humanitarian program to help the people. Floods and disasters respect neither individuals nor sections. They come unexpectedly to all people. We should all realize the necessity of doing something about this problem. Realizing the scope of recent disasters, the President would like to construct a program of aid. The President is in favor of this program because he believes it is not just spending more money, but rather he believes that through the establishment of a proper insurance program the country can save money when disaster comes and erases the savings of a lifetime.

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

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, I again desire to add my voice to those who are appealing for this \$14 million to implement the Federal Flood Indemnity Program.

Those devastated by the 1955 floods will not soon forget the terrible loss of life and property which resulted. We, the Congress, however, are now being charged with having forgotten.

Last year the Congress adopted the Federal flood indemnity insurance program. It may not be a perfect law, as has been claimed by some of its critics. However, what law is? Last year the memory of the devastating floods of 1955 was fresh in the minds of the Members of the Congress, and the decision was almost unanimous that something must be done to minimize these losses to citizens and to relieve the Government of heavy demands for the relief of flood victims. Appropriate legislation was enacted into law. No one can deny that the legislation then passed represents the first practical attempt to make flood insurance available at reasonable rates.

Under this program, people living in areas of flood danger are, for the first time, offered a practical approach to their ever present problem.

However, the program on the books is completely valueless without money to bring it into being.

I would like to repeat what I said before on this subject—this is not charity—it is merely giving to all people of this country the opportunity to partially protect themselves in time of flood—it gives them the opportunity to purchase needed insurance.

This is in accord with the general American pattern. The net effect might be to reduce demands upon the Government in flood emergencies and thus produce savings instead of added expenditures.

The sum of only \$14 million is asked at this time. Last year it was felt that there was a clear duty to provide this protection. Is such duty any less this year? Therefore, I support this appropriation item.

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

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. PATTERSON. I concur in the statements just made by the gentleman. I would remind the Members of the House that they only would have to witness a devastating flood once to realize the value of a piece of legislation like this. As far as the people are concerned, it is something that will help them. It is something that will help them to rehabilitate their business establishments and rebuild their homes. It is a program that will protect them in the future.

With many of my colleagues here in the House, I introduced flood-insurance legislation as early as January 3, 1956. I supported and fought for the bill that was subsequently enacted. This law must be given a thorough trial to afford our people some measure of protection against future floods.

In my district in Connecticut, we are exerting every effort to install flood-pre-

ventive works before the next storms strike. But the alarming fact we must not forget is that no flood-protective works are 100 percent efficient, and floods can and do occur somewhere in this country every season of the year. Furthermore, it requires years of engineering planning and construction to provide adequate flood-control protection. In the interim, flood insurance will afford some measure of protection.

Flood losses this year are already in excess of the damage caused in the whole of 1956, and the arrival of the hurricane season is awaited with great misgivings. Few sections of the country are completely secure from flood disaster, and it would be wrong to deny so many of our people the protection afforded by the Federal flood-indemnity program.

I have personally followed the step-by-step development of the flood-indemnity program, and I am firmly convinced that Commissioner Frank J. Meistrell's associates have formulated an economical and practical program that could be put into effect almost immediately if we today make available the operating funds contained in this meager appropriations item requested at this time.

Under the proposed program, any person can buy Government insurance against flood loss on his home, firm, or business property up to prescribed amounts, at rates which may be from \$1 to \$2.50 per \$100 of coverage. The contracts will be sold and serviced by the private insurance industry.

I can think of no more economical way to operate this program than by using the personnel and facilities of the insurance industry on an actual cost basis. This is what the insurance industry has agreed to do, and it is convincing proof of their desire to make this new experiment in insurance a genuine success.

I earnestly implore my colleagues in the House to support this \$14 million appropriation item to implement the Federal flood-indemnity program.

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

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I concur in what my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut, has said as well as the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts and I concur with the gentleman from Massachusetts who has instituted this amendment.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I attended the flood-control conference called by the President and, together with the Governor of the State of Pennsylvania, at the request of the President. I was much impressed with the need for the program. I concur in and support the position that the gentleman from Massachusetts has taken.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that people living in areas which may be flooded live in perfect terror and fear of being wiped out? A

program such as this would do much to alleviate their loss.

Mr. MARTIN. I repeat, this legislation is a considered effort to help people help themselves. That is the heart of this program. It is not expected to be a continued expense upon the Government; it is an effort in time of need to give people a chance to have the insurance which would rescue them from disaster.

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

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I wish to ask a question of the chairman of the committee with regard to page 4 and amendments 11, 12, and 13 which were deleted in the Senate.

My question to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations with regard to that is: I understand there is a Senate bill pending which would accomplish the same objective, S. 1740, and I understand that it is the belief of the Committee on Appropriations that the matter should be handled in that manner, and that already some 16 beneficial companies have been taken care of; that there are 9 who do not have the benefit the other 16 already have.

Am I correct in understanding that, as a result of the Appropriations Committee's action they are covered in the Senate bill when it is enacted?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my interrogating the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] on the deletion of amendments Nos. 11, 12, and 13 under chapter V, Independent Offices, which "deletes language proposed by the Senate relating to the Federal employees' group life insurance fund" was to bring to light the effect this deletion has on many retired people who have group life insurance with beneficial associations that have not as yet been taken over under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended in 1955, some 9 of some 25 of such groups, and some 90,000 people who have no redress if Congress doesn't give some relief this year.

The deleted language eliminates \$180,000 to appropriate this amount for payment from the employees' life insurance fund expenses incurred by the Civil Service Commission in assuming and maintaining the assets and liabilities of certain beneficial associations, a program entered into under the 1954 act but which must be abandoned so far as the remaining 9 associations with slightly over 90,000 policyholders thus put in jeopardy. Since the act of August 11, 1955, amending the 1954 act, the Commission has assumed the assets and liabilities of 16 such beneficial associations, leaving these 9 yet unassumed, and the Commission is without time—act expires August 17—or money to complete the job already embarked upon.

It certainly is unfair to have the United States undertake to assume the assets and liabilities of only a part of the beneficial associations and a part of the policyholders. Why should some

90,000 policyholders in some 9 associations be discriminated against? Congress is responsible as the results of the 1954 act for jeopardizing these associations by enacting the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act, and recognized this would be the case by passing the 1955 act giving some relief.

I brought out in debate that the Senate has had favorably reported to it S. 1740 by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and I trust that it will be passed promptly, this bill authorizing the continuation of the program under the 1955 act and protecting these 90,000 policyholders. My purpose was to call this situation to the attention of the House and to elicit from the Committee on Appropriations the thought that the amount was eliminated mainly because of the possible question that the spending of the money had not been sufficiently authorized and that the committee thus was not necessarily opposed to it in principle. I trust immediate action will be taken by the Senate, and I urge the House to act favorably on the matter as well.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, we have spent some money in perfecting this experiment and we are about ready to go ahead. Let us not stop now. Let us spend these few millions requested in the hope that it will save the country many millions later. People overcome by great disasters have a right to expect aid from their Government.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I realize full well the complex problems relating to the adoption of an adequate, equitable, flood-insurance bill.

When I first appeared before our very distinguished House Committee on Banking and Currency during the hearings on the original proposal, I expressed myself very definitely on the point that any worthwhile flood-insurance program would have to apportion the risk over the entire field on the principle of the war risk insurance laws. However, this principle was not accepted. On the other hand, another approach was adopted by the committee which worked long and zealously, and this one was finally adopted by the Congress last year.

I presume that no one, including the committee which labored long and diligently to perfect suitable legislation, would contend that the bill adopted was completely satisfactory or adequate. It was reported and passed with the distinct understanding that it was a beginning, so to speak, that would inaugurate a period of experimentation in order that with some experience in this difficult field a program could be finally evolved that would do the job that will have to be done in order to afford sufficient protection for flood-stricken areas.

I still adhere to my original concept that such a bill should be much broader in its coverage. I recognize the difficulties that are implicit in such a broad-gauged measure. First, it would be necessary, as I think it is with regard to all proposals of this kind, to write into the legislation safeguards for our private enterprise system. This Congress must

be most zealous not to set up needless competition with the private companies. At the same time we have every reason to expect the cooperation of private companies and recognition on their part that the Nation is confronted with a major problem regarding flood insurance that must be solved by something more than the mere creation of makeshift provisions.

When we consider the large number of floods and natural disasters that occur every year in this country and the great damage and havoc that is wrought and the stultification of incentive and enterprise that frequently results as an aftermath, it seems shocking indeed that the Congress should turn its back during this session upon the flood-insurance legislation which we enacted during the last session. The proposed abandonment of the flood-insurance program is neither wise, nor can it be logically justified on the grounds of economy or any other grounds. The few million dollars that are involved here in order to carry last year's program forward are of little or no consequence in the overall budget of over \$73 billion. In fact, the amount sought is negligible and petty as compared with huge sums we are spending abroad and at home for many causes far less worthy and certainly less urgent.

None of us can be sure of the degree of urgency that is involved in this legislation because great, fearsome, natural disasters, floods caused by violent sustained storms, tornadoes and other holocausts, protracted droughts, wind and sand storms, devastating fires, and other destructive natural phenomena would seem to be on the increase.

There are some who believe that the large number of severe storms, climatic phenomena, tornadoes, and the like that we have been having recently are attributable to current nuclear experiments, in fact, many things seem rightly or wrongly to be attributed to these man-made explosions designed to perfect substances of apparently almost infinite, global destructibility. Notwithstanding the assurances of the scientists and experts, many thoughtful American citizens are not persuaded that there is not some relation between nuclear explosions and recent natural disasters stemming from violent, torrential storms. I am not asserting that there is necessarily any relation between the two, because I have not had the opportunity to study the question at any great length, but the occurrence of so many of these holocausts serves vividly to bring forcibly to our attention the need for adequate Government organization to cope with them, and this includes not only flood insurance, but the adoption of other proposals improving our readiness and efficiency in handling these disasters which I have heretofore touched upon in the House and about which, unfortunately, in the broader sense, the Congress has not as yet taken affirmative action.

To be sure, we have made substantial provisions for relief and rehabilitation of distressed areas and on the whole these have been carried out by the Government. In the case of storms and disasters in my own district and area and in other areas, I may say with pride and

gratitude that the Congress has acted to provide assistance and to inaugurate projects that will materially reduce, if not entirely eliminate, many future dangers. In my appearance before our distinguished House Appropriations Committee recently in support of additional budgetary implementation of existing projects, I was happy to note what seemed to me to be a commendable understanding of these problems and a cooperative spirit and purpose to further their solution. I have every reason to believe that pending legislation will appropriate sufficient funds to carry forward the urgent projects that have been commenced.

It is to the broader aspects that I am addressing myself, first, with regard to natural disasters, and, secondly, with regard to so-called manmade disasters which may seem remote—and we hope they are and believe they will be—but which nevertheless are definitely within the range of possibility, however much we may seek to persuade ourselves to the contrary. In other words, it is to every eventuality, and not merely to some, that I direct the attention of the House, and this would include provisions for an overall, fully integrated, comprehensive program that would entail the creation of an adequate, ready organization that could be promptly mobilized both in its military and civilian components and rush speedily into the breach whenever the need arises.

I am convinced that Congress should consider these matters in the very broadest sense. I particularly urge the adoption of all pending appropriations that have been approved by the committee up to this time with respect to flood and water control and the implementation of the flood-insurance program in its entirety, so that we may go forward as heretofore authorized and planned with the proposed experimentation program that will point out the ways and means by which we can finally come to an effective solution.

Let us by all means continue to practice commendable economy which we so badly need today to insure the American people some relief from staggering burdens of taxation. But as we effectuate economy and efficiency, let us not be blind to the stern fact that we must achieve these desirable needs without paralyzing or impairing legitimate essential activities of government. Economy achieved at the expense of vital governmental programs would be merely an illusion and in the end would defeat its own purpose by stultifying the progress of the Nation and jeopardizing the security, well-being, and happiness of the American people. If we avoid irrational penury as well as extravagant spending, we will best be serving the paramount national interest.

The distinguished majority leader, my valued friend, Mr. McCORMACK, with his usual forward-looking approach, judgment, and ability, in an exceedingly meritorious, able, recent speech on the Federal Flood Indemnity Administration, has presented an unanswerable plea for the further implementation of the previously established flood insurance system. Our very able, much beloved, val-

ued friend, the distinguished minority leader, Mr. MARTIN, is in strong support of flood insurance. The House voted last year to commence this most necessary program, only \$14 million is required to put the program into effect, if this sum is voted by the House existing plans can be put into operation immediately, the matter has been exhaustively studied and documented, the Government would not be competing with private insurance companies, Congress would be fully informed of the progress of the experiment so that, if necessary, perfecting action might be taken. These are the plain facts.

Many safeguards are contained in the bill to minimize the Government's potential liability. I allude to the limited coverage of \$10,000 for single dwellings and their contents. The mere statement of this amount clearly indicates and establishes the strict limitations on Government liability.

I am in a position, personally, to testify on this phase of the question because as a consequence of the 1955 flood disaster in my district, one company is said to have spent about \$1 million to rehabilitate its plant and continue the employment of about 3,000 employees. Other companies spent very substantial sums for this purpose, and many of them really could not afford it. Many people lost everything. Flood insurance would greatly mitigate disaster, hardships, and damages.

Conditions are written into the act strictly limiting the Government's liability, the risks will be spread over a relatively broad field, no policy can be issued indiscriminately, and zoning provisions must be enacted by appropriate public bodies which will insure even greater restrictions upon Government liability.

The rating system which has now been devised is not permanently fixed, but will be revised and reshaped in accordance with actual experience.

Floods, tornadoes, great natural disasters are no respecters of section, States, areas, or persons. They strike anywhere without warning, they wreck indescribable havoc and damage to persons and property. They leave trails of tragedy, sorrow, privation, and extensive damage. They inflict a national loss as well as State and local losses.

They are happening so frequently these days that it must be, it inevitably will be, the duty of Congress to cope with them. Lip service is not enough. Hoping that they will not happen is a palpable delusion. They will happen and we cannot foresee where they will strike. Yesterday it was my district and State. Tomorrow it could be the district and State of any other Member of this House. Let us act before it is too late, and let us act in a way that will render maximum, organized, speedy, efficient, and economical help to suffering people who will need it so badly. No amount of clever argument can possibly obscure the true urgency for flood insurance. I hope and urge that the House will support this amendment to recede and agree.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, a few years ago when this legislation was under consideration by the House, we had in New England and on the eastern seaboard from Florida to Maine a territory which had suffered one of the worst hurricane seasons in our history. Following that the west coast, including the States of California, Oregon, and Washington, suffered some of the worst floods in their history. As a result of those disasters, appeals were made to Congress and money was appropriated to help in those areas both on the eastern seaboard and also in California, Oregon, and Washington because of the severe losses that were sustained.

At that time it was suggested this might be a regional problem that concerned only New England and the eastern seaboard or California, Oregon, and Washington. That no longer is true. In this present year \$200 million of damage has occurred because of floods. The President has designated certain Midwestern States as disaster areas because of the recent tornados and floods that have occurred. Especially in the Southwest, in Texas and other States, they have suffered more damage this year perhaps than they have in many, many years.

As the author of the amendment, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] so well stated a while ago, this is not a \$5-billion program at all, although the Government is authorized to provide for coverage up to \$3 billion. It does not mean that the Federal Government is going to spend \$3 billion at all. It simply means they are going to offer this coverage and work in conjunction with the insurance companies, as a result of which the premiums will, we believe, cover the cost of such a program.

Mr. Speaker, the motion before us would restore funds to the Federal Flood Indemnity Administration and begin a program of flood insurance to offer protection to property owners throughout America.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I have some close acquaintanceship with this appropriation request. And I would suggest to the membership that the main issue before us is more important than the start or failure of a system of flood insurance. The overriding question is whether we are going to keep our people forever dependent upon handouts and charity or whether—by this vote—we will finally give them an opportunity to pay something toward their own protection. It is as clear as that: charity versus an American system of insurance.

As things stand today your constituents and mine cannot buy flood insurance. Private companies won't sell any and until we appropriate some money to get the Government program going they cannot buy Federal flood insurance.

There are people all over this country today who wish they had an opportunity to put money on the line to protect themselves from the catastrophe of floods.

As I previously stated, to date this year Americans have suffered some \$200 million property damage from floods, according to the latest Corps of Engineers

figures. The President has already declared areas in 11 States as flood disaster areas under Public Law 875. The States affected are Kentucky, West Virginia, Oregon, Virginia, Washington, Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Idaho, Missouri, and Arkansas. Twenty other States have suffered flood damage of lesser magnitude this year.

This is hardly a sectional issue. I'm from New England. We haven't had a flood yet this year. Thirty-two other States have. This is a national problem.

The man who owns his own home, whether it be near the shore or in communities along the rivers which flow through the State, is a substantial member of his community. His roots are established in that community. The taxes he pays to the community, the money he spends on family needs and utilities, go to the maintenance of that community. If through despair of ever being able to feel safe and secure from these damaging forces he pulls up stakes and goes elsewhere, the community, and each of its members, suffers to some extent.

Industry, whether it is of the small shop kind or a substantial manufacturer of goods, is the employer of thousands of people in the communities of our State. If the small shopkeeper becomes so discouraged that he will not endeavor to make a fresh start, or the stockholders who own the large manufacturing concerns decide that their investment must be protected by moving elsewhere, then the very lifeblood of the economic existence of the community is drawn off and the entire area withers. To my mind it is exactly this situation which a system of Federal insurance should be designed to prevent.

I recall vividly the situation in Providence, R. I., when hurricane warnings were raised. For weeks the economic life of the city was out of gear. The owners of businesses in the downtown area were vitally concerned with moving merchandise out of the reach of the waters which were expected to pour into the city. The feeling of frustration was terrific. The expressions of despair were many, and many times I heard men and women say they would never go through this experience again.

I have been told often by people in the insurance business that one of its greatest features is the peace of mind that it provides for the policyholder. With this thought I am in complete agreement.

Thousands of Americans today are relying upon charity and relief to repair or replace their homes, farms, and factories which were damaged by floods this year. They are hoping also that they will be able to deduct some of these losses from their next income-tax returns.

Neither is the Federal Treasury escaping any losses because of the lack of insurance. The 11 disaster areas are eligible for millions of dollars of Federal relief. Internal Revenue will feel the pinch when the next filing time rolls around.

Mr. Speaker, is this economy? Or is this any way for us to treat our constituents?

We are being asked today to start an experimental program that will protect millions of Americans from the sudden catastrophe of unexpected floods. It replaces no private enterprises existing today because there are none in this field. It will not establish a large Federal establishment because the Government will use the services of private insurance industry to sell and service these policies.

Although the Government is authorized to cover \$3 billion worth of property, this is not an expenditure. We believe premium income will substantially cover loss payments to property holders.

But this insurance will give Americans the opportunity to protect themselves from flood losses for the first time in history. I cannot think of a more equitable system.

I urge the restoration of flood-insurance funds.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON].

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, this is certainly not a political piece of legislation, it is not a partisan piece of legislation, it is not a sectional piece of legislation. The distinguished minority leader commented on the fact that the President wanted this legislation. May I say to all of those within my hearing today that I believe the people of America want this type of legislation and are entitled to it.

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

Mr. LENNON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. In all fairness, I think it should be stated that former President Truman recommended this type of legislation also.

Mr. LENNON. I thank the gentleman for his remark. We should not consider in any light that this is partisan legislation.

Let me say to those of you who are present that in October 1954 my congressional district suffered the greatest damage of any section of America by Hurricane Hazel. Twelve hundred buildings completely destroyed in 2 counties of my Congressional district, 750 homes were more than half destroyed and damage ran into the millions of dollars.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that this insurance is not now available in America at any cost, at any price that you may be able to pay. The legislation itself provides that by July of 1958 the States must enact ordinances that will set up flood-preventive measures in order that this insurance program may become a success. In July of 1959 the act provides that the several States who participate in this program must share a part of the subsidy or cost. The act now provides that the Government will pay 40 percent of the premium and the policyholder will pay 60 percent; but, after July 1959, the States must come in and share part of the expense. I think that is right.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has made a fine statement and I want to compliment him on the statement he has made.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I was just thinking, when they were talking about the terrible damage that had been inflicted by these floods, that if we had had this insurance in vogue at that time it would not have been a \$2-billion or a \$3-billion but it might well have been a \$5-billion obligation on the part of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, the \$14 million written into the independent offices appropriation bill by the other body was given full consideration by our Subcommittee on Appropriations in hearings held some months ago.

The Housing and Home Finance Agency at that time asked for a \$50-million appropriation, of which \$14 million, they felt, would be necessary to pay private insurance companies for writing the first year's business.

They had held many conferences with insurance organizations who were quite willing to cooperate, and out of those conferences it was mutually agreed that it would require about \$14 million to pay the agents and the expense of putting a year's business on the books.

Now, inasmuch as the Housing and Home Finance Agency would be by law compelled to pay a subsidy of 40 percent of the cost of the premium for the insured, it was estimated that the Government's part of the subsidy for the first year would run \$36 million. This would cause the Government a total loss the first year of \$50 million.

The Members of our committee, based on the facts brought out in the hearings, felt it was not wise to approve the flood-indemnity-insurance program, which would put the Federal Government into the insurance business in a big way on a plan, we felt, from an economic standpoint, just could not be successful.

The Housing Administrator, Mr. Cole, and his assistants explained that the premium rates on the insurance risk written would vary somewhere between \$1.50 and \$13.50 a hundred on premium rates.

I believe they testified that they thought the average might be around \$3 per hundred. Even though the Government would be committed to pay 40 percent of all such insurance premiums, we felt that the premiums would still be so high that enough business could not be written to justify the amount of money the Government would risk, and the danger of tremendous losses.

I think we know that successful insurance companies, which have built up a tremendous business over 100 years past, of necessity, had to follow a policy of scattering their risks so widely that a great deal more premium money would come into the companies in excess of the losses they would have to pay out. All of these companies have used great care in selecting their risks. Where the risk is too great, they will not write it because, consequently, the losses would be too great.

Throughout the years, the best insurance brains in the Nation have consistently refused to write flood indemnity insurance in any substantial volume be-

cause they felt the risk was too dangerous.

Now, the Government proposes to go into this nonselective bad risk insurance, and realizes it is so bad that they will have to start out with taking a loss of 50 percent of the premiums involved of the insurance that is written. In addition to that, they have to hire the insurance companies to go out and get the business, and put it on the books, and that is what this \$14 million requested in this bill is for. The insurance companies take none of the risk whatsoever. In addition, if we approve this \$14 million, I feel quite sure the Housing Agency feels they can go direct to the Treasury and get the other \$36 million which we will have to spend in paying 40 percent of the cost of the premiums written.

So, we lose on the first year's business \$50 million, and if we get started we may lose over \$5 billion in a year in attempting to do the unheard of in indemnity insurance. By the "unheard of" I mean—and this is the greatest objection to this program—that we propose to insure property against flood danger—all of which is the very worst possible risk that could be taken, and none of the risk could be graded as fair, or desirable.

We can only insure the people living along the valleys and streams who are willing, with the assistance of the Government, to pay high insurance rates against ultimate disaster that they fear and have reason to believe will follow.

In other words, no high-grade minimum-risk insurance will be written. All will be poor risk, and undesirable from an economic standpoint.

We just cannot afford to put the Government in business and add this expense, with the people demanding that the Government get out of business and that we cut the cost of appropriations.

A Member with long service in the House, in discussing this privately said to me the other day, "If we go into this flood indemnity business in a big way, it could, added to all the other pressing fiscal problems, wreck the financial solvency of our Government."

Because of these objections and many others, we felt and advised the Housing and Home Finance Agency to use \$325,000 in making a further study of this problem in the hope of coming up with a plan that would offer some possibilities of success without too great cost to the Government.

We felt that the present plan was too dangerous to adopt, but we wanted to give the Housing and Home Finance Agency an opportunity for further study to see if they could present a more acceptable plan to the committee at a later date.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I do not want anybody to feel that I have less sympathy than somebody else for those who are in trouble over floods. But I want you to get a little idea of what this would mean. Under this bill houses may be insured for up to \$10,000 at a cost of approximately \$300 a year. If you buy

fire insurance the premium for \$10,000 under ordinary circumstances, on individual houses, would only be about \$60 for 3 years, or \$20 a year. This bill is set up so that the Federal Government pays the 40 percent commission to the agents. That is why they want this money.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. BOLAND. I do not think that is quite accurate.

Mr. TABER. Oh, yes.

Mr. BOLAND. That the Federal Government pays 40 percent commission to the agents?

Mr. TABER. Forty percent commission, on these premiums, goes to the agents. That is the practice.

Mr. BOLAND. I still insist the gentleman is not correct.

Mr. TABER. I did not make the statement without checking.

Mr. BOLAND. Will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. TABER. The gentleman has had the opportunity for that. I do not think I can yield further, because I do not have sufficient time. Here is the picture. If we go into this and get it started and provide the first money for it, it rolls. And what will it roll to? Five hundred million a year for 6 years; and in addition, if the President so elects, \$2 billion more or \$5 billion over all, to come out of the Federal Treasury.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. I understood that this bill provided that the Government would pay 40 percent of the premiums, not 40 percent commission to the agent.

Mr. TABER. That is what the commission to the agent is. I did not make that statement without finding out.

Mr. MORANO. I understood the commission to the agent would be 9 percent and the Government would pay 40 percent of the premium.

Mr. TABER. That is the situation, and frankly, I do not want to get into a \$5 billion proposition. This authorizing bill was put through the House without any rollcall; most of the Members did not know it was up. That was, I believe, at the close of the last session. I do not like to have these bills go through like that without sufficient consideration. I want the membership of the House to know what is going on. Now we have that situation. When you get into this, you are getting into the neighborhood of \$5 billion of expense. If you do not stop it now we are in over our heads. The Government guarantees all the losses on these things, and the money can come right out of the Treasury without any appropriation or any review. The whole thing is wide open just as soon as we pass this appropriation to start the thing rolling.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from New York rightly brought out that to insure a \$10,000 risk

there would be a premium of approximately \$300.

Mr. TABER. For 1 year.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Would that not make it practically impossible for anybody even to insure under this Act unless he felt that his risk was so tremendous that he almost was forced to do so?

Mr. TABER. There would not be any question about that. I am afraid there would not be enough policies sold so that there would be a possibility of getting in money enough in premiums to pay the losses we would have. I do not see how it could be done.

When these people were before the Independent Offices Appropriations Committee my understanding is that they did not have a real, good, definite program, after having had \$500,000 available to them for 7 or 8 months. On top of that, they had spent only about \$150,000 when they were up before the committee, and they had \$300,000 left. With that they could get up a real program, instead of coming in here without a definite, positive program.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, let there be no misunderstanding about it, this is one of the most dangerous amendments that has been offered in this session. It does not involve mere millions of dollars, it involves billions of dollars.

One Member speaking here just now told us that in one downpour alone, in his district, 1,200 houses were washed away. Multiply that by the storms annually and by the 435 congressional districts in the Nation and make an estimate. Or consult the daily newspapers through the year and you will see that it is merely a matter of a comparatively brief time before a bill will be presented to the Federal Treasury for payment, and every taxpayer in the Nation will start digging up the coin to make up the deficit.

All over the country areas subject to inundation and shouldering their own responsibilities for a hundred years will be taking a free ride and the Government and the taxpayers will be holding the bag and paying the bill.

The title of this bill ought to be changed. It ought to be captioned, "A bill to increase the taxes of every Federal taxpayer in the United States," for that is exactly what it will do if this amendment is adopted. It will increase taxes by billions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, nearly every annual budget that comes up here has some damfool estimate in it that throws all former figures completely out of balance. And when we ask "How in the world is it that this budget is so out of all proportion to what it was last year?" The answer is that Congress passed some new law authorizing appropriations for some new project.

Thereupon everybody joins in apostatizing the legislative committees and demanding that these new authorizations expanding and mushrooming the costs of government when we ought to be reducing and contracting the expenses of government should be stopped at the source.

And here we are at the source, Mr. Speaker. If left in here this amendment will spiral and pyramid and expand, and all hope of tax reduction will be further away than ever. This amendment ought to be cut off right behind the ears. Let us right here, right now, lean a few props up against the tottering doors of the United States Treasury instead of pouring in more nitroglycerine behind the few hinges still hanging in futile effort to keep out the raiders.

But, Mr. Speaker, we sit here in wonder and astonishment this afternoon listening to these gentlemen who have been making the welkin ring all this session with screams to keep the Government out of business. On all and sundry occasions, in season and out of season, they march into this well vociferously demanding that we keep the Government out of business. And now these same identical gentlemen are demanding that we put the Government in business—the insurance business.

The country is literally littered with insurance companies. There is an insurance agent around every corner waiting to waylay you. You can insure your house, your life, your wife, your automobile, and what have you. You can insure anywhere, anytime, anything—except one thing. You cannot insure against flood. Why not? Because the insurance companies are too smart. They know they are certain to lose. Those whose property is subject to inundation will take out a policy. Those not subject to inundation will not take out a policy. It is "tails I win, heads you lose." There is no possible way to break even. So they start looking around for a fall guy. And who but Uncle Sam and the taxpayer. Extra copies of the roll call on this coming vote ought to be printed and distributed to taxpayers. And then when they hear some knight in shining armor caterwauling about keeping the Government out of business just before the November election let them run down the list and see if he voted on June 18, 1957, to put the Government in the insurance business.

Someone insists we ought to go into the insurance business as an experiment. They are unwilling to abide by the experience of every insurance company in the country. The insurance companies which have tried it have wound up with all the experience and none of the money.

And Uncle Sam has already tried it. The Government has tried every possible combination on crop insurance. I started it when I was chairman of the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations. We worked for years on it but the farmers who knew they would have a crop failure insured and the farmers who knew they would not have a crop failure would not insure. When the drought at seeding time indicated certain failure

the farmers took out a policy. And after a late flood farmers would drive in a wet field and scratch up a little dirt and throw around a little seed and collect the insurance. As usual the Government got the experience and the farmer got the money. To the desperate farmer, robbed and exploited by the rest of the Nation who took his hard-earned produce away from him at less than cost of production it was a case of the blind sow finding an acorn once in a while.

It is not an experiment. It has already been weighed in the balance and found wanting. It cannot fill any legitimate need in the economic life of the country. It puts the Government back into business—a business doomed to certain failure. It expands the cost and function of Government with no compensating advantage. It was defeated here in the House when it was first on the floor in the original bill.

To all my friends whose hearts are bleeding for the downtrodden taxpayer, may I suggest that here is at last an opportunity for you to give a reason for the faith that is in you. Here is a chance to ride horse and dragoon to the rescue of the taxpayer—not by eloquence and perfervid oratory—not by heroic platform declaration or challenging release to the press, but by your vote. By your vote to defeat this amendment and keep down taxes and keep the Government out of business.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks following Mr. CANNON.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee has worked so diligently on the multitude of matters before him that he has been unable to study the details of the problem. The proposed act does not put the Government in the insurance business. It merely allows the private companies to extend risks which ordinarily would not be taken. If these risks pass a certain stage, the Federal Government stands behind the loss. These people pay a premium, so this is not like many of the proposals supported by the gentleman from Missouri, such as the giveaway farm programs. In any event, people on Long Island would like to be able to insure their houses and property against the ravages of hurricane. The gentleman from Missouri is killing their chances.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of the motion that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15 and agree to

the same, in order to provide the sum of \$14 million, to remain available until expended, for operating the Federal flood insurance program. The adoption of this motion will signal the initiation of the Federal flood insurance program. In so doing, we reassure our citizens that the Congress was sincere when it passed the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956 and held out to the public at least partial security from flood damage.

In 1955 flood losses in our Nation cost about \$1 billion. The Congress determined that some legislative program was necessary to minimize the losses suffered by citizens in such disasters, as well as to relieve the amount of direct Federal and State aid for relief, rehabilitation, and charity. In this regard, permit me to direct the attention of our members to Public Law 875 of the 81st Congress, which authorizes the President to determine when certain catastrophes may be classified as major disasters. Public Law 875 provides that the governor of the State involved must request that the law be invoked and give assurance of the use of a reasonable amount of funds by the State or local governments for relief. Since the enactment of Public Law 875 in 1950, the appropriations thereunder have mounted to over \$90 million.

Now for the first time our citizens have an opportunity to contribute to their protection. The reduction in flood losses in 1956 and the present economy wave cannot remove our responsibility to the public who overwhelmingly requested the Federal flood insurance program.

Unless the House takes action now, the Congress must tell the American people—the small property owner, the small-business man—that after almost 1 year we are not yet ready to proceed with the program. At the same time the Federal Flood Indemnity Administrator has testified that the Federal flood insurance program is ready to be put into operation promptly.

It should be made clear that the item of \$14 million is for operating expenses of the program and is not required for the payment of salaries to employees of the FFIA staff. The amount is required to cover the expenses of insurance companies for issuing and servicing policies, underwriting, accounting, and statistical work on behalf of the Government. In other words, the item of \$14 million is for the express purpose of providing the operating expenses to the private insurance companies that will write the contracts, will sell the insurance, and adjust the losses.

The objections that have been offered to appropriating this amount are easily overcome. If anyone is of the opinion that this program means the Government is getting into the insurance business, let us dispel that fear by pointing out that the Government is prohibited from so doing by the plain language of section 12 (a) of the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956, which provides as follows:

No insurance or reinsurance, or loan contract, shall be issued under the provisions of this act covering risks against which insurance is available on reasonable terms from other public or private sources.

There certainly cannot be objection to the fact that a portion of the requested amount is for expenses to be paid claim adjusters for their services in handling the settlement of claims. The payment of compensation for services rendered by outside specialists cannot be criticized. Such practice is not without precedent in the administration of other Federal programs. On the other hand, it means that the Government will not be called upon to recruit a large staff and to employ claim adjusters whose services would, of course, only be needed if and when losses should occur.

It is a sad reflection upon the House when we realize that by rejecting this item we are, in effect, nullifying our action last year when we passed the Federal flood-insurance law. That legislation was enacted only after days and days of extensive hearings and after lengthy studies and surveys were submitted. The insurance industry itself has assisted and cooperated in the organization of the Federal Flood Indemnity Administration. Rates have been established for each major river basin in the United States, and these rates have been reviewed and approved by the industry itself. It is my understanding that the program includes adequate safeguards that will maintain a proper balance between premium and loss reserves. Admittedly, then, there is no justification to the argument that additional studies are needed.

Obviously, the Federal flood-insurance program is not designed to benefit big business, which can well afford the high premiums that would necessarily be required by private insurance companies for insuring risks of this nature. The adoption of this motion, however, will reassure thousands of citizens, such as our small-business man and the ordinary homeowner, that the Congress is not abandoning them and leaving them at the mercy of Federal aid in the form of charity.

My State of West Virginia was stricken by the severe floods early this year. Parts of West Virginia, Virginia, and Kentucky, were declared areas of major disaster by the President. Pursuant to the authority under Public Law 875, the President has allotted to these States the sum of \$2.4 million for flood relief. On May 29, 1957, Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, president of the American National Red Cross, forwarded to me the final field report summarizing the Red Cross relief activities in these three States. That report showed that, while a total of 17,469 families were affected by the floods, 9,512 families received assistance. This assistance involved expenditures of \$3,963,231.

These figures make it evident that, if we do not appropriate these necessary funds, we cannot rightly say that we are effectuating a saving. As a matter of fact, we are disregarding the will of our people who are eager to contribute to their own protection. By making possible such contributions, the net effect might well be to reduce Government expenditures in flood emergencies and, thus, provide a real savings to the American taxpayers.

In view of these facts, I sincerely hope that the motion will be adopted.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, let me talk briefly to both sides of the aisle on this problem. I do not know too much about it, but I have been studying it hard, I assure you, and if you know anything much about this bill, you are much better than I am because I do not think you can know much about it in the shape that it is in. There is nothing partisan about this subject matter. This has been tried before and it has been studied before. Read the report from that able committee headed by the able gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] in 1951 when we had the tremendous flood all through the Middle Western States along the Missouri River, when that one flood alone cost \$2,500,000,000 in damages. There is nothing partisan about it and there is nothing new about this subject. We have had floods for the last 100 years in this country, and I am sure and I am afraid that we will have them in the years to come regardless of what we do or do not do here today. Floods are horrible and they are heart-breaking, but still we know we are going to have them because we have had them in the past. There is no telling what this program will cost.

Read the report I referred to a while ago, the report back in 1951 when they had all the top private insurance company executives in American before the committee. Who are we to disagree with those gentlemen who with their predecessors have been in the insurance business for from 50 to 100 years. They said, "Gentlemen, it will not work. It cannot work. It is not a proper field for insurance because nobody is going to buy such insurance unless he is reasonably certain that he is going to suffer damages." And, yet, we are putting our expert opinion up against the opinions of those gentlemen. Does it not really make us look a little bit foolish? Those representatives of the insurance companies say it will not work and that it is too expensive. I have figured out that if we had had this insurance in effect in 1951 when we had that horrible flood throughout Missouri and the other States—if we had had only one-fifth the coverage allowed under this act—we would have lost in excess of \$450 million at that time. Think about it. Who is going to pay for that? Your taxpayers and mine are going to pay the bill.

My country is under water, too; a lot of it. Some part of it has been getting under water for a good many years, and I am sure that for a good many years in the future it will continue that way. Yet you do not want to listen now.

Our Hoover Commission friends said, "Get our Government out of business. Get us out of business." I can hear them hollering now all the way from Houston up here about getting the Government out of business; and my friends from Massachusetts and South Carolina can hear it, too; yet here we are about to embark on a business where the probabilities are the loss will exceed \$500 million a year. If anybody can controvert that statement, he is all right in my estimation.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. BOLAND. I do not like to dispel the argument of the gentleman from Texas, because he is one of the most persuasive of men in the House. He kills us with kindness most of the time but winds up killing the bill.

The testimony before the committee was that there would be no loss totaling the amount the gentleman has mentioned.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman's guess is as good as mine. He said the loss will not be large. I say it will be. Certainly the gentleman would not say there would be no loss under the bill.

But let us get back to the matter I was talking about, getting the Government out of business.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. Just one minute, are you going to have the Government pay for forest-fire insurance? We have had some terrible ones. Are we going to put the Government in drought insurance? We have had more droughts in the last 7 years than we have had floods. Those droughts have cost many States a lot of money, and my friends out there in the drought area certainly are as much entitled to relief as those in the flood areas. And some of my friends out on the Pacific coast have had some earthquakes. Are they not entitled to subsidized earthquake insurance, too?

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me. I have worked rather hard on this.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman certainly did.

Mr. WHITTEN. Here is what I would like to say for the record. The evidence is that most of the damage in these floods come from people who push closer and closer down to the water level. If this bill is passed where the Government would pick up the check, you would find the people getting into the more risky areas day after day, adding to the problem the gentleman has mentioned.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the gentleman very much. He is 100 percent correct.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I must yield to my friend from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Does the gentleman claim that a Government insurance program would not be putting the Government in business?

Mr. THOMAS. Does the gentleman deny that?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. It would be putting them in business.

Mr. THOMAS. It might be a give-away business.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. What has the gentleman to say about war insurance, when we gave each man a \$10,000 policy during the war when no insurance company would write such a policy as that?

Mr. THOMAS. We had 20 million men under arms at that time. There is no more connection between that and this form of insurance than there is between daylight and dark.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. How much is twenty million times ten thousand?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, this item ought to be deleted, this \$14 million. Do you know what the request was when this first came to us? It was \$100 million. Then they called a second confab, and do you know what their second request was? \$50 million. Now my friends take a third bite at it and they set the figure at \$14 million. If you give them \$100, you might just as well give them \$100 million, because they will be back here next Monday asking for the remainder.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. PILLION. Whether we invest \$14 million or \$500 million, will we be able to save one life or avoid one tornado or one hurricane, or minimize the loss in any way?

Mr. THOMAS. May I thank the gentleman for bringing that point out. We have had these terrible floods in the past and will have them in the future, whether we have this program or do not have it. It is not going to save any lives.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. That is not the issue, the matter raised by the gentleman from New York. It is not a question of saving lives; it is a question of saving people who are in these areas from disaster. It gives them an opportunity to get on their feet.

Mr. THOMAS. A gentleman stated a while ago that if we adopt this program we are going to save the money that the Government is now spending for disaster relief. There never was a more sincere but a more erroneous statement made on the floor than that, because we appropriate money every year, \$20 to \$25 million for the President, regardless of which party he belongs to, for relief purposes. How is that money allocated? Is it allocated to aid a particular State? The President must first examine the area in a State and designate that as a relief area. Then the money goes to that particular State and that State allocates the money, not to A, B, or C, but allocates it on a community basis. Let us get this point straight. The act is so defective that the State and the counties and the political subdivisions under it cannot get one red 5-cent piece. Does anybody challenge that?

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Did I not hear the gentleman in his committee recommend some funds for this organization to go ahead with the program?

Mr. THOMAS. Did we or did we not?

Mr. CANFIELD. Did the gentleman not recommend some fund, the gentleman and his committee?

Mr. THOMAS. No.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield to me, we did carry an appropriation last year of \$500,000, of which \$300,000 is left.

Mr. THOMAS. About \$175,000 now.

Mr. CANFIELD. Did the gentleman not recommend that when he last appeared before the House?

Mr. THOMAS. I think you have \$175,000 left to study it. Let them study the matter and get these horrible conflicts out of the way.

Do you know what this act does? It is possible to have \$5 billion in insurance outstanding at one time. It is possible for the Administrator to go to the Treasury and bypass the Congress and get \$500 million. If the President says, "O. K." he can go back without coming to the Congress—get this, without coming to the Congress—and get how much more, do you know?

Mr. CANFIELD. No, I do not know.

Mr. THOMAS. Any amount, five, ten or fifteen million dollars—think of it—without the Congress ever saying one thing about it.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentleman's committee is keeping the organization in business.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote now. We have debated this matter extensively. The amendment ought to be voted down. If you give them \$14 million they are in business and they will be back here in less than 10 days looking, and your guess is as good as mine, for five to one-hundred million dollars more.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from California?

Mr. JACKSON. I want to ask a question. Last summer my district in California suffered from a disastrous fire that swept through the mountains out there. Many homes were wiped out, homes which could not be insured because of their location. Now, the analogy is complete. There is no difference between one of those homes in those mountains and a place that cannot be insured. It is only one short step from flood insurance to fire insurance to drought insurance and to other forms of insurance.

Mr. THOMAS. If your people are entitled to flood insurance they are entitled to fire insurance.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. I think I can say to the membership of the House that flood insurance is not generally available to the public throughout this Nation. There is not a Member here who advocates this program who would want this program if that insurance were available, but flood insurance is not available. Fire insurance is available all over the Nation.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, the reason flood insurance is not available is that the experience of these people who

have been in the business for a hundred years shows it will not work. Now, if it would work, it would be available.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. I should like to point out that in addition to the fund which the chairman has indicated—the President's emergency fund—there is also available the Federal civil defense disaster relief fund through which aid can be given and has been promised; also the Red Cross goes into areas where they have these particular disasters; also there are available assists from the Corps of Engineers, and the States and the municipalities, so that when flood disaster strikes there is always an abundance of aid made available from various sources without the need of the Congress subsidizing insurance companies for embarking on a new program.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. A vote of "nay" on this motion to recede is a vote to reject this operation.

Mr. THOMAS. And I hope everybody votes "Nay."

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. I do not see how you can compare fire insurance with flood insurance. Anybody can buy insurance against fire, so how can you talk about fire insurance?

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman was talking about forest fires in his section where you cannot buy insurance because it is too expensive and the people would lose money on it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 15.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY) there were—ayes 95, noes 124.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 186, nays 218, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 115]

YEAS—186

Addonizio	Bonner	Curtis, Mass.
Albert	Breeding	Dawson, Utah
Alexander	Brooks, La.	Delaney
Anderson,	Broomfield	Dellay
Mont.	Brown, Ga.	Dempsey
Anfuso	Burdick	Denton
Aspinall	Byrd	Devereux
Auchincloss	Byrne, Pa.	Dingell
Avery	Canfield	Dixon
Baldwin	Carnahan	Dollinger
Baring	Carrigg	Donohue
Barrett	Celler	Dorn, N. Y.
Bass, N. H.	Chamberlain	Doyle
Bates	Chelf	Durham
Beckworth	Christopher	Eberharter
Bennett, Fla.	Chudoff	Edmondson
Bennett, Mich.	Clark	Elliott
Boggs	Corbett	Engle
Boland	Cretella	Farbstein
Bolling	Curtin	Fascell

Fenton
 Flood
 Fogarty
 Forand
 Fountain
 Freilinghuysen
 Fulton
 Gathings
 Gavin
 Gordon
 Granahan
 Gray
 Green, Pa.
 Gubser
 Hagen
 Hale
 Hardy
 Hays, Ark.
 Healey
 Heselton
 Hoeven
 Holland
 Holmes
 Jarman
 Jonas
 Jones, Ala.
 Karsten
 Kearns
 Kee
 Kelley, Pa.
 Kelly, N. Y.
 Keogh
 King
 Kitchin
 Kluczynski
 Lane
 Lanham
 Lankford
 Lennor
 Long
 McCarthy
 McCormack
 McFall

McIntire
 Macdonald
 Mack, Ill.
 Magnuson
 Martin
 May
 Meader
 Merrow
 Metcalf
 Miller, Calif.
 Miller, Md.
 Montoya
 Morano
 Morgan
 Morris
 Morrison
 Moss
 Moulder
 Multer
 Natcher
 Nicholson
 Norblad
 O'Brien, Ill.
 O'Brien, N. Y.
 O'Konski
 O'Neill
 Osmer
 Passman
 Patman
 Patterson
 Perkins
 Pfost
 Philbin
 Porter
 Price
 Prouty
 Rabaut
 Rains
 Reece, Tenn.
 Reuss
 Rhodes, Pa.
 Rivers
 Robison, Ky.

NAYS—218

Abbitt
 Abernethy
 Adair
 Alger
 Allen, Calif.
 Allen, Ill.
 Andersen,
 H. Carl
 Andrews
 Arends
 Ashmore
 Ayres
 Bass, Tenn.
 Baumhart
 Becker
 Belcher
 Berry
 Betts
 Blatnik
 Blitch
 Bolton
 Bosch
 Bow
 Boyle
 Bray
 Brooks, Tex.
 Brown, Mo.
 Brown, Ohio
 Brownson
 Broyhill
 Budge
 Burlinson
 Bush
 Byrne, Ill.
 Byrnes, Wis.
 Cannon
 Cederberg
 Chenoweth
 Chipperfield
 Church
 Clevenger
 Coad
 Cole
 Collier
 Colmer
 Cooley
 Cooper
 Coudert
 Cramer
 Cunningham,
 Nebr.
 Curtis, Mo.
 Dague
 Davis, Ga.
 Davis, Tenn.
 Dennison
 Derounian
 Dies
 Diggs
 Dooley
 Dorn, S. C.

Rodino
 Rogers, Colo.
 Rogers, Mass.
 Rooney
 Roosevelt
 Sadlak
 Santangelo
 St. George
 Saund
 Scott, N. C.
 Scott, Pa.
 Scudder
 Seely-Brown
 Shelley
 Shuford
 Sieminski
 Sikes
 Siler
 Simpson, Ill.
 Sisk
 Smith, Miss.
 Staggers
 Steed
 Sullivan
 Teller
 Thompson, La.
 Thompson, N. J.
 Trimble
 Udall
 Ullman
 Van Zandt
 Wainwright
 Watts
 Wharton
 Whitener
 Widnall
 Wigglesworth
 Wright
 Young
 Zablocki
 Zelenko

Simpson, Pa.
 Smith, Calif.
 Smith, Kans.
 Smith, Va.
 Smith, Wis.
 Spence
 Springer
 Stauffer
 Taber
 Talle
 Taylor
 Teague, Calif.
 Teague, Tex.

Tewes
 Thomas
 Thompson, Tex.
 Thomson, Wyo.
 Thornberry
 Tollefson
 Tuck
 Utt
 Vanik
 Van Pelt
 Vinson
 Vorys
 Vursell

NOT VOTING—29

Andresen,
 August H.
 Ashley
 Bailey
 Baker
 Barden
 Beamer
 Bentley
 Bowler
 Boykin
 Buckley
 Coffin
 Cunningham,
 Iowa
 Dawson, Ill.
 Hays, Ohio
 Hébert
 Hillings
 Holtzman
 Kean
 Loser
 McConnell

So the preferential motion was re-
jected.

The Clerk announced the following
pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Murray against.
 Mr. Holtzman for, with Mr. Loser against.
 Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Scherer against.
 Mr. Bailey for, with Mr. Kean against.
 Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Williams of New
 York against.
 Mr. Dawson of Illinois for, with Mr. Hill-
 ings against.
 Mr. Machrowicz for, with Mr. McConnell
 against.
 Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Beamer against.
 Mr. Ashley for, with Mr. Bentley against.
 Mr. Coffin for, with Mr. Williams of Mis-
 sissippi against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bowler with Mr. Cunningham of Iowa.
 Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. McIntosh.
 Mr. Barden with Mr. Baker.
 Mr. Boykin with Mr. Wilson of California.

Messrs. BOYLE, RHODES of Arizona,
 and YOUNGER changed their vote from
 "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. PATMAN and HAGEN changed
 their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on
the motion offered by the gentleman
from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask
 unanimous consent that all Members
 who have spoken on this matter may
 have permission to revise and extend
 their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to
 the request of the gentleman from New
 York [Mr. TABER]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will re-
 port the next amendment in disagree-
 ment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 17: On page 11,
line 14, insert:

"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"Acquisition of strategic minerals
 "For an additional amount for 'Acquisi-
 tion of strategic minerals', \$30 million."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move
 that the House insist upon its disagree-
 ment to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House insist
 upon its disagreement to the amendment of
 the Senate No. 17.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a
preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ENGLE moves that the House recede
 from its disagreement to the amendment of
 the Senate No. 17 and concur therein with
 an amendment as follows: In lieu of the
 matter proposed by said amendment insert:
 "Chapter VI, Department of the Interior,
 Office of the Secretary, acquisition of stra-
 tegic minerals. For an additional amount
 for 'acquisition of strategic minerals' \$10-
 000,000."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for
a division of the question.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it
is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5
 minutes to the gentleman from New
 York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the amend-
 ment before us calls for \$10 million
 to continue the subsidy on tungsten.
 Now, the situation is this: The Congress
 provided for a stockpile, and we have
 gone ahead and built up that stockpile,
 and we have now reached the point
 where we have enough tungsten on hand
 to last for 20 years if we had an extreme
 use of the metal in case of hostilities.
 That is the kind of a situation we are
 up against. The question is, Should we
 longer continue a subsidy on tungsten.

Now, for my own part, I cannot go
 along with that operation, because I do
 not feel that we have any right to put
 money into things that there is no pros-
 pect of being used. I think that we
 ought to protect the interests of the
 United States and have everything in
 the stockpile that we need, but we have
 got everything of that kind there now
 that we need, and why should we go
 further and pile it up?

I have seen reports in the newspapers
 relating to the production of tungsten.
 There was an article in one of the papers
 recently telling about a stockholders
 meeting where the president of the cor-
 poration that produced tungsten pri-
 marily told these people that they were
 going to be able to produce tungsten and
 sell it in the market at the regular price,
 which price is affected by importations,
 and he said that they were going to be
 able to produce tungsten and sell it for
 that price and that they could do it with-
 out any subsidy. Now, when one of them
 can, I believe that others can, and I can
 see no sense of our going along and pil-
 ing up enormous quantities of tungsten
 at a price away above the market price
 and at a time when we have enough on
 hand to last for 20 years of very active
 use of that article. Now, I do not believe
 that the ordinary fellow is getting too
 much of this subsidy. The information
 that seems to come in is that the big
 payments go to the big corporations
 whose other interests are paramount and
 with whom the tungsten proposition is
 a minor figure. I do not believe, if we
 are going on the basis of giving a gratui-
 ty to the small producers that we should
 approve a proposal under which most of
 the money goes to big producers. There
 may be many small producers, I would
 not want to say, but what they get rep-
 represents a very minor item as compared

with what is received by the large producers. I think it is time for the people of the United States, represented by their Members in Congress, to be careful about what we do this year. This year things are not as good as I wish they were because our appropriations are so high. But we should not make them higher by adding this item to the list.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. Frost].

Mrs. FROST. Mr. Speaker, the passage of this amendment to provide \$10 million for the purchase of strategic minerals is of grave importance to the people of Idaho. The livelihood of many of the people of Custer and Lemhi Counties—two of the counties in my congressional district—are desperately dependent upon what action we take here today.

But it is not only the people of my congressional district—and the people of the State of Idaho—who have their eyes on Congress right now. Good citizens everywhere are watching to see whether we are going to welch on our solemn word, given last session, to appropriate funds to implement Public Law 733.

The promise in question was made close to the end of the 2d session of the 84th Congress. At that time we appropriated \$21 million to finance the purchase of strategic minerals—including tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum—for the remainder of the calendar year of 1956, with the assurance that additional funds would be forthcoming to continue the purchase program in 1957.

Tungsten producers in Idaho—and elsewhere—took us at our word. Rather than close their mines down, and let their labor force scatter to the four winds, they kept on producing tungsten, and stockpiling it against the day when the new purchase program would swing into action.

As a result there was on hand—on the last date for which figures are available—an unsold tungsten backlog totaling about 220,000 tons.

It is now almost a year since Congress promised the funds to implement Public Law 733. Already many tungsten producers have been wiped out by the long delay in the passage of an appropriation item for which the Congress had already morally obligated itself.

Frankly, I do not know how I can go out and face the people of Custer and Lemhi Counties if we betray them here today—betray them unforgivably and indefensibly. We should appropriate the \$30 million we promised them, but since the Congress is not willing to do that, surely you will vote for the \$10 million this amendment provides.

Let me tell you briefly how serious the situation is for Custer and Lemhi Counties. Ima mine, which produces tungsten at Patterson, Idaho, is 1 of the 2 major mining operations in the area. It is Lemhi County's largest single taxpayer. The mine spends approximately \$100,000 in the region each month, and

has an annual payroll of over \$500,000. If a substantial appropriation to continue the tungsten-purchase program is not included in this bill today, I am told that Ima mine will close down within the month, throwing a large number of miners out of work, and stranding their families.

Now, I realize these figures are not too impressive to those of you who represent districts which have hundreds of large industries in them, with annual payrolls running into the millions. But in Lemhi and Custer Counties, the loss of an industry with an annual payroll of \$500,000 is a serious economic blow to the whole region. I wish I had time to read you some of the telegrams and letters I have received from citizens in all walks of life—merchants and miners, public officials and civic leaders—imploping me to do everything humanly possible to secure funds to continue the tungsten-purchase program—funds which we here in this Chamber solemnly promised would be forthcoming.

It is not only the miners and merchants of Idaho who will be hurt, however, if this amendment fails. We are taking a long chance with America's security.

It has been argued on this floor that we now have on hand in our stockpile a supply of tungsten sufficient to meet our military needs for 20 years to come. However, you have not heard any responsible military authority who is in a position to know about our requirements make such a statement. Those who have enough information to assess our needs—both our present military and industrial needs, and our long-range ones—say flatly the figure is closer to 6 years. And even then they can't be sure.

Right now this country is on the threshold of enormous new uses for tungsten—both military and industrial—and our needs may double or treble within the foreseeable future.

The original stockpiling program was designed to bring in enough tungsten for munitions—particularly for tungsten core shells, and basic armor-piercing shells and for special armaments. We are using tungsten in the development of heat-resistant metals for faster planes, for high-temperature alloys for rockets, and for light-weight radiation shielding essential to atomic aircraft. When it is alloyed with carbon it constitutes the hardest of all manmade materials.

If the accelerated technology in many fields increases the requirements for tungsten to the extent now forecast, our present tungsten stockpile could evaporate in a very short time. This is a chance we cannot afford to take. We must keep our tungsten mines operating.

As many of you know, once a mine is closed down it is often very difficult and expensive to open it. The shaft may fill up with water or the timbers dry rot, as happens in many Idaho mines. It takes time and money to put a deteriorated mine back into operation.

If a good part of the tungsten mining industry goes to the wall, and the predicted technological advances or urgent defense needs suddenly step up de-

mands for tungsten, we would have to reach out into the world market for it. And a large portion of the world's tungsten resources are behind the Iron Curtain.

We all remember what happened during the last war when our tungsten requirements skyrocketed. The price went up to \$90 a ton, and we had men out all over the world trying to locate tungsten. We can buy it now for \$55 under Public Law 733—and stockpile it indefinitely for the uncertain and perilous years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, it will be a breach of faith with the people who have worked for and invested in the domestic critical minerals industry if we do not vote here today for the necessary appropriations obligated in the passage of Public Law 733.

It would be utter folly to allow tungsten production to stop when the goals will most likely have to be reset in order to meet increasing industrial and defense needs.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING].

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I take exception to the figure given by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. John Lieber of the ODM told us that there was a 6-year supply, not a 20-year supply. The State of Nevada has a black picture, all the mines are closed because Congress prefers to let the domestic industry die and purchase tungsten from the foreign market. I hope you will seriously consider this letter when the amendment is voted. I am quoting a letter written by one of my constituents who is a tungsten miner. He succinctly expresses the domestic miners' feelings toward Congress in its failure to appropriate funds to carry out the provisions of Public Law 733.

RENO, NEV., April 6, 1957.

Mr. LOUIS D. GORDON,
Secretary, Nevada Mining Association,
Reno, Nev.

DEAR Mr. GORDON: A courageous fight has been waged by the proponents of the tungsten appropriation, and not the least of the struggle has been waged by Senators MALONE and BIBLE, Representative BARING, and you. I am very sure that everyone directly or indirectly connected with the production of this vital metal, and they number in the thousands, join me in expressing heartfelt thanks.

That I might establish my right to speak of a far more vital issue than the mere refusal on the part of the House Appropriations Committee to recommend the appropriation, I respectfully submit that I purchased a large tungsten property in central Nevada in 1952; that subsequently, under the stimulus of the original stockpiling program, I subjected this property to a thorough and competent development program; that between the years 1953 and 1956 I spent upwards of \$60,000 in payments on the purchase of the property and in development of the ore deposit; that when the 84th Congress passed Public Law 733 extending the stockpiling program late in 1956, I, along with every other domestic producer, committed myself fully to the mining and milling of tungsten; that having exhausted my own financial resources I drew others into the project, whose faith in the integrity of their Government was as unshakeable as my own; that these working men and women invested more than \$30 million in the project of mining and milling tungsten ore, and

that the project in which they invested was entirely sound and profitable under the appropriation covering Public Law 733; that as the sole result of the refusal on the part of the House Appropriations Committee to recommend the appropriation, our project has failed, debt has been accumulated, the investors have lost their hard-earned savings, and I have been wiped out.

If, by the above, I have qualified myself to speak out, then I would say that the issue here is betrayal, inexcusable and unforgivable. I would argue that the issue is not whether or not our Government has stockpiled enough tungsten concentrates to meet any emergency for a long period of time; not that the budget ought to be reduced; not that only a very few domestic producers benefit by the stockpiling program; not for any other policy, economic or political reason, but rather if it intends to meet an obligation it incurred by the passage of a law of the land, after inducing a whole industry to irrevocably commit itself by the passage of the law.

If our elected representatives in Government can now betray a handful of "dispensable" voters without danger of punishment, how long will it be before with like impunity they can betray a whole people?

We hold there is a law in effect now, a law that drew us deeply into the mining and milling of tungsten; that had the law not been passed we would not have so committed ourselves; that we did so commit ourselves because we had unbounded faith in our Government, and that the duty of Government is therefore plain.

We hold that if this appropriation is not passed, and at once, we have been cruelly and fatally betrayed; but we hold that something far more horrifying will have been established if this appropriation is not made: a clear precedent will have been raised for more and ever greater betrayals, shocking and confounding the peoples ever more deeply, destroying in increasing measure their faith in their own kind. And, if that comes to pass, what then will follow?

Cordially,

ROBERT C. ARMSTRONG.

It is almost unbelievable that the House Committee would so completely reverse itself in regard to the tungsten program after it had become a law. This very act by this committee can do nothing but shatter the faith of the people toward Congress. Assurances were given to producers, who in turn laid out operational programs and expended funds for development and operation and found themselves suddenly cut off. The tungsten mining industry cannot be turned on and off as a water tap. If our foreign supplies are suddenly cut off in an emergency, will our domestic operators be expected to produce our needs by reopening their mines on short notice? Should they be subjected to competition from foreign sources because of a lack of a proper tariff? The American taxpayer seems to be the goat in this case. Not only is he being taxed, unconstitutionally, for foreign aid, which moneys help produce the foreign tungsten, but his support at home is cut off. However, he is still expected to go along with any foreign aid program. Will he be able to continue paying these taxes if he is shut down? Not unless he finds some other means of livelihood.

The 84th Congress passed Public Law 733 to provide for certain purchases of domestic tungsten, asbestos, columbium, tantalum and fluorspar. Rejection by the House Appropriations Committee of

a promise of \$30 million for continued purchase and stockpiling of strategic minerals threatens to stop in its tracks defense efforts to develop the heat resistant metals we must have for faster planes and light weight radiation shielding essential to atomic airframes and engines.

Back of this story is a perfect example of the absurdity of passing legislation to implement progress and not providing the money to do it. But as the RECORD will show, there are outstanding some \$62 million in contracts to purchase tungsten from foreign producers, at an average price of \$55 a unit. I am advised that those contracts are legal, they are enforceable and foreign producers can collect on them. Are we to say to our domestic producers, "We, now in Congress, did not pass Public Law 733 and we will not carry out the promise given you last July to buy your tungsten?" Without the Government purchase program America is at the mercy of foreign producers, since the world price of these metals is too low to support American wage scales.

Dr. Flemming, formerly with the Office of Defense Minerals, stated:

I want it to be clearly understood that we favor Public Law 733 and naturally, favoring the public law, we favor the appropriation of funds necessary to carry out the policies.

We must give our domestic producers a chance. Foreign spending has put them out of business and closed their mines.

I want to remind the Members that Secretary Seaton endorsed the tungsten program.

In a statement made to the Senate Interior Committee on June 4, 1957, Secretary Seaton said:

The Department of the Interior has supported and will continue to support the tungsten purchase provisions of Public Law 733. We feel that it is right and proper that the domestic industry be enabled to amortize investments made at the urgent request of the Government during the Korean conflict, and be given an opportunity to reorient their operations to the market. Continuation of Public Law 733 is the best method of assuring these objectives. We believe that if the industry operates under this program until December 1958, the production then existing, coupled with new and reasonably anticipated demands from industry, will provide a more realistic basis from which to evaluate the position of the industry in our overall economy.

Dr. Flemming, stated before the Senate Interior Committee on February 26:

We feel that Public Law 733 represents sound public policy under all of the circumstances that confront us at the present time.

We should avoid weakening this particular segment of our economy by permitting it to close down, as a weakened segment of the economy weakens the foundations on which our whole defense mobilization program rests.

In conclusion, the issue is not whether this country has sufficient tungsten now—but whether it wants to have some assurance of a supply in the event of an emergency.

In normal times, the domestic industry cannot maintain itself without help in the face of foreign competition.

Without the Government purchase program, America is at the mercy of foreign producers since the world price of these metals is too low to support American wage scales.

The Members not acquainted with mining do not realize when a mine closes down, the timbers rot, the mine fills with water and caves in, thus making it almost impossible to ever reopen.

Members of the House, I urge you to support this amendment for actually a committee of this House has indicated it will ruin a segment of our national economy by its refusal to appropriate funds and this committee is not an authorizing committee but an appropriating committee. The Interior Committee of both Houses passed this law and I cannot see how the House Appropriations Committee can reject the will of the people. Also, I remind you that if you shatter the belief of these miners in their Government, then in time of an emergency, whom are you going to turn to? I urge you, gentlemen, please support this amendment. If the law is no good, then let us amend it or get rid of it; I refer to Public Law 733. For Heaven's sake, let us keep our word and faith to the people.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, it would not be possible in 5 minutes to debate the merits of this program from one end to the other. I am perfectly sure that the Members of the House have not had an opportunity to read and study the record, but I want to call the list of the people who stand with us on this proposition.

First is the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the House Committee on Interior. We held a hearing just the other day and passed a resolution in which we called upon the House to support the continuance of this program. A copy of that resolution was sent to every Member of this House. We did not do that because this program is completely silly and we are wasting the taxpayers' money.

The committee of the other body, the Senate Committee on the Interior passed on the same matter and took the same position.

The Senate Committee on Appropriations twice and the Senate itself twice by overwhelming votes have supported this appropriation and the continuance of this program.

The Department of the Interior not only recommended it initially, but Secretary Seaton came before the Committee on the Interior of the Senate in the last week and recommended that this particular program, Public Law 733, be continued as a part of the permanent long-range domestic mining program.

The Office of Defense Mobilization appeared before the Senate Committee in February and testified again in support of this program.

The Bureau of the Budget not only has cleared this amount of money but has cleared a total of \$90 million to carry this program from the beginning to the end.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you that our distinguished friends of the Committee on

Appropriations are the only group, the only committee, the only agency of the Government, which has ever considered this program and heard a word of testimony on it, that has been against it.

I know that you do not have the time, as I say, to read all the testimony, and I have not the time here today to argue it all.

But I do say that if you will listen to the list of witnesses, these are the people, these are the agencies, charged with the responsibility for this program, and they have supported it.

The Senate added \$30 million in this bill for the minerals program. This amendment will substitute the sum of \$10 million, which is enough to run the minerals program for a period of about 2½ months. That is just beyond the expiration of this session. Secretary Seaton has submitted his long-range program, in which he has recommended the continuation of this very program. If that long-range program is adopted before we adjourn, then this whole matter will be necessarily considered on its merits again. If it is not, then we have provided a sum for these people to wind up their production.

You must remember what has happened. This bill passed in August of last year. Twenty-one million dollars was appropriated. The committee of the other body told the producers and told the Senate itself that a supplemental appropriation would be requested. They ran out of money in November. The General Services Administration, which is the purchasing agent, sent out letters, and I intend to put them in the RECORD, in which they said that—

When moneys are made available for the continuation of this program you will be advised. You may continue to submit monthly offerings until the program reopens.

In another letter they said:

We will continue to receive offers during the period for which the program is suspended and will appreciate your making them monthly.

In other words, these miners were led to believe that this suspension was only temporary, by the purchasing agency itself, and as a consequence they have proceeded. Along came the Appropriations Committee and cut them off at the pocket and left them a mile and a half from shore without any oars or even a boat to get back in. What I say is that the fair thing, the elemental fair thing this House can do, is to give this \$10 million which continues this program until we have a chance to go into the long-range domestic program.

After all, this was never a defense program, it was an interim program set up to take the place of any program until we come up with a long-range mining program. If that is not adopted, this \$10 million simply constitutes a clean-up program and an opportunity for these people to get back to shore. You must remember that they had to open their minds, they had to employ help, that they have had to make commitments, and this is the fair thing for the House of Representatives to do. I hope you will vote for this amendment.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that the general purchase programs established by Public Law 733, the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956, be carried out in accordance with the basic legislation that was passed by both Houses of the 84th Congress and then approved by the President on July 19, 1956. The domestic tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum miners were encouraged by the basic act to continue their efforts to search for and to develop and to mine domestic deposits of these materials—which are significant for high-temperature applications. Moreover, these materials will become of increasing importance as research now underway shows us how to make better use of the higher temperatures that are associated not only with new forms of energy, such as atomic energy and high-energy chemical fuels, but also with the improvement of the efficiency of such items as vessel propulsion plants, and superheated steam turbo-generators. The advancement of our technological civilization is dependent on the development and the improvement of materials that will permit the safe and efficient utilization of superheats at elevated temperatures and pressures, often in atmospheres where corrosive conditions are extreme, and in surroundings subject to vibration and shock.

That the high-temperature area is of highly critical importance to the national defense and domestic uses was pointed out in no uncertain terms as recently as last month (April 2, 1957) by Lt. Gen. C. S. Irvine, Deputy Chief of Staff for Material of the Air Force, when he told the Society of Automotive Engineers in New York that:

Improved use of engineering manpower and capabilities is an essential forward step in the production of air vehicles. But beyond this step lie many problems which must be solved if we are to progress as rapidly as necessary in the efficient design of future air vehicles. Foremost among these problems we must find ways of developing and using new materials capable of withstanding sonic vibration and high temperatures. * * * For the plain fact is that unless we do advance the state of the art of the thermal resistant materials, air vehicle development will lag.

And in a similar vein, the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, testifying before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on February 26, 1957, said:

I think it is clear to the members of this committee that we are utilizing at the present time the properties of our presently available nickel and cobalt base, super-high-temperature alloys to the maximum possible extent. We all know that we have some shortages as far as that is concerned. And there is reason to believe that any further gain which might be realized in the high-temperature properties of these types of alloys will be marginal at best, and, therefore, it would appear that any further developments will lie in the area of greater use of refractory metal such as columbium, molybdenum, tantalum, and tungsten

which have melting points considerably higher than cobalt and base alloys we are now working with.

For the benefit of those Members who may not be familiar with the materials that are considered to be suitable for refractory, that is high-temperature, applications I wish to insert in the RECORD at this point a table listing in descending order the melting points of those elements which occur in quantities sufficient to justify considering them for any significant industrial uses. Melting points are in degrees centigrade, and are taken from the Reactor Handbook published by the Atomic Energy Commission:

Element:	Melting point (°C.)
Carbon (graphite).....	3,700
Tungsten.....	3,395
Tantalum.....	2,996
Molybdenum.....	2,622
Columbium (niobium).....	2,415

It should be noted that the melting points of these materials are all considerably higher than that of the conventional stainless steel ingredients such as iron, 1,539° C.; cobalt, 1,495° C.; and nickel, 1,455° C. It is also immediately obvious that three of the materials covered by Public Law 733, tungsten, columbium, and tantalum are in the refractory category.

Now, in past weeks, we have heard many statements as to the quantities of some of these materials on hand in Government inventories, and while I wish to be fair to those who may have used such statements, I can only state that the official testimony clearly shows that the Government, at this time, has absolutely no idea as to the amounts that are required for defense purposes, and that all such statements as have been cited as to the amounts on hand are obsolete and based on war plans that are no longer current. For proof of this, I wish to cite the letter written on December 13, 1956, by Hon. Reuben B. Robertson, Jr., Deputy Secretary of Defense, to Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director of Defense Mobilization. Mr. Robertson said:

Recently the Secretary of Defense announced a clarification of the roles and missions of the military departments which was necessary owing to recent, rapid technological advances in weapons. It is, therefore, now evident that new guidance is required from the Joint Chiefs of Staff in order to develop requirements consistent with these new concepts. It is difficult for us to forecast at this time the effect of these revisions upon the determination of materials requirements in the event of mobilization; it is probable, however, that such requirements will be lower for most materials than they have been in the past.

Now, naturally, it is to be expected that these new technological advances in weapons will reduce requirements for most of the classical strategic materials, such as natural rubber, abaca, sisal, sperm oil, and tin, which are presently stockpiled, but certainly the effect of these new advances must be that requirements for the high-temperature refractory metals, including tungsten, columbium, and tantalum will go up.

Now, in the face of the expert opinions cited above, it seems clear to me that the basic policy and program established

by Public Law 733 is sound, and that it could well be suicidal from the defense viewpoint for us to shut down our domestic mining mobilization base for these refractory metals—tungsten, columbium, and tantalum—at this point.

And what of the 2 other materials covered by Public Law 733? Asbestos is one of the best high-temperature insulating materials, while fluorine, produced from acid-grade fluorspar, is an ingredient of some of the high-temperature chemical fuels. Thus, all 5 of the materials covered by Public Law 733 are particularly important to the fabrication of the super-speed jet planes and the guided missiles, upon which we are putting ever-increasing reliance for the defense of not only the United States itself, but also of the entire Free World.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the very clear defense reasons for carrying out this program, there are also equally compelling moral and economic reasons for its continuance.

The Congress of the United States encouraged the domestic miners of these minerals to believe that the programs established by law—Public Law 733—were honestly set forth and intended to be carried out in accordance with the law. Indeed, what honest citizen could assume otherwise when he reads the clearly stated and detailed programs set forth in the basic law? If now the Congress of the United States comes along less than a year later, and kills off this program by a failure to appropriate the necessary funds, then respect, not only for this law, but for all laws, can only decline. Since respect for the law is one of the prime foundations upon which our great American civilization has been erected I for one cannot in good conscience associate myself with any sleight-of-hand maneuver designed to circumvent the basic law in this case. Our citizens who have been encouraged to invest their time, capital, and their best efforts in the search for these minerals and in the production thereof under the programs set forth by Public Law 733 must be honestly and fairly dealt with by their elected representatives here in the Halls of the Congress. You may be well assured that if we fail to keep faith in this area, the precedent will not pass unnoticed in many other fields.

Lastly, there are several economic justifications for implementing the programs set forth by Public Law 733. Who does not remember the price-gouging to which our industries have been subjected in the past when too great a reliance has been placed on foreign sources of vital materials, even when these materials were in the hands of nominally friendly nations? If we permit our domestic mining industry for these critical materials to go down the drain simply because it appears at the moment that the spot price for material of foreign origin may be lower, who can say that the price for the same material will not rise several times over once our domestic mines are shut down, the equipment dismantled, the skilled miners dispersed to other jobs, and the mine workings themselves flooded by the ever-present groundwater? While we all are searching for real and honest ways to save

money for the taxpayers, let us not beguile ourselves into believing that reliance upon foreign sources of critical materials is economic. Indeed, when proper weight is given to the State, local, and Federal taxes paid by the mining companies, their employees, and their suppliers, it should be obvious that domestic production of these vital minerals takes place at real costs that can compare favorably with present prices for foreign material.

To sum up, then, there are defense, moral, and economic justifications for the proper implementation of the domestic mineral-purchase programs set forth less than a year ago by the Congress in Public Law 733, and approved by the President on July 19, 1956. Let us not present the citizens with a picture of a Congress that knows not from 1 year to another right from wrong, that goes off in opposite directions without apparent purpose. Rather let us cease forthwith the undue dalliance that has already caused great hardship among the miners of these United States. Let us make available without further delay the funds necessary to carry out the program that we ourselves established less than a year ago, so that the confidence of the citizens in this body is restored and strengthened and so that they can proceed in an orderly way with the very important business of producing vitally important strategic materials—materials which are essential for the defense of the Nation in time of emergency and which are also essential for its continued growth and technological advancement in the present age of peril in which we find ourselves.

In a jet engine like the J-57 there are approximately 45 pounds of tungsten contained in the various parts of the engine which are made of tungsten alloy metal. Some of the engine parts, of course, contain no tungsten and some parts contain more than others but on the average, in a modern jet turbine like the J-57 there is contained about 45 pounds of tungsten or something like 1 percent of the total weight of the engine, which is approximately 5,000 pounds, with the afterburner.

The amount of tungsten required for the manufacture of a jet engine like the J-57 is roughly 3 times the amount contained in the finished parts, so it is easy to calculate that somewhat more than 140 pounds of tungsten are required in the manufacture of each modern jet engine. This is due to the fact that the forgings have to be on the average three times the weight of the finished part. This is true on the average of jet engines. In many cases it is much higher as, for instance, in the cylinder-head part of a piston engine where the weight of the original forging is 10 times that of the finished part. In the case of a crankshaft for a piston engine the forging would weight six times as much as the finished shaft.

It is, therefore, apparent that any conception that only 20 pounds of tungsten is required in the manufacture of a modern jet turbine is completely inaccurate as an average of somewhat more than 7 times that is required. The parts of the forging which are trimmed

off and cut away are not completely lost but they are lost as far as the manufacturer of the jet engine is concerned for the reason that waste of this type is recovered and sold in the steel alloy trade to be used in the manufacture of alloys using lesser amounts of tungsten for other purposes. This, however, does not change or alter the fact that more than 140 pounds of tungsten is required for the manufacture of a jet engine like the J-57. When a tungsten base alloy is developed which will permit jet engines of this type to be operated at a much higher temperature than at present the amount of tungsten required for each engine will be vastly increased and will no doubt exceed more than 1,500 pounds for each engine.

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

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I do have a district where there are mines and where most of those mines are shut down today because of the importation of foreign metals at disastrously low competitive prices. I would like to ask the gentleman if this amendment is not adopted, will the Government's purchasing program on columbium and tantalum also be terminated?

Mr. DURHAM. It will be terminated on June 30 and there will be no more of it.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I certainly join with the gentleman, and I hope the amendment for the \$10 million is put in this bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak a little bit about asbestos. Too many times we think there is only one mineral involved here. But, that is not the case. There is an asbestos mine on the San Carlos Indian Reservation in Arizona which would not be there except for this particular program. This mine is affording employment to some 200 San Carlos Indians who would not otherwise be employed. This mine will be in a position to sell in the world market within 2 years because of the fact that they have been able to uncover a very fine vein of asbestos. If the mill is built, which is needed to process this asbestos, the asbestos will be sold on the world market within 2 years.

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I feel that there has been too much talk about stockpiling as far as the proposition now before the House is concerned. As far as this particular matter is concerned, this is not primarily one of stockpiling. The question is whether or not we are going to firm up our domestic mining industry. We were caught short in this country before each 1 of the last 3 major conflicts. It is a fact that we now have built up a healthy domestic producing tungsten industry. This is largely because of some of the incentives that we have heretofore offered.

The issue before us at this time is really quite simple. It has been confused

only because we have overlooked the fundamentals and given weight to transitory statements and positions.

I realize that the distinguished members of the Appropriations Committee who have opposed the provision of funds for the continuation of purchases under Public Law 733 have done so out of a conviction that the program is not necessary. I respect their opinion and regret very much that I must disagree with these friends of long standing. I might concede to their position were it not for the fundamental consideration which I cannot overlook. This fundamental can be simply stated. Just last summer the Congress passed and the President signed into law an 18-month program to purchase a certain quantity of critical minerals, primarily tungsten. Funds to implement this purchase program were approved last year in the amount of \$21 million. The program then was activated by the proper agencies of government and the interested producers of these materials had then, and should now have, every reason to believe that the program as passed would be carried out. They proceeded to mine and produce these materials, making investment, blocking out ore, firming up employment and the many details which go into a production venture. Now they see this effort, this investment suspended in midstream. Workers who thought they had employment see its sudden termination. This boom-and-bust fluctuation in mineral production has been all too prevalent in this Nation, and it has cost the Nation valuable reserves of critical mineral resources as mines were left to cave and ruin. The Congress should not, indeed cannot, be an active party in another such dismal event, since the Congress was the body which held the carrot before these producers in the form of the purchase program.

I have no tungsten production in my district and my district interest, if any, would be in the fluorspar part of this program since there is fluorspar production in my district. Still, I have seen too often the tragic consequences of abandoned mines, flooded, caved, a crumbling hole which swallowed investment, hope, and valuable mineral reserves which this Nation needs.

I have had information from a tungsten producer in Colorado, not in my district as I said earlier, but a small Colorado producer. This small firm has limited capital, yet in prospect of the purchase program, it invested some \$65,000 in its operation. This company now stands to lose some \$200,000 on tungsten concentrates already produced and over \$500,000 on improvements made in reliance upon this Federal program. Beyond this, some 80 workers will be out of work in a small town where no alternative employment opportunity exists. This we cannot, in good conscience, allow.

Consider, there is now outstanding and enforceable, some \$60 million in contracts for tungsten with foreign producers. These will be honored. There will be no midstream termination. We can do as much for our own people and equally honor our commitments to them.

There is some suggestion that certain producers have done better than necessary under this program and that perhaps certain adjustments are needed. If this be true, then this program should come before the proper legislative committee where, I can assure you, it will be carefully considered and necessary adjustments made as to production to be purchased from any producer, price, and so forth. We owe these domestic producers at least this consideration for their determined effort to provide for us a domestic tungsten industry. We need to have, beyond any doubt, a safe domestic supply, even an oversupply, of this evermore vital defense material.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would just like to call attention again to the fact that this bill does build up the domestic mining industry and in so doing has served in the best interest of the Nation's well-being.

I do not want you to pull the rug out from under these producers the way you did after World War II. Someday, you know, we are going to have to ask those people to produce, and they are not going to do it because they will remember when they once got their feet burned. We have done it twice now; I do not think we should do it again.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Agriculture which from time to time authorizes farm programs. I am wondering what he thinks would happen if after initiating a farm program we chopped it off about the 1st of January rather than permitting it to run along for a sufficient period of time, or at least we changed our mind about it suddenly? What does he think would happen if they cut this off this year instead of next year?

Mr. HILL of Colorado. I would say to the gentleman that he is speaking good, sound, hard sense. We are going to do that.

A few days ago the Senate had gump-tion enough to put some three to five hundred millions back in the soil bank, and I for one say to you that it is about time we took a second look at agriculture. I want to associate myself with all the Members of this House who feel that we should not cut this tungsten program off at this particular time. I am not an expert; I only live close to the mines. Colorado had a great history in mining, but it was before my day, long before my day. Now we have an opportunity to keep our mines open and we have a few mines in the West where tungsten is a very important product, most of them are small mines.

I am turning to page 5 of the testimony of a gentleman, which was given on February 26, 1957, Dr. Arthur Flemming. Let me give you his full name so you will know who I am talking about,

Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

Now, we are losing the impact of the argument for this appropriation unless we consider it as a defense activity, and we also lose it if we start at the word "defense" and do not consider the future. We probably do not know, and the testimony would indicate that they are not quite ready for an overall and all-inclusive minerals program. But what are you going to do? Listen to what Dr. Flemming said here uncontroverted. He said, commenting on a letter on the stationery of a certain firm—I will not read the name of the firm:

Attached to this letter is a chart. There are figures here which purport to show the total stockpile of tungsten.

Every one of you should listen to this because these are the facts. Let us get it straight.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Ohio yield me 1 additional minute?

Mr. KIRWAN. I am sorry, but I cannot.

Mr. HILL. I will put the statement in the RECORD where Dr. Flemming shows we have only a 6-year supply, not a 20-year supply. You had better think this over before you cast your vote.

Dr. FLEMMING. It is recognized by all of us that our total mobilization program must rest, if it is to succeed, on the foundation of a strong and sound economy. This is reflected in this report. It is clear that if the industries with which we are dealing this morning are shut down, one segment of our economy will be weakened. Surely no one can argue that closed-down mines filled with water, with miners out of work, can do anything but weaken this segment of our economy.

We felt last year, and still feel, that it would be unwise for the Congress to permit this to happen in view of the fact that the administration intends to recommend and the Congress to consider long-term policies that are designed to create or will be designed to create a more favorable economic climate for these industries than now exists.

As I indicated, Mr. Chairman, last year, we regard this as purely interim, stopgap legislation. Nevertheless, we feel that it is important for Congress to go through with the policy set forth in Public Law 733 until the long-term policy is developed and enacted into law.

Mr. Chairman, that is simply a restatement, really, of the position that I took when the Congress was considering Public Law 733.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Flemming. Mr. Redwine of the committee staff desires to ask you a few technical questions. Mr. Redwine?

Mr. REDWINE. Dr. Flemming, I hand you a letter on the stationery of Kennametal, Inc., Latrobe, Pa., which for reasons which will develop in a moment, Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to offer for the record. I just want Dr. Flemming to identify it.

Dr. Flemming, attached to this letter is a chart. There is a figure here that purports to show the total stockpile on tungsten. Is such a figure classified information?

Dr. FLEMMING. It certainly is. Mr. REDWINE. Dr. Flemming, please do not mention the figure that is given, but can you say whether or not, without violating security, that is a realistic figure?

Dr. FLEMMING. I prefer not to comment on the figure at all, in view of the fact that it is classified.

Mr. REDWINE. Doctor, in the letter reference is made back to that figure and it is stated that that figure constitutes a 20-year supply in time of emergency of tungsten.

Can you say whether you have a 20-year supply of tungsten on hand?

Dr. FLEMMING. Let us make the question very specific. That is a 20-year supply for dealing with a wartime emergency?

Mr. REDWINE. Correct, sir.

Dr. FLEMMING. The answer to that is "No, we do not have anything approaching that on hand."

Mr. REDWINE. Can you, without violating security, tell the committee approximately how many years' supply you have on hand for wartime emergency?

Dr. FLEMMING. Thinking in terms of the requirements for a wartime emergency, we have on hand enough to carry us through approximately a 6-year emergency.

Mr. REDWINE. Mr. Chairman, I do not think this letter should be put in the RECORD in view of the testimony of Dr. Flemming.

Dr. Flemming, you have been procuring materials for a good many years for the Federal Government. Do you consider when you announce a program that you will purchase so many tons or units of this or that, that you have entered into an implied contract with the producers thereof?

Dr. FLEMMING. That is the position, of course, we have taken consistently before this committee where we made in effect a holding out that we will require certain quantities within a given period of time; that the Government is then under obligation to acquire those quantities provided they come in within the time period set.

Mr. REDWINE. The Congress, faced with the circumstance it is, that it has made an implied contract with the producers of these 4 metals, if Congress reneged on that, what effect do you think that would have in a time of dire emergency which might come ahead of us? What would the producers feel if the Government had once reneged on them?

Dr. FLEMMING. Mr. Redwine, as I indicated in the conclusion of the statement I just read, we feel for a number of reasons that it is important for Congress to go through with the policy it outlined in Public Law 733 until this long-term policy is developed and enacted into law.

On the other hand, as you have indicated, competent authorities do continue to advise us that accelerated technology, particularly in the field of military devices, is moving constantly in the direction of higher and higher temperatures.

I think it is clear to the members of this committee that we are utilizing at the present time the properties of our presently available nickel and cobalt base, superhigh-temperature alloys to the maximum possible extent.

We all know that we have some shortages as far as that is concerned. And there is reason to believe that any further gain which might be realized in the high-temperature properties of these types of alloys will be marginal at best and, therefore, it would appear that any further developments will lie in the area of greater use of refractory metal such as columbium, molybdenum, tantalum, and tungsten which have melting points considerably higher than cobalt and base alloys we are now working with.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, again I would like to make the proposition very clear; we are not supporting, we did not support Public Law 733, and we are not supporting it now on defense grounds; that is, in terms of the need for these materials for defense purposes as of the present moment.

But we are supporting it on the ground that there is a long-term policy that the administration is going to present and that the Congress is going to consider and we feel that during this interim period, between now and the time there is agreement on the long-term policy, it just does not make good sense from any point of view to permit these mines to close down and the water to flood the mines and so on, and to put the miners out of work.

Senator MALONE, do you wish to ask some questions at this time?

Senator MALONE. Yes, I would like to develop one point with Dr. Flemming.

Doctor, are you familiar with the research that is going on now to develop higher heat-resistant alloys?

Dr. FLEMMING. Yes, sir, generally; not as a technician, but I have been informed along that line, as I indicated a few minutes ago.

Senator MALONE. Yes. I doubt if the emphasis has been sufficient on that point.

We had a very interesting paper from Dr. Thielemann, whom you probably know, R. H. Thielemann, chairman of the department of metallurgy of Stanford Research Institute. His latest results are a part of his paper.

I would like to call your attention to this matter for the record in the light of your testimony that you have a 6-year reserve or stockpile on tungsten.

Now, Dr. Thielemann says, and I heard him testify before a House committee in San Francisco last Sunday, a week ago, that:

"If satisfactory tungsten base alloy can be developed which will have useful engineering properties of temperature of 2,000° F. and higher expected consumption would be doubled or tripled."

Now, if you believe that is really right on top of us, what would you say about your stockpile?

Dr. FLEMMING. Senator, as you know, it is difficult to comment on that in a specific way because I do not know what Defense will come up with in the way of requirement in the light of a statement of that kind, but unquestionably the requirements will be higher than they have been at the present time and that will be reflected in the stockpile.

I would like to say this, Senator: I think the point we are making, although we don't have any figures to go on at the present time, the point that you are making nevertheless indicates the desirability of keeping industries of this kind on a going basis rather than letting them shut down because in this kind of world we never know when somebody is going to come through with something like this.

Senator MALONE. I think you and I discussed this at another meeting we had last year, that is your best stockpile is a going-concern industry.

Dr. FLEMMING. We have always had that feeling.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Allott, of Colorado, wishes to ask some questions.

Senator ALLOTT. I have no questions I want to ask the doctor; thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am a member of this subcommittee, but I have one or two things I would like to say.

First of all, I want to express to Dr. Flemming my own personal regret that he is leaving the position he has occupied. I think it would not be amiss to emphasize here what I conceive to be one of the biggest dangers and faults in our Government at this time which he on his part has done his best to eliminate. Unfortunately, in these hearings, and this is true not only under this administration, but it has been true for many years, in the testimony of people who are charged with policymaking, there is always the tendency to leave a door or doors open which lead to statements and declara-

tions of policies which have so many doors in them that they are not policies at all. Doctor, if I could commend you for anything at all, it is for the forthrightness and definiteness with which you have always stated your own point of view, which then gives other people a chance to put it on an anvil and beat it out to find out its merits or lack of merit, as the case may be.

Dr. FLEMMING. Thank you.

Senator ALLOTT. And in your case it has been mostly merit. I would like to say this in addition: I appear here only because I want to express myself completely and wholly in support of the program. The real matter at issue here is to give the doctor a chance to refute some misconceptions of his testimony. But at this time I cannot help but follow up to some extent my good friend, the Senator from Idaho, and express my own thoughts in support of this whole program to implement Public Law 733 of last year.

There are so many examples that can be used in this field that they are almost endless. I point to the fact that 2 years ago, in 1955, numerous Senators appeared before the Appropriations Committee and begged for appropriations to continue our oil-shale experiments. Contrary to that, they were gutted. The place was closed down, and the situation which many of us predicted was a possibility has become an actuality in less than 2 years because we do not have any Suez Canal any more, and we do not have any pipelines of oil out of the Near East. Yet the means and the opportunity to make at least 900 billion barrels of oil available to the American people was in our hands and we flubbed it. When I say "We," I do not want to take any burden for that myself, because most of the Senators—in fact, all of the people here, as far as I know—supported that building up of the oil-shale development so that it could be economically feasible. We should have right today—right this minute, right this second—an oil-shale process which would enable us to produce oil in unlimited quantities competitively with oil out of the ground. If we should find ourselves in another war, nuclear or otherwise, we will rue the day that we did not follow through and complete this oil-shale program.

There is another thing I want to speak out very strongly for. I realize that we do have to trade with other countries some. I do not believe that we serve our own interests by purchasing all of our minerals at home. I think in a broad sense we help ourselves by purchasing some of them abroad. And where the balance will be struck is a question that will always be troublesome to the administrators and to our administrators and Senators and Congressmen. But I do oppose, as we did in Mexico, taking United States money and building production of fluorspar to compete as we did with our own dollars, while we are shutting down our own. I recognize the advisability, as I say, of trading somewhat with those people and making purchases there and trying to reason out with reasonable men a balance. But to take that when we have the production in the United States and build production in competition to our own is something which I do not think can be justified, and I want to express myself as being opposed to it.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, for this opportunity to say these few words, because I could not let this opportunity go by without expressing my complete support. I hope the Members of the House who are here will be able to do something on their side to put this appropriation back in good order.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Allott.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE]. If this House fails to appropriate at least sufficient funds to permit an orderly liquidation of the tungsten program, the producers in my district will feel and will be entitled to feel that their Federal Government has broken faith with them and has utterly failed to fulfill the promises which have caused them to make large expenditures. I appeal to the conscience and the fair play of the Members and I most urgently ask them to provide funds with which to carry out the provisions of Public Law 733 which this Congress held forth as a promise and an obligation to carry on the strategic minerals program.

I call to your attention that in dozens of small mines in this country, producers have continued operations and kept on employing miners and borrowing money to meet payrolls on the strength of your promise of a market for their ore. They have piled up this ore and it lies there without a market unless these funds are appropriated. They are far in the hole, overobligated to the banks and lending agencies on the strength of your promise. They have no future except disaster and bankruptcy if you now say you never intended to fulfill the promises upon which they relied. It is not conceivable to me that you will let them down.

There is ample evidence of the urgent need of this program, lest we again be caught without the minerals essential to a crash war production program and an operating mining industry to provide them. We are all deeply concerned with adequate defense and the strength of America and we need to continue to make sure we have these minerals.

For the strength and future of our country and to fulfill our promises in good faith, I most urgently appeal for the passage of this amendment.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON].

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I do not customarily take a position in opposition to my good friend from New York [Mr. TABER] or the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], and if I did not feel keenly about this being an economic measure I would not be here at the present time. I would simply like to rehearse some of the facts which I think indicate that we are going to make a mistake if we do not agree to this amendment. Back at the time of World War II we did not have a domestic tungsten mining industry in this country, so the Government adopted a program of trying to stimulate the production of tungsten in this country. At that time we were paying as high as \$65 a unit for tungsten. We entered into long-range contracts with foreigners for this metal at that price. Then we came along and stimulated the domestic mining industry and, as a result, we brought the price down 100 percent under the amount we were paying to our foreign friends. The industry, of course, sprang up and our producers got in business. At the present time if the Government does not continue to give them support to keep them

going, we are going to be again at the mercy of the foreign producers. You are going to be paying a price that will more than offset the amount of the subsidy which we are now giving to our domestic producers.

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

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DIXON. This is not a question of stockpiling, it is a question of the existence of these strategic mines.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. DIXON. You cannot turn a mine on and off like you would a faucet. Would the gentleman explain that?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. That is a mistaken notion that a lot of people have, that by keeping these metals stored up in the ground you are effecting a conservation program; however, if you close a mine which is timbered and subject to flooding, you are going to actually do the very opposite. The timbers rot away, the mine caves in and the metals are lost to the country. The cost of putting them back into production again is far greater than the amount spent in the form of subsidies.

Mr. DIXON. I wish to associate myself with those supporting this amendment. I do not think we should go from white to black in one leap the way the proposed bill would do.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Let me inform the Members, particularly those on this side of the aisle, that this is an administration measure. There has been some reference made to the fact the administration does not back it. Ten days ago, Secretary Seaton came before the Senate Interior Committee and in answer to a question I propounded to him in regard to the effect on the industry if we failed to go ahead with the program, he made this statement:

I said this morning that the administration supported the program in the first instance and it supports it now.

Further, in reply to a question by the chairman of the committee, he made this statement:

I said as delicately as I could that I do not want to put any blame on anybody in the Congress, but I feel personally, and I cannot help but express myself, that when the Congress of the United States authorized this program in the last session there was in fact a moral commitment to carry it on.

There is that commitment. These people have gone to the expense of building up their facilities depending on the program being carried out. If we let them down now and close the facilities, we are not keeping faith and the mines will close.

In answer to a further question put to Mr. Wormser, the following statement was made by Mr. Wormser, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, in regard to what would happen to these producers if this appropriation were not granted. He stated:

My feeling is that we perhaps have 1 or 2 producers able to meet the international competitive situation, but by and large the industry has been shutting down.

I can testify that in my own State we have two producers who process tungsten. One is closed down and the other is preparing to close down probably next week if this appropriation is not granted.

In the narrowest sense, the approval of funds for the continuation of the Government's tungsten purchase program is necessary if Congress is to keep its pledge to the domestic producers of this vital and critical metal.

But in the larger sense, continuation of this program—until an adequate alternate can be adopted—is necessary if this Nation is to remain self-sufficient in a metal that, due to the high temperature jet age, is vital to our national defense.

This history of our dependence upon foreign sources is, in miniature, a typical example of what happens when this Nation allows low-cost foreign production of any needed material to become our sole source of supply of this material. First during World War II and more recently in the Korean war we have been given a dangerous and expensive lesson in this regard.

During World War II we managed—of necessity—to meet with domestic production our tungsten needs by bringing into being an entire new industry. This required expensive Government investments and diversion of critically needed manpower from other war industries. But we learned then—as we should remember now—that we cannot depend upon foreign production to meet our needs in times of emergency.

This lesson was quickly forgotten in the bright era of peaceful optimism that flared up briefly after the war. We again allowed our domestic sources to collapse, choosing instead to again become dependent upon foreign sources of tungsten. The folly of this course was soon demonstrated as the cold war flamed into a raging conflict in Korea.

Deprived of major sources of tungsten from abroad, this Nation saw the world market price increase to over \$65 per unit as foreign producers adopted the techniques of charging all the traffic would bear. The only alternative was to revive—again at great expense—our domestic mining industry. Our domestic producers again rose to the task. The tungsten industry arose like the phoenix from its own ashes. Right now, the United States is capable of meeting its own tungsten requirements.

If this industry is to survive—if we are to avoid a mistake already twice-made—we must continue the tungsten purchase program until an adequate substitute is evolved. For my authority, I quote Secretary of Interior Fred A. Seaton. Appearing before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on June 4, 1957, the Secretary was asked what would happen if Congress failed to vote funds to continue the tungsten purchase program. He replied and I quote:

Secretary SEATON. Mr. Chairman, in the first place, I would not like to think in terms of being unsuccessful. I said this morning that the administration supported the program in the first instance. It was part of the President's budget in this session of the Congress. The whole administration has supported it time and again.

I said, as delicately as I could, that I did not want to put any blame on anybody in the Congress, but I felt personally, and cannot but feel, that when the Congress of the United States authorized the program in the last session, that there was, in fact, a moral commitment to carry on.

In the language of the appropriation, we were advised that we had been given part of the money, or part of the money had been appropriated to carry it on, and there was certainly at least an implied invitation if not an actual one to return to Capitol Hill and ask for further appropriations in this session of the Congress.

I would hope very much that those of us who believe in the program, and those who feel as I do about the program's being carried on, will be successful in their efforts.

As to what we do if those things do not come to pass, I would much rather reserve that for consideration, but I would assure you, Mr. Chairman, that we would have no intention of just leaving that hanging on the line. What we could do might be entirely different, sir, because a Congress which had refused to appropriate money to carry on a program which it, itself, had authorized might or might not be susceptible to further suggestions, do you not see, either from the Department of the Interior or the administration as a whole, or the gentlemen who are members of this committee and who believe in the program. That is a question I cannot answer.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think any Member of Congress should want to consider this problem on the basis of our being unsuccessful today in our efforts to have it continued. The tungsten program is too involved in our basic defense needs to lend itself to the economy ax. The producers who interpreted a decision by Congress last year to continue the program are entitled to have their confidence in our intent justified. The Nation itself is entitled to the comfortable feeling of knowing that its supply of domestically produced tungsten is available in cases of national emergency.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

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

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] asked what would happen if the farm program were changed. I do not know but in the last 25 years farm programs have been changed every year. I would like also to say to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] that one farm program that has been kept very stable is the wool growers support price program and the beet sugar producers support prices. If they just apply that rule to the rest of agriculture, we would get along pretty well, but Mr. Benson and some of the Members in Congress are willing to change the farm program every year.

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

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. It is true, also, is it not, that tungsten is used in armor-piercing shells, in tools, and also in other ways?

Mr. KIRWAN. It is used in many ways. Now, I will tell you that in 1944 the steel companies that were using 72 percent of the total tungsten concentrates for drills and dies and tools were

only using 26 percent in 1954. There they are using a substitute which is much better. I asked for and received a table from the Department of the Interior showing how much tungsten was consumed in the 5 most prosperous years of the history of this Nation, the last 5. They said that an average of 7,400,000 pounds were used annually in the last 5 years. We added 400,000 pounds a year to that, just so that we would not be wrong, and would give them the benefit of the doubt. Based on 8 million pounds a year, we now have enough tungsten for 26 years of peacetime use.

Let me read what President Eisenhower said to the Congress in his budget message. Turn to page 89 of this year's budget. He said, "We have \$260 million worth of tungsten that we cannot put in the stockpile." That is in this year's budget.

One of the speakers who preceded me told you about what a wonderful mineral tungsten is. Any schoolboy or schoolgirl knows that and has known it from the day that Edison invented that light bulb up there. Tungsten was what kept it from burning out. But I am telling you what supply this Government has of tungsten. This is what the President of the United States said in this year's budget, that we have \$260 million worth of tungsten that we cannot put in the stockpile.

The stockpile went up to the limit in about 2 years. Then they came in and extended this act for 2 more years. Then when they tried to extend it still again, the President vetoed it.

There never was a time when the Department of the Interior or anybody down the street asked for this bill. It was initiated here by the Congress. Congress was responsible. Is not that a fine thing to take out to the people of the United States, that that is the way we are running the Government? But that is what we did. The administration never asked for this legislation. We did it. We thought they needed more tungsten. There were no House hearings printed on the matter.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. The gentleman said that the administration was not backing this program?

Mr. KIRWAN. They just came out for a long-term program, is that correct?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. KIRWAN. Secretary Seaton said he was for it. He would be foolish if he were not, when he was appearing before the Congress. Anyone down the street would be for it. But they never asked for it before the Congress passed it.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Is it not a fact that in the statement that was handed to some of the Members there was included the fact that the matter was deferred by the committee awaiting the long-range program.

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Now the long-range program is out and they are recommending the continuation of the subsidy-purchase program.

Mr. KIRWAN. Let me turn this thing around and ask the gentleman a question. Is the gentleman for more tungsten when the President says that we have \$260 million of it that we cannot get into the stockpile? Are you for tungsten when one producer of tungsten, General Electric, which owns 30 percent of a mine that produces tungsten, will not buy 1 pound of their own tungsten? But they do tell you that 40 percent of the tungsten that they sold to the Government is of nonstockpile grade. Why, Russia would not do that. There is no nation on earth that would do it.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. The gentleman asked me a question and I would like to answer it as to whether the President was for this program. The President has recommended this program. I think that is the best answer.

Mr. KIRWAN. I again tell the gentleman this. I heard Mr. Flemming's name mentioned here a while ago. Flemming said, "I again tell you that no additional tungsten purchases are necessary for defense purposes." Then when he is up here with a group of attorneys and Senators around him trying to press him and asking the question, "Will you go for the program?" he would be foolish, as he was leaving the Government in 1 week, not to say that he was for the program. He was just living up to the old adage, "Always leave them laughing when you say goodbye."

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Why did he recommend it?

Mr. KIRWAN. Because he was going out of the picture. He never asked for it.

Let us review the history of this subsidy program.

In 1953, Congress extended this domestic purchase program for 2 more years to help these producers. During this period we bought \$187,562,000 worth of tungsten and all of it was surplus to the strategic and critical stockpile. We paid \$63 a unit when the market price was \$43.

The President vetoed H. R. 6373 on August 14, 1955, which would have again extended the domestic minerals purchase program. At that time he stated:

Finally, the provisions of H. R. 6373 would apply to only a small segment of the domestic minerals industry and would not reach the fundamentals of the program. Indeed this bill would make solution of the overall problems of the industry more difficult. * * * The interests of the domestic minerals industry will be better served by proceeding with the careful development of a long-range minerals program than by approving a stopgap measure extending substantial Government aid to only a segment of the industry.

On July 13, 1956, S. 3982, which became Public Law 733, was brought in here under the suspension of the rules and was passed without any debate. The legislation had not been proposed by the administration. There were no

printed House hearings available and there was not a word of explanation on the Floor that this law would cost \$91 million.

The Senate Appropriations Committee inserted \$35 million in the Second supplemental appropriation bill, 1957. In conference the Senate conferees agreed to strike the item and the conference report was approved by this House without a dissenting remark.

The Senate insisted on restoring the item in the closing hours of last session and in conference we finally compromised at \$21 million to carry the program until the House committee could review the need for additional purchases. Of this total, \$16,273,000 was for tungsten.

I have now had a chance to study this subsidy and here are some of the facts. A 6-year wartime supply of tungsten is now on hand in inventory, another year's supply is on order, and at least an additional 2-year supply can be readily produced during war time in United States, Mexico, and Canada.

Based on current annual consumption the supply in inventory and on order would last over 26 years.

As of December 31, 1956, the estimated value of undelivered orders under existing foreign contracts was \$61,957,368. Other funds have previously been made available to finance these contracts some of which extend into 1959.

The United States has purchased to date \$635,683,000 worth of tungsten including \$219,555,000 from domestic producers. An additional \$32,386,000 is estimated for 1958 under the existing foreign contracts.

The President states in his 1958 budget that there is \$260 million worth of tungsten in inventory which cannot be absorbed within existing stockpile objectives and there is no current industrial need for the material in the economy.

The Sixth Annual Report of the Joint Committee on Defense Production states the ultimate net loss to the Government on the tungsten stockpile will be \$138 million, the highest loss among all the minerals.

NUMBER OF TUNGSTEN PRODUCERS

It was claimed that 700 small producers would benefit. Yet only 177 have participated, and 11 producers have received \$12,826,000, or 86 percent of the total. Ninety-two percent of the money went to only 18 producers. Take for example, Idaho.

Under Public Law 733 only three companies in Idaho have sold tungsten to the Government, totaling \$968,000. \$397,000 of this, or 93 percent, went to the Bradley Mining Co. These mines are leased from the Haile Mines, Inc., of North Carolina. Thirty percent of the stock in this company is owned by the General Electric, one of the largest users of tungsten in the United States. Yet, the president of this North Carolina mining corporation testified as follows on page 117 of the Senate hearings in answer to questions by one of the Senators:

Senator ———. I was amazed yesterday when I learned that not a single pound of our domestic production (of tungsten) is

used by industry. Do you think that is correct?

Mr. LONG. Not a single pound.

Senator ———. I also understand that some of our biggest processors, General Electric, Union Carbide, Sylvania, are interested in the production of tungsten, the mines where the total output is sold to the Government, although these same companies purchase the tungsten they use in their own operating facilities from abroad; is that correct?

Mr. LONG. Yes.

This means we are being asked to continue buying from the domestic mines of some of these corporations at \$55 a unit while they continue to purchase foreign tungsten for use in their own industry at the United States market price of \$26.

For example, Union Carbide, one of the largest users of tungsten, has received \$1,696,541 under this new subsidy program since last August 1 for tungsten produced in its domestic mines.

The Government to date has purchased over \$26 million worth of tungsten from the North Carolina mines of the Haile Corp., including \$1,375,000 under Public Law 733, at prices far in excess of the going market price.

In addition, this corporation received a certificate of necessity for rapid tax amortization on its tungsten production.

Also this Carolina corporation and the Bradley Mining Co. currently have contracts for Government assistance totaling \$355,000 to discover more tungsten under the defense minerals exploration program. Altogether the Government now has 21 such contracts in force at a cost to the taxpayer of \$1,011,050 to discover more tungsten. Yet Senator MALONE said on page 104 of the Senate hearings on Public Law 733:

For your information there is enough tungsten in Nevada and California to last the country a hundred years * * *. Now we are arguing about how to get rid of it. * * * It is running out of their ears.

What are some of the other corporations who it is said will suffer if this subsidy is not extended again?

First. One company in Colorado, which has received \$932,000 under Public Law 733, reported a net profit of \$15,152,965 from its various mining operations in 1956. According to Moody's Manual, it had assets of \$66,489,302 in 1955.

Second. Another large domestic producer, who has received over \$2 million under Public Law 733, still has over \$22 million due under its contract with the United States to furnish tungsten from its foreign mines. It is the same old story of working both sides of the street.

Third. Another large domestic producer also has mines in Mexico and is negotiating to acquire other interests there. This company announced on April 5, 1957, that it was "dealing with the Mexican Government for a large reduction in export taxes and for the approval of tax subsidies as provided by Mexican law in connection with building of a plant." Yet we are told we need this appropriation to protect our mines from foreign competition.

SMALL NUMBER OF MINERS AFFECTED

Now it has also been claimed thousands of miners would be put out of work

if we stopped this subsidy. When we asked the Assistant Secretary of Interior about this, he said:

There are not too many, however, as a matter of fact.

A president of one of the large tungsten companies testified before the Senate, page 80 of the hearings, that based on figures he had gathered there was a total of only 4,000 employees in the United States who would be affected if the purchase program was stopped. He said as of February 1956, a little over 1,000 were directly employed in Nevada, which has produced about one-third of the tungsten under Public Law 733.

An official of the third largest producer under the program testified he had 308 employees and that they could be consumed by other local industries.

NO OBLIGATION TO PRODUCERS

Now let us look into this claim that we still have an obligation to these producers, for whom the law was previously extended for 2 years at a cost of \$187,562,000. We paid them \$63 a unit when the market price was \$43 and all of the purchases were surplus to the stockpile requirement. Ten of the producers, including Union Carbide, Wah Chang, and Tungsten Mining of North Carolina received certificates for rapid tax amortization.

Public Law 733, which as I said, passed the House without debate under suspension of the rules, merely authorizes appropriations. It contains no definite amount to be appropriated. Nor does it state how much tungsten shall be purchased. Instead it states "No more than 1,250,000 short tons of tungsten." In other words, the law sets a ceiling on purchases, not a minimum—there is no guaranty in the law that the United States will purchase \$70 million worth of tungsten as the proponents claim. Nor has a single contract been executed with any producer.

The initial request for funds went directly from the Budget Bureau to the Senate during the closing days of last session. There was no opportunity for the House Committee on Appropriations to hold hearings and consider the items. The Senate reported out only \$35 million, not the budget estimate of \$91,670,000. It is true that the Senate committee in its initial report stated that it expected the Department to submit a supplemental request for funds when additional funds were required. But this did not constitute final action on the item. To the contrary, the Senate committee agreed to strike all funds for Public Law 733 in conference and that report was agreed to by the House without any dissent. The Senate, however, rejected this conference report and the House conferees, in the closing hours of the last session, finally compromised at \$21 million to carry the program until they had an opportunity to review the program. There was no assurance given in the conference report that any additional funds would be provided. To the contrary, the action by the conferees could not be construed to have been other than to cast doubt on possible extension of the program.

The resolution recently adopted by the House Subcommittee on Mines and Mining states:

Whereas the General Services Administration, to which was delegated responsibility for administration of this program, indicated to the domestic miners that the necessary funds to carry out the programs were expected to be forthcoming and that the miners should conduct their operations on this basis (as detailed in letters from GSA in November and December 1956).

I have reviewed these letters, sent to the regional commissioners by the Commissioner here in Washington, and in each instance they made perfectly clear that future acceptance of offers would be dependent upon whether additional funds were made available by Congress. These letters, to which the resolution refers, were necessary because the producers and the Interior Department exhausted the funds by November 1, 1956, within 3 months after they were appropriated, instead of spreading them over until February 1, 1957, as was intended by the conferees. So these producers wanted to keep submitting offers to be on record if they could pressure Congress into appropriating funds and authorizing the backdating of purchases to December 1, 1956. For example, the letter of December 18, 1956, from the General Services Administration clearly stated:

It is repeated that such offers cannot now be accepted and that the final determination as to whether they can be accepted later will depend on the terms upon which further funds may be available to GSA.

We have no obligation to these corporations, and they know it. This is just a last minute smokescreen they have put up when they knew they were fighting a losing battle. If the House Appropriations Committee had been given an opportunity to review this program, they would not even have received the \$16 million that was rushed through in the closing moments of the last session.

And it is interesting that a vice president of one of these tungsten companies is quoted in the "Western Mineral Survey," dated April 5, 1957 as follows:

Mr. Sullivan said that tungsten operations in Montana would proceed, it is anticipated, throughout 1957, "since the Calvert Creek Mines is able to produce ore at a cost that will be competitive with any foreign product."

There is a real obligation, however, which every Member has, and that is to the taxpayers of this Nation. Now that the facts are available, our only course of action is to stop this terrible waste of money. We have purchased \$219,555,000 worth of tungsten from these domestic producers and it is all surplus to our needs. Think of the millions we will have to keep on spending just to maintain this excess material.

Another interesting fact that we have discovered is the poor quality of the tungsten which these producers are dumping on the Government at over \$20 a unit above the market price. We have found that of the tungsten which was sold to the Government prior to Public Law 733 for \$187,562,000, about 40 percent was of nonstockpile grade. Now under Public Law 733 you would expect that they would have at least shipped

us better stuff. But GSA figures show that 18.5 percent of the tungsten received at a cost of \$16 million since last summer was of nonstockpile grade. Maybe this explains why industry prefers to sell its tungsten to United States at subsidy prices and use foreign tungsten in its own plants. And yet they say we have an obligation to these companies.

NO DEFENSE REQUIREMENT

I note that the resolution of the House Subcommittee on Mines and Mining also states:

Whereas any present official statements as to the defense requirements for high temperature metals, such as tungsten, columbium, and tantalum, are completely obsolete (as noted in the letter of December 13, 1956, from the Deputy Secretary of Defense to the Office of Defense Mobilization).

What are the facts? Dr. Flemming was questioned about this at a special hearing before a Senate committee on February 26, 1957, and here is what he stated:

Dr. FLEMMING. You will recall in the letter of December 13 the Secretary of Defense, or the Defense Department, did advise us that it is probable that the military requirements will be lower for most materials than they had been in the past. * * * I do think it well to keep the issue rather sharp. We do not have any firm, tangible evidence from the Department of Defense at the present time pointing to the fact we do not have enough of these materials on hand; we just don't have any evidence along that line. I would like to make that clear.

Now, the tungsten sponsors like to quote Dr. Flemming's statements on this day when they called him up for the special hearing in the Senate and worked him over after we had cut the money out in the House. That was on February 26, 1957, and he resigned and left his Government post on March 14, 1957.

But despite efforts that day to make him say the tungsten supply might not be adequate for defense requirements, he finally said:

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, again, I would like to make the proposition very clear. We are not supporting, we did not support Public Law 733, and we are not supporting it now on defense grounds, that is, in terms of the need for these materials for defense purposes as the present moment.

SURPLUS TUNGSTEN AVAILABLE FOR NEW USES

R. H. Thielemann, chairman of the department of metallurgy of Stanford Research Institute, is the leading spokesman for the sponsors of this subsidy on possible new developments of high-temperature alloys. Again it is interesting to know that the Stanford Research Institute is financed by the tungsten producers of this country.

I wonder why the sponsors never discuss what our present inventory of tungsten really means in terms of these so-called future possibilities.

We now have in inventory and on order a surplus of 115,000,000 pounds of tungsten in excess of the long-term strategic stockpile objective. Just for example, let us see what this surplus tungsten will do.

First. They talk of the possible need of more tungsten for jet engines. Even assuming double the present average of

about 25 pounds per engine, or 50 pounds we would have enough tungsten surplus to the long-term stockpile objective for 2,300,000 airplane engines. With the present defense requirements of about 12,000 engines per year, the surplus tungsten would be adequate for about 192 years.

Second. Now let us look at this new claim that tungsten may be needed for shielding atomic aircraft from atomic radiation.

It is true that tungsten is one of many metals being studied. However, because of the weight of tungsten it is possible that a lighter weight metal will be found to be more satisfactory.

An atomic airplane will have to be very large to carry the weight involved. Therefore, only a relative small number of such planes would be built considering the excessive cost. Yet even if 10 tons of tungsten would be used in such a plane, we have enough in surplus alone to build 5,750 atomic aircraft.

Now here is what a Member of the other body said a year ago during the Senate hearings on the authorizing bill on this question of the adequacy of the tungsten supply and restrictions on defense use:

Since it has been amply proven, and I said before the success of the program works against me a little bit, that we are now currently producing twice as much tungsten for the normal civilian needs and that you have a 5-year stockpile (it is now 6 going on 7). The going concern production is such that coupled with the stockpile it is so far ahead of needs that there is no need of worrying about it at all.

Dr. FLEMMING. That is right, on the basis of our present requirements and information.

NO LONG-RANGE PLAN FOR TUNGSTEN

The stated purpose of Public Law 733 was to merely provide interim assistance to the tungsten producers pending the development of a long-range nondefense domestic-minerals program. We have all waited patiently for over 2½ years for the administration to come up with solution to the problem. Even as late as May 24, 1957, the House Subcommittee on Mines and Mining in its resolution gave as one of the reasons for supporting this appropriation the fact that the long-range program had not yet been recommended by the administration. Well, last week on June 4, the administration finally submitted its long-range minerals program to Congress. Again I repeat Public Law 733 was merely to provide interim assistance until we have a long-range nondefense plan for tungsten—and what was announced as the long-range plan—that we continue with the interim assistance under Public Law 733. Just go ahead and buy another \$53,650,000 worth of tungsten which we don't need and all the problems will be solved. The domestic producers claim they can't compete with foreign producers in the United States market. I fail to see what is going to be accomplished by continuing to sell all of their tungsten to the United States Government at \$20 a unit over market price, while foreign tungsten is used by industry. The only long-range plan that I can see in this is that they will keep coming back and back for more money. We don't need the tungsten. We have \$260 million worth now we don't know what to do with, and more is still coming in. The taxpayers would be a lot better off if we gave these producers a gift of \$30 a unit and told them to leave it in the ground.

The truth is there isn't going to be any long-range plan, at least as long as there is hope they can keep this handout going. Now is the time to stop this so-called interim assistance.

I agree with the official of one tungsten company who said in testifying on the authorizing legislation that merely continuing Government purchase of tungsten "would be an easy answer, although I believe at the end of 3 years we will still be faced with the same problem we have today."

The campaign which has been put on by the proponents of this subsidy reminds me of the old days when fictitious names, taken from telephone books, were used to flood Congress with telegrams. I have noticed with interest that similar editorials began showing up in small-town newspapers from Ohio to New England stating the same generalities in favor of the tungsten subsidy. I have not received one letter from a small tungsten producer requesting this appropriation.

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

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. BOLAND. Is it not a fact if General Electric and Union Carbide and these other companies that are buying tungsten which is produced in foreign countries and are yet producing tungsten in the mines here, if they really were interested in a long-range tungsten program, they would be using the tungsten that is produced in our domestic mines by our own industry?

Mr. KIRWAN. That is correct. How do we know that they are not taking the tungsten that is produced over there in the foreign mines and selling it to the Government here?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. If you will give me proof, I will yield to the gentleman. How do you know they are not doing it?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. If the gentleman will give me some time, I will try to answer.

Mr. KIRWAN. Oh, if you had the proof, you would give it to me in 2 seconds and I would not have to yield.

This means we are being asked to continue buying from the domestic mines of some of these corporations at \$55 a unit.

Let me show you what happened just this last Friday. The world market on tungsten last Friday closed at \$26—and the duty is included. That means now that we are almost about to give these tungsten people \$30 a unit. Have the farmers ever gotten a break like that?

Mr. WITHROW. What is meant by a unit?

Mr. KIRWAN. It is 20 pounds.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I understand that before the committee of the other body the question was asked of the president of the Tungsten Institute as to whether or not the domestic production was used by industry and the president of the Tungsten Institute said, "Not a single pound."

Mr. KIRWAN. That is correct. He said that not a single pound was used,

Mr. TABER. So they do not use what they produce.

Mr. KIRWAN. No, they do not use what they produce. The can buy it for \$26 and sell it to us for \$55. Suppose we went home and some fellow came up on the television and said, "Look at what John McGook, your Representative, is doing?" Where would we be? Why, they would have us in the ash can—this, the great deliberative body that styles itself the greatest deliberative body on earth. I am only telling you facts.

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

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. I think the gentleman has shown to this House that there is an abundance of tungsten available, both in the stockpile and at the mines. I think we should be guided in this debate by the testimony of the Administrator of the General Services Administration before the Independent Offices Subcommittee to the effect that the Government had reached its minimum objective and also its long-range minimum objective in most categories.

Mr. BOLAND. I ask my colleague if this is not true, that not one dime was appropriated here for the fiscal year 1958 for the stockpiling of tungsten by GSA and the Office of Defense Mobilization? Is that not right?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes, there is more than an abundance in the mineral stockpile. They have achieved the minimum objective and the long-term stockpile objective.

Mr. BOLAND. And the long-term objective was a period of 5 years?

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

Mr. KIRWAN. Briefly.

Mr. ENGLE. I do not want to make a lengthy statement, but I would like to ask if it is not true that Dr. Flemming, the head of the Office of Defense Mobilization, appeared before the House committee—

Mr. KIRWAN. That was asked before, and I know he did appear before the Senate committee.

Mr. ENGLE. I am getting back to the authorization bill. Let me finish my question.

Mr. KIRWAN. I do not care about that fact. I told you about it and I did not lie.

Mr. ENGLE. I am not accusing the gentleman of lying, I am just calling attention to all the facts.

Mr. KIRWAN. I covered all that, and you sent me to conference without even the hearings being printed.

Mr. ENGLE. I beg to differ with the gentleman, and I want to cite the record. I am asking a question.

Mr. KIRWAN. On Public Law 733 did you have printed hearings?

Mr. ENGLE. Please let me ask the question. I ask if it is not true that Dr. Flemming, the head of the Office of Defense Mobilization, appeared before the House Committee on the Interior as well as the Senate Committee on the Interior? And his testimony appears on page 6 of the House Committee Report No. 2596 accompanying the bill S. 982, a measure which became Public Law 733.

Mr. KIRWAN. Dr. Flemming at no time said that he did not have enough tungsten for defense requirements. Now, I have covered that already.

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

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I wanted to ask the gentleman—I am not so concerned about tungsten—but I am concerned much more about the other metals.

Mr. KIRWAN. I know what the gentleman refers to—the conference with the other body.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I want to ask the gentleman why it was they did not eliminate tungsten.

Mr. KIRWAN. We did not want tungsten, but in the conference they would not take out one; it was all or nothing.

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

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. There is a tungsten mine in Montana producing tungsten and selling tungsten on the market, but there are other tungsten mines in Montana which have closed down because they could not produce competitively.

Mr. KIRWAN. Let me read you a letter I received from a taxpayer in Montana.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed clipping is an example of the extreme pressure being exerted, on those of you chosen to direct our Federal Government, by special groups.

While it is not my wish to close down these tungsten operators in my county, the fact remains that you have a very great responsibility in expenditures. Our Government must have spent some \$20 million in getting these properties in operation. If they can't stand on their own feet by now, I'm sure there is no hope for them.

This in no way criticizes the initial program. If you need the tungsten for stockpiling, that's one thing. If we don't, let's not have mineral surpluses like we have farm surpluses.

I salute you fellows for doing your own thinking. Keep it up.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM E. HAND.

DILLON, MONT.

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

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. I know the gentleman wants to be fair. Does the gentleman know about the tungsten contract we have over there in Korea?

Mr. KIRWAN. I do not care about Korea. We have enough for jet engines to last for 192 years. I know we flew it out of Korea during the war, but we do not need it today.

Mr. DURHAM. We will tear down an engine and we will settle the argument of how much tungsten there is in a jet engine. We will try to do that.

Mr. KIRWAN. We took that up with the research and development laboratory at Wright Field and they said they used on an average from 20 to 25 pounds of tungsten in a jet engine. They are the ones who gave us the information.

Mr. DURHAM. Why are we buying tungsten then?

Mr. KIRWAN. That is what we are trying to prove here today.

Mr. DURHAM. We want to further subsidize the mine and put them in business with American dollars. You cannot blame them for buying it where they are getting it the cheapest.

Mr. KIRWAN. Do we need tungsten today?

Mr. DURHAM. I am not arguing with the gentleman about tungsten, if he will listen to what I said. I was putting this on the basis that we must continue our mining industry in this country.

Mr. KIRWAN. There are about 4,000 people in this country in the tungsten industry from the king down to the miner. I am talking about people working in the industry. It only involves 4,000. Yet in the State of Pennsylvania alone there are something like 25,000 miners who have not worked since World War II and we are not thinking of giving them a bonus to go back to work. We are not giving them any work to do.

Mr. DURHAM. I am not arguing that.

Mr. KIRWAN. I speak from the heart when I say it has not been easy for me to oppose my friends who have favored this appropriation to help the mining industry in their States. I only hope they will understand how I feel when I see this needless expense of \$70 million and realize what that money would accomplish in our national forests and parks, in providing urgently needed flood protection and reclamation, and in research on our national resources. Our committee has approved large increases for the Bureau of Mines. On the 4 minerals covered by Public Law 733, we more than doubled the research in the 1958 bill over what was appropriated in 1956. These are the expenditures which will keep this country great and I will continue to support them. But with the rising cost of Government, we will not be able to provide adequately for these essential expenditures unless we stop needless subsidies like this which benefit only a relatively few individuals.

I have no objection to providing additional funds fluorspar, asbestos, and columbium-tantalum, because these are small industries needing help to get started. An unobligated balance of over \$2 million is still available, and only a very small appropriation is required to carry these 2 minerals through the next fiscal year. I will make every effort to see that these funds are made available.

Now many Members have told me in recent weeks that Members on both sides have come to them and said it would mean their defeat if this tungsten money was not appropriated. The way I look at it, if we give this \$70 million away, the people should ask for waivers on all of us.

I ask you all to support the committee in stopping this tungsten subsidy for I know it is the only right thing for us to do.

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

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

There was no objection.

DOMESTIC MINERAL POLICIES

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of those Members who are supporting this amendment.

In my opinion in the debate upon appropriations for the purchase of tungsten and other strategic materials there is much more at stake than the number of dollars involved.

First. The testimony in hearings before congressional committees proves that in 1951 we were desperately in need of tungsten. This need was directly due to the failure of maintaining our tungsten production following World War II. We were relying on cheaper imports from other nations, and seemed to be unwilling to pay a price for American tungsten to offset American costs of labor, taxes, and materials.

Our desperate need of tungsten led the Defense Department to initiate a domestic program which contemplated the production of 3 million units of tungsten at a price which would pay American costs.

In addition contracts were executed with other nations to produce approximately 7,500,000 units at a price level quite comparable to that paid to domestic producers.

The foreign contracts brings up the question, Why did we execute production contracts with them for two and one-half times that of domestic contracts? The answer in my opinion is that many of those in charge of procurement had been led to believe that we did not have the domestic deposits to produce the tungsten required by the Defense Department.

Five years of production, however, have proved that we do have the deposits to produce the tungsten we need for many years in the future, providing we have a mineral policy which believes in domestic production and provides a unit price which will permit the payment of American cost factors.

For Congress and the United States to have the definite proof that we do have tungsten deposits to supply our needs in peace or war is worth many times the cost of the program up to this time.

In addition American industry, knowing that a future supply will be available, can expand the present use of tungsten in producing many new types of high-grade steel.

Second. The Defense Department in setting up a buying program for tungsten and other strategic materials, backed up with appropriations by Congress induced individuals to invest their capital and led them to believe that the program would be replaced with a long-range mineral policy.

In the 84th Congress we enacted Public Law 733. In passing this type of legislation producers were led to believe that the program would be continued until a long-range program could be worked out. Therefore in my opinion Congress is morally obligated to continue the appropriations until such time as may be required to replace it.

Failure to appropriate the funds will mean the closing out of our tungsten industry. In so doing we will liquidate the capital invested for production and once again we will be dependent upon other

nations in a period of uncertain supplies and uncertain future needs. I cannot conceive of anything more destructive to our economy than to discontinue production from our own natural resources. It means a loss of jobs and income.

Three. Opponents of the appropriation are afraid of the cost. Why should we be afraid of costs? If we produce the tungsten we will have both the tungsten and the money. We cannot lose by producing our own supply.

During the 25-year period 1929-53, the record of our economy proves beyond the question of doubt that for each \$1 of raw material produced in our economy we generated \$5 of national income. Let me illustrate the turnover of the new dollar earned by production of new wealth in the form of tungsten.

In 1956 we produced approximately \$55 million of tungsten. With the five times turnover of the new wealth dollar, the industry created \$275 million of national income.

At the present time the average wage earner is receiving approximately \$4,000 per year. In other words the national income created by tungsten production will pay directly and indirectly the wages of 68,750 American workers.

There is an old saying that you cannot have your cake and eat it. Failure to continue the appropriations will force us to lose both the tungsten production and the \$275 million of national income created by its production.

The Federal Government at the present time is receiving approximately 23 percent of the national income in tax revenue. The loss of tax revenue on the national income created by tungsten production will approximate \$63 million.

It should be remembered that in closing up the tungsten mines, we will also close up many communities now dependent upon the mines for their business volume and their payment of State and local taxes. From a financial standpoint for Congress to deliberately vote to shut off the appropriations thus forcing the mines to close would be pennywise and pound-foolish.

Fourth. Finally in voting against the appropriations to continue the mining of tungsten and other strategic materials we will indirectly establish a precedent which could lead to the destruction of all metal mining in the United States.

Since 1954, by the purchase of metals for stockpiling, we have been in reality supporting the metal prices for the entire world. If it is a sound policy to stop the appropriations for tungsten because of the fear of costs, the next logical step would be to vote against all appropriations for stockpiling of other metals. Such a step would force many other types of mining to suspend their production thus shutting off the sources of many billions of dollars of national income.

In closing I would like to point out that since 1940 we have added approximately \$600 billion to the total debt, public and private. We have increased hourly wages from an average of 63.3 cents per hour for all industry up to \$2.05 per hour in 1957.

These financial obligations and the payroll existing at the present time cannot be met by closing down our own production of new wealth. They cannot be met by importing cheap raw materials from other nations as a reciprocal market to buy the output of manufactured goods. The current buying power of an American miner producing tungsten is approximately five times that of miners in other producing nations.

Stated simply we cannot afford to cut back the production of new wealth from any domestic source if we wish to have the income to operate a solvent economy. What we do in regard to this appropriation is applicable to thousands of American products. If we are going to discontinue our own production because of costs then we must be prepared to accept a similar reduction in payrolls, national income, and domestic buying power.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ENGLE) there were—ayes 47, noes 156.

So the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] was agreed to.

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

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the conference report may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1958

Mr. CANNON. 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. 8090) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army and certain agencies of the Department of the Interior 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 not to exceed 2 hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], and one-half by myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

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. 8090, 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. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations presents to the House the Public Works Appropriation bill for 1958. With the exception of the mutual security appropriation bill and the usual supplemental bills, it is the last appropriation bill to come to the House.

It is not a perfect bill. But it is probably the most satisfactory public works appropriation bill reported by the committee for some time. It totals \$814,813,023. It is \$61,639,977 below the budget estimates and it is \$52,521,977 below corresponding appropriations for the fiscal year 1957.

We are glad to report that there is not one item in the bill that is not budgeted and there is no item above the budget estimate.

Mr. Chairman, some have contended that the Congress should not permit the Bureau of the Budget to write the appropriation bills. I heartily concur. That is a function of the Congress. Congress does permit some of the departments to write some of their own legislative bills, as you know. Congress in effect has partially surrendered its functions to some of the departments.

But in connection with the disparaging reflections made by some on the function of the Bureau of the Budget, may I call the attention of the House to a very interesting chapter in the fiscal history of the Nation.

It goes back to 1908 and beyond. At that time, although the revenues of the Government were largely from excise taxes, we were already beginning to appreciate the inadequacy of the old haphazard method of handling appropriations.

In 1908 a National Monetary Commission was appointed under the chairmanship of Senator Nelson W. Aldrich, of Massachusetts. This Commission visited practically every capital in Europe, carefully considered the budgetary system of every major nation of the time, and with large and competent staffs exhaustively analyzed and collated European methods with our own.

Finally, in 1919 a special committee of the House under the able chairmanship of Mr. Good, of Iowa, collaborated with a Senate committee and reported out what became the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921.

The pressure for a revised budgetary system was further emphasized when the 16th constitutional amendment was adopted. Under the 16th amendment income taxes brought in such a golden stream of revenue, so far beyond anything which anyone had anticipated, that a more modern system was imperative.

The act of 1921 established the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau has more than justified the expectations on which it was established. Naturally, it has

had its critics but to date there have been no criticism which a one-package appropriation bill would not remedy.

Its estimates should be considered ceilings and this year those ceilings have been particularly high—the highest in the peacetime history of the country.

And yet there are those who complain because the budget, as large as it is, does not include estimates in which they are personally interested. It might be said in passing that if a project is so lacking in merit or priority as to fail to be included in this year's budget, it must be deficient indeed.

Certainly proponents of a project reveal the poverty of their cause when they seek to make capital for their proposal by abusing the budgetary system established with such painstaking care and so fully justified by the experience of more than three decades of exacting trial and research in the most hectic period of the world's history.

Mr. Chairman, we concede that in the bill now before you—a more than a generous bill—it is possible there may be included, items perhaps of doubtful merit, appropriations which could be reduced or eliminated.

But certainly, Mr. Chairman, the bill provides every expenditure for public works, submitted either by the Bureau of the Budget, or by any member of the committee or the House, legitimately needed at this time.

We welcome reductions which can be justified. We see no possible need for increases in any item.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I presume most Members have read the report which is not too lengthy, but which explains the bill quite well. The committee recommends an appropriation of \$814,813,023, a reduction of \$61,639,977 or a 7-percent decrease in the budget estimate and \$52,521,977 below similar appropriations for the fiscal year 1957—that is the present year. The recommendations of the committee and the specific appropriation items will be found in the table at the end of the report as usual.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, this appropriation provides funds for a multitude of projects, all river and harbor improvements, flood control, irrigation and reclamation, hydroelectric dams and transmission lines. There are some 280 projects provided for in this bill either for investigating funds, planning funds or construction funds. The committee held hearings for 2 months. There were over 700 witnesses before the committee of which approximately 200 were Members of Congress who came before the committee with people from their districts who are interested in projects in their respective areas.

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides money for many things in America. There is no money in this bill for anything beyond our shores. It is a bill to furnish funds to carry on the conservation of our natural resources of every nature including the conservation of our soil on all our public land, the conserva-

tion of minerals and metals and the conservation of soil in every area of this country where erosion is a problem along our seashores and rivers.

So it is a very important bill. I am sure if every American could have the privilege of sitting in the hearings of the Committee on Public Works they would be intrigued by the great interest manifested by people in every walk of life, asking the Federal Government to spend money for these many projects. I would say an overwhelming majority of those projects are very necessary and worthwhile, and all of a beneficial nature nationally. When we on the committee get ready to mark up the bill to determine how much money we shall allow for each item, we are dealing with important matters. We want to do the thing that is best for every area of the country, but we do not want to appropriate money that is not necessary.

There are disturbing things, of course, that come before the committee. I might read what the report says on page 12, half way down the page, under the heading "Local Cooperation":

The committee is seriously concerned about the lack of local contribution on many of the local flood protection and harbor projects. It feels that where there is a major flood-control problem on large interstate rivers that the Federal Government logically can assume the greater portion of the cost. On those projects that are intrastate, and often of a strictly local origin and benefit, the local interests should rightfully provide a substantial portion of the cost of the projects. It is the intent of this committee to give more consideration to those projects where local interests are willing and able to make the proper contribution, regardless of whether or not the authorization requires it.

Many localities show good faith when they come before the committee, and their representatives tell us that the local contribution to the project is so many hundred dollars or so many thousand dollars or so many million dollars. There are projects in this bill, that cost millions and millions of dollars where there is not one red penny of local contribution I am sorry to say.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I notice on pages 17 and 18 a rather critical reference by the committee of the Ainsworth and Farwell projects in Nebraska. They were disallowed largely because the Ainsworth project paid only 30 percent of the repayment rate and Farwell 40 percent. The average repayment, I am sure the gentleman knows, in the Missouri River Basin is about 17 percent. Some projects only pay back at the rate of 10. However, under reclamation law the power revenues are applied. I am a little disturbed when I find these two projects, after the people had their repayment contracts made and had gone through all of the machinery it is necessary to go through, then have them disallowed on the basis they were not paying back when actually they are paying back far more than the average reclamation project in the United States. There

is no flood-control money in here because flood control pays back not one penny.

Mr. JENSEN. I know well what the gentleman is talking about and I can understand why he is disturbed about the fact that funds for those projects were deleted from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, generally speaking, reclamation projects pay back on an average about 90 percent of the funds Congress has appropriated for such projects, based upon a 50-year amortization period. These two projects in Nebraska would be exceptions, and I might say that I, too, was quite surprised that these two projects were deleted from the bill.

I do want to call attention also to some language in the bill wherein the committee was quite critical of the Bureau of Reclamation regarding the transfer of funds without coming to the Appropriations Committee members to make a case for such transfer.

I have a statement here from Mr. Dexter, Chief, Bureau of Reclamation, which I shall read into the Record at this point.

The statement is as follows:

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1958—BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

The committee print on the public works appropriation, dated June 13, 1957, covers funds for civil functions of the Department of the Army, civil works of the Corps of Engineers, and the following agencies of the Department of the Interior: Bureau of Reclamation, Bonneville Power Administration, Southeastern Power Administration, and Southwestern Power Administration, and recommends an appropriation of 7 percent below the budget estimate submitted.

It is noted in the report that for the majority of the agencies the committee recommended appropriation of most of the money requested by them. However, it is noted that extreme and drastic cuts far in excess of the 7 percent were made in the Bureau of Reclamation request. For example, planning funds for the Bureau were cut 25 percent. The overall cut for the Bureau of Reclamation is over 12 percent.

This is most difficult to understand because, first, the Bureau of Reclamation is an agency which returns over 90 percent of its funds appropriated by repayment contracts with water users and by power revenues. In addition, over 50 percent of the funds appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation is from the reclamation fund which is made up of revenues from public land States. The planning work done by the Bureau of Reclamation is most essential to development of sound, economical, and well-engineered projects before presentation to the Congress. Planning of the projects, of course, does not necessarily mean that the Congress will authorize them. Extensive hearings are held before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of both Houses before any project is authorized for construction. In view of this, it seems very shortsighted to curtail a program of investigation so important to development of the water resources of the arid Western States.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have been asked the question as to whether or not the pending bill contains any money for power facilities for the Trinity River project. My answer is a categorical "no", while the bill contains money for other fea-

tures of the project, it contains no money for power facilities. So that Members will be informed on this point, I should like to make a brief explanation.

The act—Public Law 386, 84th Congress, 1st session, approved August 12, 1955—which authorized the Trinity River division of the Central Valley project of California contains this provision:

Provided, That the Secretary is authorized and directed to continue to a conclusion the engineering studies and negotiations with any non-Federal agency with respect to proposals to purchase falling water and, not later than 18 months from the date of enactment of this act, report the results of such negotiations, including the terms of a proposed agreement, if any, that may be reached, together with his recommendations thereon, which agreement, if any, shall not become effective until approved by Congress.

The Secretary of the Interior, in compliance with this directive, made a report to the Congress with respect to negotiations on the sale of falling water to be produced by the Trinity River division. He also submitted the terms of the proposed agreement together with his recommendations thereon. His report and recommendations were submitted on February 12, 1957, and are contained in House Document No. 94, 85th Congress, 1st session.

Bills which would carry out the Secretary's recommendations have been introduced and are now pending before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

Because of the provision in the basic act which I have just read, the President did not recommend any money for the power facilities of the Trinity project. The President correctly construed the authorizing language to mean that the authorization for the power facilities cannot be effective until the requirements set forth in the proviso quoted above have been complied with.

When appropriations for the Central Valley project were being considered by our committee, the Secretary's recommendations and the pending legislation were discussed at some length. I proposed that the following language be included in the committee report:

In 1954 the committee enunciated the policy that it would not consider appropriations for any project not authorized by legislation. Although the Trinity project as a whole was authorized in 1955 (Public Law 386, 84th Cong.), the authorizing legislation directed that a study be made by the Secretary of the Interior to determine the feasibility of construction of the power facilities by a non-Federal agency and that any recommended agreement covering joint development be submitted to the Congress for approval.

Such agreement has now been recommended by the Secretary and bills which would authorize joint development are now pending in the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Under these circumstances, the committee does not consider the authorization for Federal power facilities as being effective until the action directed by the authorizing act has been completed. Therefore, the committee directs that no part of this appropriation shall be obligated for Trinity power facilities.

The committee felt that the language which I proposed was unnecessary. Their view was materially strengthened by the clear-cut and positive statement

of Clyde Spencer, regional director of the Bureau of Reclamation, Sacramento, contained on page 442 of the hearings and reading as follows:

Mr. RABAUT. Are there any funds in the 1958 request which would implement construction of the power features either on a partnership or on an all-Federal basis?

Mr. SPENCER. No, sir.

Mr. RABAUT. All right. I assume you would not use any available funds to implement the power features on either basis until after appropriate review by the committee.

Mr. SPENCER. That is correct, sir. We would have to have a mandate from the Congress.

You will note that Mr. Spencer agrees that without further action by the Congress, neither the Bureau of Reclamation nor the Department of the Interior have any authority in law to use any funds or to request such funds to implement the power facilities of the project.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to my good friend from California.

Mr. GUBSER. I wonder if the gentleman knows offhand, or could inform me at a later time, as to whether or not this bill includes funds for any project or any investigation which was not in the President's budget request?

Mr. JENSEN. No; it does not.

Mr. GUBSER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I would like to ask my friend from Iowa a question relative to the introductory paragraph on page 14 concerning the Department of the Interior which perhaps is one of the most significant criticisms that the Appropriations Committee can levy against any bureau of the Government. It is particularly interesting to me because I have the responsibility and the honor of chairmanship of the committee which has to do with irrigation and reclamation. The paragraph reads as follows:

During the course of the hearings, a number of the Bureau witnesses demonstrated an apparent lack of preparedness and an inexcusable unwillingness to provide factual and responsive answers to questions of the committee members. The committee expects and is fully entitled to prompt, comprehensive and responsive answers. It does not expect to be put through the process of digging out facts piece by piece in a time wasting and unnecessary process.

I wish my good friend from Iowa to know that I agree entirely with the statement in the last two sentences, the expectations of the committee, but I would like to know as fully as the gentleman has time to explain it just what did take place or what did not take place as to the Bureau of Reclamation's failure to justify its presentation.

Mr. JENSEN. My only answer to the gentleman must be that I did not—I was not asked to take part in writing the report; nor did any Member on my side of the aisle have any part in writing the report to my knowledge. I do not know who wrote the report. There are some things in the report I do not agree with.

The final draft of the report on the bill was handed to us first just shortly

before we went into committee. Now, I am sure the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] would be in a position to answer that question.

Now, Mr. Dexheimer in his statement, which I will make a part of my remarks, explains that that reduction is going to work a hardship on the Bureau of Reclamation. I hope that the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation, whoever testifies before the Senate committee, will make a better showing and that they will explain this matter more to the satisfaction of the Senate committee than they did to our committee.

Mr. ASPINALL. Then may I ask this additional question? It is the feeling of the gentleman from Iowa that they did fail to make a complete justification?

Mr. JENSEN. I must admit that their answers to our questions in some instances were not quite up to the standard of the past several years.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to support this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the average yearly flood damage to New England is \$32 million.

In 1955 hurricane Diane cost 90 lives and between five hundred and six hundred million dollars due to river flooding alone.

Next to the Connecticut, the Merrimack is the most important river in this region.

The disasters suffered by New England in this decade, would even wake up a Rip Van Winkle. As a result, New England's share of flood-control money was raised a little. In 1956 it reached 4.23 percent of the Nation's total. This is far, far below the amount needed to provide flood-control projects that, in the opinion of Army engineers, are essential to prevent a recurrence of such disasters.

In considering the bill that provides appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, and certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, I am aware that the Committee on Appropriations is guided by the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget. I know that the committee has labored long and earnestly to bring out a bill that it considers fair and prudent.

In this connection, I am grateful for the \$550,000 that is recommended by the committee for the Mystic River in Massachusetts. Concerning the \$14,000 for an initial study of methods to control the Merrimack River which courses through the States of New Hampshire and Massachusetts, I think that it errs on the side of moderation.

The flood control compact for the Merrimack River was ratified by the legislatures of the two States whose agreement was necessary in working out preliminary details.

Congress gave its approval.

On April 23, 1957, President Eisenhower signed the bill giving consent to this interstate compact.

As the Bureau of the Budget had already made its recommendations before this ratification procedure had been com-

pleted, the \$600,000 that is regarded as a minimum to expedite work on the Hopkinton-Everett Reservoir that will be the key to control of the Merrimack, was not included in the present bill.

I hope that, before this bill goes to the President for his signature, ways and means will be found to insert this \$600,000 item in the bill.

Time is the all-important factor here, because it will take over 5 years to complete the Hopkinton-Everett project. Legislative delays will extend the danger period for the hundreds of thousands of people living in the industrial communities that were built up along the banks of the Merrimack in the days when the river provided water-power for the textile mills.

Mr. Walter P. Muther, staff director, Associated Industries of Massachusetts Flood Control Committee, describes the Merrimack as "potentially the most dangerous flood site in Massachusetts today."—From Industry, which is the official spokesman for industry in Massachusetts, in its issue of October 1956.

The history of the Merrimack offers an all too vivid and painful documentation of this fact.

What happened before, will happen again * * * with damage to property and irreplaceable loss of human life, unless we build protective works to control the Merrimack in flood season.

I know that it is impossible for the Committee on Appropriations to approve every flood-control bill that is introduced. The exigencies of politics require that every Congressman should try to get as large a slice of these appropriations for his own district, in order to provide construction jobs for some of his constituents, and to prove that he is on the ball.

This is a human motivation, with which one cannot quarrel.

But, as between those projects that are urgent and those that could be deferred or denied, I submit that there is an important distinction as to need and priority.

By any objective appraisal, the Merrimack River constitutes a real danger that must be controlled.

To verify this statement, I have no hesitancy in referring you to the sound and competent judgment of the United States Army engineers.

The appropriation of \$14,000 for the Merrimack, out of an overall appropriation of \$814,813,023 recommended by the committee, is but a "finger in the hole of the dike."

I shall vote for this bill, in the national interest, and because of the worthwhile and necessary projects in other sections of the nation, but even at this late date in the legislative process, I seek some way to keep the door open for additional funds to expedite progress on the Merrimack Valley flood-control program.

Before this bill reaches the President, there should be recognition of the fact that a \$14,000 appropriation is not enough to make a real and effective start on a flood control project that has been delayed for 17 years, with consequent losses to the people and the industries of the valley.

How long, Mr. Chairman, must we wait for flood protection?

Mr. BATES. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, the Merrimack Valley flood control problem is a serious one to which I have given much time and attention, and I regret that the compact between the States of Massachusetts and New Hampshire on flood control was not consummated in time to permit the incorporation of the required funds in H. R. 8090, the public works appropriation bill before us today, and thus permit the construction of the Hopkinton-Everett Reservoir project in the Merrimack River Basin.

The Army engineers have advised me that their studies have convinced them that the lack of control of the Contoocook River watershed basin poses a very serious threat to the entire Merrimack Valley.

It has been estimated that a recurrence of the 1936 floods in the Merrimack area would cause \$157,000,000 damage and losses without reservoir protection. Of this potential damage, about \$94,000,000 would be prevented with existing reservoirs.

It is imperative, however, that the project must be completed in order to give the area the protection it requires.

I sincerely trust that the Senate will provide the funds requested in my bill H. R. 6637 and totaling \$600,000 so that the initial step may be taken this year and thus initiate proper protective flood control for this area.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of clearing up what I consider to be an error in the report, at least an error in the material which was placed before our subcommittee when we were marking up this particular bill. I have reference to the Elk City—Table Mound—Reservoir in Kansas.

At the time we were considering the bill in subcommittee under the general understanding that we would not consider projects which fell in a certain classification, there was, before the members of the subcommittee, a so-called worksheet upon which Elk River was designated as a new start. In the multiplicity of these projects none of us can keep advised of each and every one of them, but had I known at the time that \$165,000 had already been expended in investigation related to this project I certainly would have insisted that the \$85,000 presented by the budget for this project should be included.

The purpose of my rising now is first to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] if my statement is not correct that upon the worksheet placed before us the term "new start" was used in connection with this project.

Mr. FENTON. This is what it says: "New planning start."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct. It was upon that assumption, Mr. Chairman, on the part of several of us on the committee, that we turned down this project.

May I ask our chairman [Mr. CANNON] if we could not rectify this error by agreeing unofficially that this \$85,000 to complete the planning for this project should by right be in the bill. Would the gentleman go as far as to agree with me on that?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is correct that it is a continuation of the planning. When it was submitted to the committee, as the gentleman will recall, it was submitted upon the recommendation of people who had studied the matter, and no recommendation was made that it be further provided for in this bill. I do not recall any discussion of it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. As I have stated, it escaped our attention, immersed as it is in this vast quantity of projects. I personally never would have agreed in subcommittee to the deletion of this project unless I had felt it was a new start, which it is not. So it is my intention when we read the bill for amendment to offer an amendment to restore this \$85,000 to the planning for this project.

Mr. CANNON. This project was not taken up for consideration in the subcommittee.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct. I would appreciate it if at that time I could offer it as a committee amendment, to rectify this error.

Mr. CANNON. As the gentleman is aware, the amendment was taken out of the bill at the time the subcommittee reported it to the whole committee.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct.

Mr. CANNON. It was not considered either in the subcommittee or the whole committee, except we did know it was an amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It is my intention to offer it as an amendment when we reach the proper place in the reading of the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GEORGE. This \$85,000 is to carry on a project that has been underway in the planning stage since 1941. It has cleared the Army Engineers and been recommended all the way through. However, due to the fact that some of my colleagues considered it as a new start, they did not give it the consideration in committee it should properly have had.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct. As far as I personally am concerned, and I am sure this applies to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], we did consider it as a new start because of that asterisk placed in the worksheet before us.

Mr. GEORGE. Certainly this committee has heard evidence on it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and other members of the committee who have preceded me, have fully covered the major items in the pending public works appropriations bill. This bill carries recommended overall appropriations in the amount of \$814,813,023 to continue the work and services of the various agencies for which the funds are needed in the public interest.

It is always stimulating and refreshing to work with the members of the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee. Service on this committee, at times is taxing and arduous, but it is also rewarding and I would like to take this opportunity to again express my thanks and appreciation to our Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and to our subcommittee chairman, LOUIS RABAUT; to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], and all of the members of the committee for their cordiality and spirit of cooperation.

The bill as reported, carries funds for the management and operation of the Bonneville Power Administration, Southeastern Power Administration, and Southwestern Power Administration, civil functions of the Department of the Army which includes the public works program of the Corps of Engineers.

In keeping with the other recommendations of the Appropriations Committee during this session of the Congress, this bill represents a reduction of \$61,639,977, or 7 percent less than the budget request—and is \$52,521,977 below similar appropriations for the fiscal year 1957.

This bill can truly be called an all-American bill because of the diversity of the projects included in this appropriation. The public works development of our Nation will move forward as result of the money provided in this bill and our country will be made stronger and our national defense strengthened.

Having heard the testimony throughout the hearings on this bill, one cannot escape without being impressed with the great public works program of the Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of Reclamation and the power marketing programs of Bonneville, Southeastern, and the Southwestern Power Administrations.

Our committee has heard testimony and sympathetically considered projects for all areas of the country—the New England Basin, the South Atlantic Basin, the upper and lower Mississippi River Basins, the Ohio River Basin, the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway Basin, the Missouri Basin, the Rio Grande and Southwest area, the upper Colorado River Basin, the Columbia River Basin, the Central Valley of California, and, in fact, projects in all areas of our great Nation.

Time will not permit extensive statements with respect to all of the great projects carried in this bill. Funds are provided for continuation of the great

program undertaken in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River basin. This overall program includes the dredging of a canal from the St. Lawrence River which will extend more than 250 miles into the heartland of our country and thereby creating a network of canals and ports which will greatly improve navigation and commerce. This overall plan calls for construction of 32 hydroelectric power-producing units within this project—16 on the American side and 16 on the Canadian side.

Also of particular concern to the Nation is the great construction projects underway in our New England States which have suffered severely in recent years from recurring floods. These projects in New Hampshire, New York, Rhode Island, Vermont, Massachusetts, and other New England States will greatly contribute to soil conservation and be effective in reducing the terrible toll from floods which have plagued this particular section of our Nation.

For example, funds are carried in this bill totalling \$14,970,000—almost \$15 million for construction alone in the State of Massachusetts for needed and necessary projects. The smaller State of Vermont will receive \$7,802,000 for construction work on 5 projects.

These projects are aimed at conserving and utilizing the water resources of our country—one of our most precious and valued possessions. Our ability to turn the God-given water of this land to its proper and natural use for travel, irrigation, and power, has contributed beyond measure to the growth and greatness of our country. Through appropriations such as the one before us today, our Nation will move forward in the progress of the internal development of our great Nation.

For 133 years the Corps of Engineers has built and maintained our Nation's harbors and navigable waters—helping bring this Nation to its present peak of world leadership in navigation.

Since 1936, the United States Corps of Engineers has been chiefly responsible for the task of providing nationwide flood control. In this history of achievement, the corps has completed some 2,200 projects authorized by the Congress—at a cost of more than \$3.4 billion. In addition, \$3.9 billion has been invested in projects underway, and authorized projects will cost \$9.3 billion. These projects are primarily for navigation and flood control, but they are yielding and have yielded other benefits—such as hydroelectric power, municipal and industrial water supply, recreation development, pollution abatement, fish and wildlife conservation, irrigation supply and other emoluments.

A few moments ago, I referred to this bill as an all-American bill, and I would like to explain this remark a little more in detail. We, of the Tennessee Valley, are almost continuously under fire because of our great Tennessee Valley Authority. I would like to point out that Tennessee projects in this bill make up only a small portion. The largest percentage of funds in this appropriation will go for the development of the Missouri Valley. More than 15 percent of the total appropriation will be expended

for needed developments in this great basin. More than 14 percent of the total appropriation will be expended for developments in the Columbia River Basin in the Northwest; 10.59 percent will be expended on the lower Mississippi; 9.30 percent for the Ohio Basin and slightly more than 9 percent for New England and the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway development—every area and region of this Nation will benefit by this bill.

In this connection, I recall to mind the statements of Assistant Secretary Aandahl of the Department of Interior who appeared before the committee. Mr. Aandahl appeared to present the 1958 recommendations of the Department of Interior for irrigation, development of arid lands and the marketing of electric power—and I would like to quote part of his opening remarks.

Mr. Aandahl said, and I quote:

While these programs are conducted mainly in the Western States, they benefit the Nation as a whole. The conservation of our water, the reclaiming of unproductive lands, and the producing of power which turns the wheels of industry, all add to the commonwealth of the Nation and thus benefit all of the people.

Mr. Aandahl was speaking with great accuracy when he said that these great projects, taken individually, benefit only a small part of our population, but taken together and collectively, they benefit all of our people and contribute directly to the strength of this Nation.

This is the point that we of the Tennessee Valley are continually making—that construction, for example, of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway will have little direct effect on the people I am privileged to represent in the great Fourth Congressional District of Tennessee—nor would projects on the upper Colorado—nor would the \$16 million Los Angeles County drainage project. However, one would be entirely provincial in thought if he did not admit that these projects, as well as the others in this bill, will contribute directly to our national economy and strength.

Even though there is no money in this appropriations bill for a construction project in my congressional district, I am pleased to support the appropriation requests for the many projects—they are needed and necessary and I am convinced that in the final analysis, the citizens of the Fourth Congressional District of Tennessee as well as all citizens will benefit from the proper utilization of our natural resources.

If our country is to attain greater heights—for which we all strive—we must continue this development of our water resources—utilizing these benefits, to the greatest possible advantage.

I am confident that with all regions and areas working together, that we will be able to continue to develop our water resources program for the benefit of all the people and not just for the benefit of selfish and special interests. In doing this, we will be serving our best interest and promoting our great American heritage.

Mr. Chairman, I join my colleagues in urging passage of this needed bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I am pleased to yield to my distinguished leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to congratulate my friend from Tennessee on making what I consider to be one of the finest speeches I have ever heard in its national outlook. The gentleman's broadness and understanding of the fact that we are a Union of States is very, very impressive, and the speech made by my friend from Tennessee, in my opinion, is one of the finest I have ever heard on this subject in all the years I have been a Member of this body.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman is most generous; I appreciate his remarks.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I would like to add my endorsement as well. I appeared before the committee a number of times. The gentleman from Tennessee was always there, and he has a grasp of the problems of all areas of the country that I think deserves the notice and commendation of every Member of this Congress.

Mr. EVINS. I thank my friend.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, since this is the first time that I have had the opportunity of serving on this subcommittee I want to express my appreciation for the fine manner in which the hearings were conducted.

Chairman CANNON and our colleagues, Congressmen RABAUT and KIRWAN handled the hearings in such a businesslike manner that I am sure the witnesses that appeared before us could not help but feel satisfied.

Our hearings began on March 27 wound up about 2 months later—May 21 to be exact.

In that time many witnesses were heard from the Chief of the United States Army Civil Function Engineers, Gen. E. C. Itschner and his staff, to the many fine, capable, and distinguished officer in charge of the field work throughout the United States.

Likewise the Bureau of Reclamation was represented by Assistant Secretary of the Interior, our former colleague, the Honorable Fred G. Aandahl, the Commissioner of Reclamation W. A. Dexheimer, and their staffs, together with the various chiefs of divisions and regional directors from the field.

During the 2 months of hearings, in addition to the governmental agencies, we heard about 800 witnesses—witnesses from all over the United States.

Included in those 800 witnesses were about 175 Members of Congress—that is from the House of Representatives, and 12 or 13 Members of the Senate. In other words 188 Members of the Congress.

Three governors, and many personal representatives of governors, appeared before us, and—last but not least—our distinguished Speaker.

And may I point out that of the remaining 612 outside witnesses, pleading

for money for planning, beginning construction, or construction to be continued, were scores of chambers of commerce representatives and officers from the 48 States and our possessions.

Now I was greatly impressed with such a large array of witnesses—not only because of the interest they displayed in their particular projects, their earnestness and in most instances their anxiety—but the time and effort they expended, the expense that they incurred by coming to Washington—many at their own expense.

In fact I wanted to follow through in those hearings and consequently I heard pretty nearly all of them testify because I had an almost perfect attendance record.

As I have already indicated, the witnesses received and were afforded many courtesies as was the membership of our subcommittee by those in charge.

Now I want to particularly point out that this is going to be charged by some as a "pork-barrel" program; it is also going to have to run the gamut of those who will charge that because of the large budget that we will have to put aside many projects in favor of economy; it will also be charged that some of the projects are not necessary and may encroach on the historical rights of others. These gripes are particularly true of the flood-control features of this bill.

Therefore I have endeavored to weigh all of those arguments and with the majority of the membership of our subcommittee and the full committee, I believe we have presented to you a reasonable bill. While we have eliminated over \$61,639,977 from the budget estimate, it is nevertheless a bill that we believe can be justified.

There will naturally be some disappointments—in one way or another—but I can assure you that, speaking as one of the subcommittee, we have done our best. The testimony as recorded in the 4 volumes of hearings consisting of 3,784 pages will, I believe, attest to that.

Each project of which there was any question at all was given thorough consideration in our markup. There was no meat-ax approach, and again I want to pay tribute to the panel—regardless of whether we agree or not on certain projects.

Speaking for myself, I cannot see any justification for permitting conditions to exist that are inductive to the destruction of life and property.

My friends, you would be amazed at the mounting numbers of people who have lost their lives over the years and the terrific property damage occurring annually by floods. I have not attempted to secure any totals because of lack of time. However, I am sure that from the history given by the testimony before us that we are justified in doing something to prevent future distress.

Another thing that impressed me very much in the testimony of a vast majority of the witnesses were the statements that the projects were of great help in not only retaining industry already located in those areas but also in securing new industry.

Therefore it is very apparent that the taxpayers of those areas—American

citizens—are entitled to protection not only from loss of life and property but also to improve their industrial potential.

Incidentally, this poses a question that should receive the attention of this Congress. I refer to a number of bills that have been introduced—both in the House and the Senate—area redevelopment bills that would establish a program of financial and technical assistance designed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment in economically depressed areas, and so forth.

Those areas are to my mind entitled to just as much consideration as far as saving existing industry or assisting in securing new industry as are those areas located on rivers and streams that are subject to periodic flooding. I certainly cannot see where there is any great difference in those two cases. A disaster, whether by a flood or by economics, is just as harmful as far as the inhabitants of the involved areas are concerned.

We hope that the appropriate committees who have those area assistance bills within their jurisdiction will soon be able to have hearings and make a report on them. Coming from one of those areas, and knowing how some assistance is needed—it will be appreciated if action can be expedited.

Navigation is another subject that came to our attention throughout a great deal of the hearings. The dredging of rivers and streams to permit water transportation—yes; even to manmade canals.

These dredgings for navigation have, of course, two objectives—namely, cheap water transportation and more industry in those areas, together with flood control.

Now of course the things that I have mentioned thus far are in the interest of America—just as much as are our commitments made under our foreign policies. In fact more so, because it is from our industrial strength and the taxes therefrom that we are able to help as much as we have—our friends in other countries.

Thus far I have spoken mainly of the functions of the Army engineers in civil functions.

The Reclamation Bureau as I said before testified at considerable length.

They have a large program and over the years have done fine work.

Having served on the Interior Department Subcommittee on Appropriations for a number of years I am fairly familiar with some of their work and projects.

I am frank to admit that I have been greatly impressed at times at the enormous work and jobs that they have done, and at other times I have been disappointed.

Of one thing I am sure—that they have expended plenty of the taxpayers money in those projects over the years.

Here we have another arm of our Government which deals basically with flood control—at least that is the premise on which most of the proposals are made. We are for all justified flood-control projects.

However, from this has grown the multiple purpose dams—dams to control floods; for hydroelectric plants to take care of the scarcity of power—so they say, for irrigation, for recreation, for fish and wildlife, and so forth.

We have no quarrel with all of those fine objectives, except to say that they should not say it is for scarcity of power that they erect hydroelectric power plants—rather should they say that it is for cheap power because you and I know that that is the drawing card for industry.

Now I relate those things, not in the spirit of criticism but rather to point out that area redevelopment—or area development—is not new and I repeat that we should be getting on with some of the bills for redevelopment of areas of great unemployment. They are just as entitled to consideration as those areas that enjoy the works of the Reclamation Bureau.

The budget estimates for the functions under this bill was—as you know—\$876,453,000 for fiscal year 1958, broken down as follows:

Corps of Engineers.....	\$638,905,000
Bureau of Reclamation.....	199,312,000
Bonneville Power Administration.....	33,772,000
Southeastern Power Administration.....	1,939,000
Southwestern Power Administration.....	4,464,000

As I said before the Committee cut the budget estimate by \$61,639,977, broken down as follows:

Corps of Engineers.....	\$31,708,200
Bureau of Reclamation.....	24,623,777
Bonneville Power Administration.....	5,263,000
Southwestern Power Administration.....	45,000

Which amounts to about 7 percent.

However there will be some items that were allowed by our subcommittee and the full committee that will cause some dispute and which will probably call for some discussion.

In that respect may I again call to your attention the fact that certain items were discussed at length in the committee and that there was no meat-ax approach used.

As far as I am concerned there was no pork-barrel policy involved either, and the items allowed were to my knowledge fully justified.

Your subcommittee handling this bill has worked hard and earnestly and I trust that you will support us in adopting it as recommended.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I would like to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], for his great record of attendance to duty which he exhibited during these hearings, and I want to add to the gentleman's name that of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]. Those gentlemen sat for many, many a day listening to these many witnesses at sessions some of us on the subcommittee were unable to attend. The House little realizes the strain put upon the members of that subcommittee

listening to witnesses continuously, not for days but for weeks, and I want to pay my personal tribute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] for the good job they have done on this particular bill.

Mr. FENTON. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to add my word of appreciation particularly to the chairman and the senior members of this committee for the fine job they have done on these hearings. Any time you sit down to listen to 800 witnesses on a single bill you have a job cut out for you.

I wish also to comment briefly on a point which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] mentioned; and that is the habit of the press of referring to this as the pork barrel bill.

I should like to say particularly to the ladies and gentlemen of the press, of whose ranks I was once a member, and may be again some day if the voters of my district see fit to turn me out of Congress, that we do not consider this bill a pork barrel bill. The money appropriated in this bill is among the most important appropriated by the Congress. It is an investment in America and I think while the term pork barrel is a catchy phrase and like all catchy phrases has a tendency to catch on and be repeated, it is a most unfair and derogatory term to use constantly in connection with this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to discuss two items which were eliminated from this bill by my committee. Both are of vital importance to my area and I feel a serious mistake has been made.

It is not my intention to offer an amendment at this time because I know of the committee's strong desire to hold the line which has been set up in this bill. However, it is my hope that by the time the bill has been signed into law, both of these appropriations will have been restored and that my colleagues on the Public Works Subcommittee will be in agreement with that action.

The items I refer to are for starting work on two transmission lines for the Bonneville Power Administration grid. One is the Rocky Ford-Tacoma line, for which \$1,863,000 was requested and eliminated by the committee. The other is the Chief Joseph-Rocky Reach Valley line, for which the committee rejected a \$296,000 request for surveys.

I am most hopeful that when all the facts are understood, the conferees on this bill, and the House and the other body, will agree that reconsideration should be given to these two items. To eliminate them will have a most serious adverse impact on the economy of the Pacific Northwest. Furthermore, to deny them strikes at the very heart of the power-wheeling system operated by Bonneville, which has operated with such tremendous benefit to the Northwest and the Nation.

In the report on this bill, the position is taken that the wheeling of non-Fed-

eral power, which would be a part of the use of these proposed lines, should have separate authorization, and that the wheeling of power from Priest Rapids and Rocky Reach Dams by Bonneville would set a precedent.

I should point out that Priest Rapids Dam is being built by the Grant County Public Utility District by express authority of Congress. Rocky Reach Dam is being built by the Chelan County Public Utility District. Both the public utility districts are public agencies, although non-Federal.

In my opinion, and in the opinion of the solicitor for Bonneville, ample legal authority exists for the proposed lines in the Bonneville Power Act, particularly section 2 (b). That section provides in part:

In order to encourage the widest possible use of all electric energy that can be generated and marketed and to provide reasonable outlets therefor * * * the administrator is authorized and directed to * * * construct * * * such electric transmission lines and substations * * * as he finds necessary, desirable, or appropriate for the purpose of transmitting electric energy, available for sale, from the Bonneville project to existing and potential markets, and, for the purpose of interchange of electric energy, to interconnect the Bonneville project with other Federal projects and publicly owned power systems constructed on or after August 20, 1937.

I should like to call attention particularly to the words, for the "interchange of electric energy with publicly owned power systems." These words precisely describe the situation contemplated here. The Bonneville Power Administration proposes to accept Priest Rapids power at the substation nearest to the dam and use that power to supply the needs, among others, of the Hanford atomic energy project nearby, and then to give the Grant County Public Utility District power at a substation near Seattle in exchange. A similar interchange of power is proposed for the Rocky Reach project.

In addition to the Bonneville Power Act, there is specific legislation relating to the Priest Rapids project which, in my opinion, also authorizes and requires the proposed interchange of power. That act requires that there be integration of the Priest Rapids development as part of the comprehensive plan for the Columbia River, that the output of the plant be sold in neighboring States as well as in Washington, and that the public benefits accruing from the plant be spread over as extensive an area as practical. The only way that these objectives can be accomplished is through the utilization of the Bonneville grid, which reaches into all the northwestern States. Wheeling over the Federal grid specifically was contemplated in the Congressional deliberations preceding the enactment of the Priest Rapids Act; without such wheeling, I feel sure that the act would not have been passed.

For full utilization of the benefits of the Priest Rapids and Rocky Reach plants, they must be integrated hydraulically and electrically with the other major plants of the region. This is a mandatory requirement of the FPC licenses under which both plants are

being built. For efficiency in transmission, the basic grid principle—the maintenance of power pooling—must be preserved. Wheeling arrangements accomplish these generating and transmission system benefits and efficiencies.

The wheeling of non-Federal power will be on a fully reimbursable basis. It will not be a financial burden to the Government or to Bonneville's other customers. Not only will wheeling be fully reimbursable, it will also be of substantial direct advantage to the Government's system and its customers.

Since load centers will be served from closest points of generation, losses of power in transmission will be reduced. More efficient utilization of transmission capacity, heavier line loadings, will result.

Wheeling is not new. The principle and specific applications previously have been approved. For example, Bonneville now wheels power from the Box Canyon plant of the Pend Oreille Public Utility District a distance of 235 miles. Beginning in November 1957, Bonneville will wheel power from the Pelton plant of the Portland General Electric Co. a distance of 100 miles. Power does not, of course, actually flow these distances. The wheeling is accomplished by displacement and interchange. This type of displacement and interchange is the real secret of the tremendous technical advantages of the Northwest Power Pool, which must be preserved.

This pooling principle to which I have just referred also is not new. The Northwest Power Pool has been commended many times on this floor. Not only are the 15 Federal generating plants of the Northwest interconnected through this pool, there are a total of 139 plants, large and small, public and private, comprising the generating resources of the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana with links to British Columbia and Utah, which are tied together. The BPA grid is, of course, the basic high voltage transmission system which makes the pool possible.

It is inconceivable that major new projects such as Priest Rapids and Rocky Reach not be linked to this grid.

The Rocky Ford-Tacoma line is of direct advantage to the Government, to the Pacific Northwest region, and, in fact, to the Congress itself.

It should be clearly understood that while this line is associated with the wheeling of Priest Rapids power, it is not required solely for this purpose. In actuality, more than three-fourths of the power flowing over the line will be Federal power. A fourth or less of the actual kilowatts on the line will be Priest Rapids kilowatts. This is so because Priest Rapids power will supply directly the Government's nearby Midway-Hanford load center, displacing deliveries to this load center which are now made from the more distant Federal plants. This is of direct advantage to the Government, as transmission losses are thereby reduced. Further, it makes more dependable the service to the Federal atomic defense center at Hanford.

The proposed wheeling arrangements will save the Government money. For example, the interchange with Priest

Rapids will eliminate power and reactive losses of \$410,000 per year. As the annual cost of the Rocky Ford-Tacoma line is \$324,000, there is a net saving here of \$86,000. In addition, the Government also will receive revenue for the Priest Rapids power which flows over the line in the amount of \$93,000 annually, so the total benefits to the Government will be \$179,000 per year.

This line, because of load growth, is required to insure the stability of service to the Puget Sound area. Without the Rocky Ford-Tacoma line, loadings on the other lines crossing the mountains will increase to the point where stability is marginal by 1960-61. In other words, loss of any line at that time under fault conditions would cause the others to open up in a cascading action, thereby disrupting the entire western half of the power pool. In later years, the Rocky Ford-Tacoma line will be required for all Federal loads. Its earlier construction, to make possible the benefits just mentioned, is essential.

I previously mentioned that the Government would receive revenues of approximately \$93,000 per year for the Priest Rapids power which will be wheeled over the Rocky Ford-Tacoma line. This, however, is only a portion of the Priest Rapids power to be wheeled. Total revenues to the Government for wheeling Priest Rapids power will exceed three-quarters of a million dollars annually.

The wheeling of Priest Rapids power by the Government—and indeed any similar wheeling arrangements of the Government—have regional advantages of such substance and magnitude that they cannot be ignored. Under wheeling, it is possible for small distributors to purchase power. Under wheeling, distributors situated at considerable distances from the plant can purchase power. A marketing scheme which would preempt the rights of small purchasers and of more remote purchasers should not be permitted.

I mentioned that wheeling was also of interest to the Congress itself. The people of the Pacific Northwest region, and in particular of my State of Washington, have demonstrated their willingness to ease the burden on Federal appropriations by making their own investments in new generating capacity. I am proud that the people of my State have been willing to undertake the tremendous financial task of raising the hundreds of millions of dollars necessary for the construction of the Priest Rapids and Rocky Reach plants. This action by the people has done much to reduce the pressure on Congress for appropriations for new generating capacity. But the willingness and ability of the Government to wheel power from these new privately financed projects is essential to the success of these present endeavors and to further efforts for non-Federal generating-plant construction.

In conclusion, because of the direct advantages to the Government, the advantages to the region, and to the Congress, which I have cited, I feel that the Rocky Ford-Tacoma and the Chief Joseph-Rocky Reach-Valley lines, and the wheeling associated with these lines,

should be endorsed heartily by the Congress. I feel also that the Congress should endorse continuation of the pooling arrangements—of which wheeling is now an important part—which have led to maximum development of the power resources of the Pacific Northwest region.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. It is stated in the report that there is no precedent for the Bonneville Power Administration to wheel non-Federal power. The facts are that BPA has many contracts under which it wheels non-Federal power and non-Federal lines wheel Federal power. It is part of our grid system. I wonder if the gentleman knows that the wheeling is not freewheeling, it is completely reimbursable.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Everything that has been said by my colleague from the State of Washington is true. Not only that, but, as I point out here, much of this wheeling is not actually wheeling for a long distance but an interchange of power, a wheeling by displacement.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CHUDOFF. The gentleman knows that the Subcommittee on Public Works and Resources of the Committee on Government Operations has made very prolonged power studies of the operation of Government-owned dams, of REA co-ops, and so on. The subcommittee felt that it would not make much sense to construct these dams unless funds were available to wheel this power. Was any reason given why the funds were not available, and if not, who was going to wheel the power?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The statement in the report is that for wheeling non-Federal power a relatively long distance a separate authorization should be sought, a statement, incidentally, with which I do not agree.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Does the gentleman agree it does not make much sense to construct these dams so that we will have the power available if there is no way to wheel it?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is right. Of course, the alternative is to have the builder of the dam construct his own transmission lines.

Mr. CHUDOFF. I understand that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But this would be duplicative. I might also point out that these lines eventually will be needed by the Federal system whether there is wheeling of Priest Rapids power or not.

Mr. HORAN. 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 Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I do feel a responsibility to point out that an elimination of item 171, Rocky Ford-Tacoma line for \$1,863,000 and item 180, Chief Joseph-Rocky Reach-Valley line for \$296,000 as proposed in the House bill

are of such impact on the economy of the Northwest that reconsideration should be given to these two items.

To carry out the intent of the Priest Rapids Act, the Bonneville Act, and integration of Rocky Reach project some wheeling of non-Federal generation by BPA is essential. This does not set a precedent as BPA has a number of previous contracts by which it wheels non-Federal power over Federal lines and non-Federal agencies wheel Federal power for BPA over their lines.

The Rocky Ford-Tacoma line is necessary for the transmission of power to the Puget Sound area. Three-fourths or more of the load on this line will be Federal power; the balance will be Priest Rapids generation and the line will be necessary by 1960. Other Priest Rapids generation will be transmitted over existing facilities. Wheeling of non-Federal power is on a fully reimbursable basis and does not constitute a cost to the Government. The benefits that accrue to the Government as a result of this wheeling are many. For example: An increased stability of the northwest grid, reduction in the line losses, savings in reactive power, economy resulting from "bulk carrier" principle, and more reliable service. This line will be required to transmit Federal power even if there are no wheeling contracts.

Chief Joseph-Rocky Reach-Valley line, item 180 in our budget, requests \$296,000. Preliminary planning and surveying are essential at this time as the line is over rugged terrain where work can be done only part of the year. This item in our budget request makes possible collaboration with Chelan County Public Utility District, Puget Sound Power & Light Co., and BPA in integration studies. This line serves a number of functions: Integration of generation from Chief Joseph, a Federal project, and two non-Federal projects, namely, Rocky Reach and Priest Rapids. Also this line will carry power to the Puget Sound area. Studies have not proceeded sufficiently far, as yet, to determine who should build the line or what part of the line. If it is decided that this circuit or any part should be non-Federal construction, the Government will negotiate appropriate reimbursement of any expenditures on this item.

In carrying out the Priest Rapids Act BPA wheeling contracts make it possible for small distributors in our marketing areas that are located in a remote point to purchase blocks of power at reasonable costs. Wheeling in the Pacific Northwest in reality is accomplished by displacement and interchange of power which makes the Northwest power pool feasible and operates to the advantage of all participants and their customers. Wheeling arrangements make it possible for public agencies, private utilities, and municipalities to purchase economical blocks of power. Also, our wheeling contracts make it possible to finance major generating projects with non-Federal funds and to achieve maximum comprehensive development of the water resources of the area.

Again let me remind you that BPA has many precedents for the wheeling

of non-Federal power and that this is fully reimbursable.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. 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 Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the Appropriations Committee did not include two items in the budget requests of the Bonneville Power Administration. These were important items and I share the views of Mr. Pearl, the administrator, whose statement with respect to them I should like to read to the Members of the House. The statement reads as follows:

Bonneville Power Administration, by amendment, revised its construction budget request downward \$5,658,000 a few weeks before presenting it to the House Appropriations Committee. We are ready and willing to cooperate in reduction to the extent requested by the Congress. We do, however, feel a responsibility to point out that an elimination of item 171, Rocky Ford-Tacoma line for \$1,863,000 and item 180, Chief Joseph-Rocky Reach-Valley line for \$296,000 as proposed in the House bill are of such impact on the economy of the Northwest that reconsideration should be given to these two items.

To carry out the intent of the Priest Rapids Act, the Bonneville Act, and integration of Rocky Reach project some wheeling of non-Federal generation by BPA is essential. This does not set a precedent as BPA has a number of previous contracts by which it wheels non-Federal power over Federal lines and non-Federal agencies wheel Federal power for BPA over their lines.

The Rocky Ford-Tacoma line is necessary for the transmission of power to the Puget Sound area. Three-fourths or more of the load of this line will be Federal power; the balance will be Priest Rapids generation and the line will be necessary by 1960. Other Priest Rapids generation will be transmitted over existing facilities. Wheeling of non-Federal power is on a fully reimbursable basis and does not constitute a cost to the Government. The benefits that accrue to the Government as a result of this wheeling are many. For example: An increased stability of the Northwest grid, reduction in the line losses, savings in reactive power, economy resulting from bulk carrier principle, and more reliable service. This line will be required to transmit Federal power even if there are no wheeling contracts.

Chief Joseph-Rocky Reach-Valley line, item 180 in our budget, requests \$296,000. Preliminary planning and surveying are essential at this time as the line is over rugged terrain where work can be done only part of the year. This item in our budget request makes possible collaboration with Chelan County Public Utility District, Puget Sound Power & Light Co. and BPA in integration studies. This line serves a number of functions: Integration of generation from Chief Joseph, a Federal project, and two non-Federal projects, namely, Rocky Reach and Priest Rapids. Also this line will carry power to the Puget Sound area. Studies have not proceeded sufficiently far, as yet, to determine who should build the line or what part of the line. If it is decided that this circuit or any part should be non-Federal construction, the Government will negotiate appropriate reimbursement of any expenditures on this item.

In carrying out the Priest Rapids Act, BPA wheeling contracts make it possible for small distributors in our marketing areas that are located in a remote point to pur-

chase blocks of power at reasonable costs. Wheeling in the Pacific Northwest in reality is accomplished by displacement and interchange of power which makes the Northwest power pool feasible and operates to the advantage of all participants and their customers. Wheeling arrangements make it possible for public agencies, private utilities, and municipalities to purchase economical blocks of power. Also, our wheeling contracts make it possible to finance major generating projects with non-Federal funds and to achieve maximum comprehensive development of the water resources of the area,

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will withhold that point of order. We are just about through with the general debate.

Mr. BRAY. I withdraw the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, it is with reluctance that I come to the well of the House at this time to call attention to an item in this bill which I think should be deleted. I refer to a project in Pennsylvania on the Allegheny River known as the Allegheny River Reservoir or the Kinzua Dam. This reservoir was first authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1936. The figures from 1936 to date, I think, are particularly important to the Members of the House, because with even a casual glance at them one should recognize just what has happened. I have had a chart made up which I have placed before the members of the Committee. From the testimony that has been brought before the Appropriations Committees since 1936, the Army engineers have asked that a dam be built, not that which Congress originally authorized but a new and different dam.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. I believe that the gentleman's presentation deserves an audience.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will permit us to proceed a little further at this time. We are going to finish debate in a few minutes and then read the first paragraph and I would appreciate it if the gentleman will let us go ahead at this time.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, this is an important speech and I think a quorum should be here to hear it.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I had promised the Members on this side that we were not going to finish debate today. Some of the Members want to speak on these projects and they would like to speak during general debate instead of under the 5-minute rule. So, Mr. Chairman, since the hour is getting late, it might be well for the Committee to rise at this time and complete general debate on tomorrow. That is what I would suggest.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THOMAS E. MURRAY OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, one of the most important governmental agencies in current scientific development, and in the formulation of national policy respecting relations with the other nations of the world, is the Atomic Energy Commission.

This Commission was set up by the Congress as a five-man Commission, expected to function as such, in the discharge of the many grave responsibilities entrusted to it. The expiration of the term of Commissioner Thomas E. Murray on the 30th day of this month, and the failure to reappoint him, have given cause for serious concern.

Commissioner Murray is a scientist of international reputation, a man of unassailable character, of the highest integrity, devoutly dedicated to the application of atomic energy to the cause of peace. He has demonstrated a degree of competence in this complex field unsurpassed by any similar official in Government service today.

He has contributed immeasurably to the work of the Commission and has been a stabilizing influence in the decisions which have been made and which should be made if the civilization of the world is to be preserved.

It was Commissioner Murray who first, in early 1956, proposed a ban on the continued testing of the superbombs, very logically insisting that we have enough of them in weapons stockpiles to obliterate and devastate large portions of humanity. His then proposal is now under serious consideration in the disarmament discussions taking place in London.

Commissioner Murray insisted earlier on the accumulation of an adequate weapons stockpile, and more recently in the development of small-scale nuclear weapons which will be more readily adaptable to the curbing of aggressions than the superbombs whose use can lead only to world conflagration. He is largely responsible for the program of uranium procurement which is so vital to the development of nuclear weapons and power.

The United States has under construction today only one large-scale nuclear powerplant with promise of early delivery of atomic electric power, the Shippingport plant which was conceived by Commissioner Murray early in 1953, and initiated by the Congress on his recommendation. He has spoken out repeatedly on the wisdom of declassifying all information relating to the peaceful aspects of atomic energy, in the interest of the advancement of atomic science, and of more importance in the interest of the advancement of peace.

Commissioner Murray has always been a firm believer in the free-enterprise system, and he himself is an outstanding product of it. He has known the problems of power generation since boyhood and was eminently successful in the field of electrical manufacturing. His inventive mind has provided over 200 patents in this field. His background is firmly rooted in private power. Yet it is he who has urged that this Nation is seri-

ously falling behind other nations in the development of nuclear power to the extent that the Federal Government should immediately undertake a program of constructing large-scale reactors at Government sites in order to at least stay abreast of other nations in this critical field.

Commissioner Murray's reward for outstanding public service is enforced retirement from a Commission which sorely needs his experienced service. No one who could be appointed to succeed Dr. Murray could possibly fill as effectively the great national and international need which will be occasioned by his summary dismissal.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Missouri for that purpose?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CANNON. 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. 8090) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army and certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentleman tell us why we must come in at 11 o'clock tomorrow and disturb committee procedures that some of us think are very essential?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; I will be very happy to tell the gentleman. The gentleman will remember that we just completed a bill today that took 2 weeks. This means that the consideration of a number of other bills has been delayed. Tomorrow there will be the continuation of this bill, and from the best information I can get I understand the bill is liable to take not only all of tomorrow but probably some part of Thursday. Then we have the excise-tax bill, the agriculture-trade bill, and several others that I would like to dispose of this week.

Mr. GROSS. If I may ask the distinguished majority leader, then is it anticipated that the T and T Club will be in operation this week, that there will be no session on Friday?

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not recognize the T and T club.

Mr. GROSS. I know the gentleman does not, but then he would let me refer to it as the T and T Club, I am sure.

Mr. McCORMACK. This, of course, is a land of free speech, and I cannot keep the gentleman from talking or

making such a reference, if he wants to; but, fairminded man that he is, I think the gentleman upon reflection will realize that that is not a proper statement to make.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman saying that we are going to meet on Friday?

Mr. McCORMACK. We are going to meet on Friday; yes. If, however, the rest of the program is completed by Friday, I am always eager to recognize the problems of Members in their offices and other places, and I am always glad to do those things from a very fair and flexible angle.

Mr. GROSS. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that we are trying to complete hearings on a pay raise bill for postal employees.

Mr. Speaker, I am constrained to object to coming in at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman objects.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. McGOVERN. 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 South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, my flight today bringing me back from my district was unavoidably delayed. I reached the House 5 minutes after the voting ended on the civil rights bill. Had I been present I would have voted against the motion to recommit and in favor of final passage of the bill.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. JENSEN. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, during the rollcall on the civil-rights bill today I was called out of the Chamber on the first rollcall. On the second rollcall I was called to the telephone on a very important long-distance call. Hence I failed to vote on final passage of that bill. Had I been present I would have voted "nay."

THE CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, on June 11 my colleague from the First District of Florida [Mr. CRAMER] spoke at length on the subject of the Congressional Quarterly and of that private publication's method of measuring the support that Congressmen give to the President. I have asked Mr. CRAMER to be present in order that I may be completely fair to him.

The Congressional Quarterly has established itself as a nonpartisan recorder of the affairs of Congress and of related

affairs; in fact, it has made quite a reputation in this field and it is now subscribed to by more than 230 American newspapers of every political hue besides many Members of both Houses of Congress. Many of the Washington correspondents who cover the affairs of the Congress refer to it regularly.

The Congressional Quarterly was founded in 1945 and since then has become a very practical place for a voter or an editor or others interested in Congress to check up on all the rollcall votes taken in the House and the Senate. This is no small service for before 1945 it was extremely difficult to go back and check on the actual votes taken by Members of Congress. My friend from the First District pointed out the fact that the Congressional Quarterly was founded by Nelson and Henrietta Poynter, who also publish the St. Petersburg Times, which is distributed primarily in the First District. Because the St. Petersburg Times usually takes the Democratic viewpoint, the gentleman assumes this viewpoint is carried over in the editorial operations of the Congressional Quarterly. This I think is an unfair and inaccurate assumption.

The Congressional Quarterly would lose its usefulness if it took a partisan point of view and to say it does is a disservice to the variety of newspapers and others interested in Congress who subscribe to that publication, as well as to the men and women employed by the Congressional Quarterly, who work so diligently to present a clear, accurate picture of congressional activities.

For example, Mr. Speaker, newspapers with such divergent points of view as the Chicago Tribune, the New York Post, the St. Louis Post Dispatch, the Kansas City Star, the Boston Herald Traveler, and that fine publication owned by the family of the distinguished minority leader of the Senate, Mr. KNOWLAND, the Oakland Tribune, all subscribe to the Congressional Quarterly.

At the moment, Mr. Speaker, the Republicans are annoyed that their non-support of the President is exposed with such a searching analysis as that made by the Congressional Quarterly. However, it seems to me a somewhat unimaginative and shortsighted point of view. Suppose, for instance, in 1960, a Democratic President is elected. The Republicans then may be very happy to have this same measurement of presidential support available to them. And, incidentally, the same analysis of presidential support now in use was conceived before the present administration took place. The characterization that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] made of the St. Petersburg Times is also misleading. It is my understanding that the St. Petersburg Times has frequently supported members of the Republican Party, and I am informed that in the last election in November 1956, the St. Petersburg Times supported the candidacy of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I would like to say to my distinguished colleague—and I am delighted that he brought the fact out—because it gives greater credence to my statement of June 11 as being impartial and not arising out of any feeling of animosity on my part toward the paper as such. When that support was proffered I told them I did not want it. I repudiated it. The character and the nature of the recommendation was anything but complimentary. It was about as backhanded a recommendation as I have ever seen. After saying "These are reasons we have never backed him before," they said, "We think we will have to back him this time because his opponent is less acceptable to the paper than he is." That is about what it amounted to. I appreciate the gentleman's information, but I suggest if he will read the editorial he will see it was not such an endorsement that either a Democrat or a Republican could be proud of it. This exemplifies clearly the type of support Republicans get from this admittedly Democratic newspaper.

Mr. SIKES. The newspaper stated it had endorsed the gentleman. The fact remains that the paper was for him, and against his Democratic opponent. That I insist constitutes an endorsement. Now to proceed; just last year, as will be seen in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 102, part 11, page 15464, the senior Senator from my State [SPESSARD L. HOLLAND] had this to say about the St. Petersburg Times:

The Republicans are in [Mr. Poynter's] debt because his newspaper stanchly supported the two-party system when they were weak in his area in numbers and funds.

The senior Senator from Florida also said that "in my years of careful reading of Congressional Quarterly reports, I have found no bias carried over to it from the editorial attitudes of the St. Petersburg Times."

As the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot said on September 2 of last year, when a similar controversy over CQ figures occurred:

It all depends upon whose political ox is gored by a particular CQ report of voting or its breakdown of that voting.

While Mr. CRAMER and others on his side of the aisle have flinched at the careful analysis of the Republican Party's support of the President thus far this year, the distinguished minority leader of the Senate used those same CQ figures in his case, to say on the television program, Face the Nation, on June 9:

As a matter of fact, according to Congressional Quarterly, I stand among the six highest Republicans, percentagewise, in support of the President's program, both domestic and foreign, with a percentage, I think, of 89 percent.

I would like to go into some of the specific criticisms that my colleague made of Congressional Quarterly's methods. I make note of the fact that he also made comparison between my voting record and the President's program which hardly were calculated for my advantage. On that I state flatly I am answerable to the people of the third district—not to Mr. Eisenhower; not to any other Presi-

dent, and this is not said in disrespect of the office of President. The gentleman shows a misunderstanding, I believe, of the purpose and the methods used by Congressional Quarterly. Congressional Quarterly does not evaluate the performance of Congress or of individual Members. It merely records the performance of Congress and its Members based on rollcall votes. We Members do the voting.

Perhaps it would be well to ask under what circumstances Members from the other side of the aisle think that Congressional Quarterly is being unfair.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I examined the Congressional Quarterly Almanac. In it I read the statement on page 82 for the Senate, where they said they counted rollcalls where Members were not present as a vote against the administration. Does the gentleman think that is a fair way of counting?

Mr. SIKES. I am inclined to believe that the gentleman does not have a complete understanding of the method of scoring. Let me go a little further, and I think I can outline what the procedure is.

Mr. HOFFMAN. May I ask the gentleman this question? Does the gentleman mean that he doubts that that is in the Quarterly, in the Almanac?

Mr. SIKES. I have not seen the material in question. The information which is available to me is that Congressional Quarterly scores all known votes of Members. If a Member does not vote they send him a questionnaire which he is requested to use to show how he would have voted had he been present. That information is included in their tabulation. If the Member does not provide Congressional Quarterly with the information on his stand he cannot expect credit for having supported the President.

Mr. HOFFMAN. As to that I do not know, but what I am referring to is the statement in the Quarterly Almanac that they do record a Member as voting against the President's policy if he is absent on rollcall or does not vote.

Mr. SIKES. Again specifically let me say I have not seen the item the gentleman has referred to. I think the method of scoring is fair to everyone and I point out again that absence does not prevent inclusion of a Members' stand in a Member's Congressional Quarterly record on voting.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If I can get it back from the Library, there would be no objection on the part of the gentleman to including that in my remarks at this point?

Mr. SIKES. Of course not.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Here is the statement to which inference was made. On page 81 of the Congressional Quarterly Almanac, volume 9, 1953, we find this language:

Failures to vote are counted as "times at bat," so that such failure reduces effective support score as much as an "anti-Eisenhower" vote.

This was to the vote in the House.

And, over on the next page, 82, we find this language:

Failures to vote are counted as "times at bat," so that such failure reduces effective support score as much as an "anti-Eisenhower" vote.

This was to the vote in the Senate.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 102, part 11, page 15070, in the remarks of Senator SCHOEPEL, he introduced a letter from MARGARET CHASE SMITH, United States Senator from Maine, in which she is bemoaning the fact that the Congressional Quarterly has been unfair to her in its appraisal of her votes with the President. She says this:

I was absent on 9 of the votes this year in the Congressional Quarterly analysis—and all 9 were marked as being against the President in spite of the manner in which I was announced.

Mr. SIKES. Had the gentle lady filled out the questionnaires submitted to her by Congressional Quarterly, she would have been recorded for or against on each of the votes in question. Since there was nothing in Congressional Quarterly records to show her stand, that organization could hardly be expected to assume she supported the President in the cases in point. Perhaps there is a better way to handle the matter of absent votes. I do not champion Congressional Quarterly's procedure. I am simply explaining it; but I must point out it applies the same way to all of us.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I believe the gentleman, earlier in his remarks, said that the Republicans were annoyed by this voting record as stated by Congressional Quarterly.

Mr. SIKES. That, of course, was a general statement. I realize there are some distinguished Members on both sides of the aisle, and my good friend from Iowa is one of them, who are completely independent and each of whom votes his own mind and conscience all the time.

Mr. GROSS. I want to thank the gentleman for making that exception.

Mr. SIKES. Perhaps we might ask under what circumstances Members from the other side of the aisle think that Congressional Quarterly is being unfair. For instance, one of the major studies of Congressional Quarterly is called the Presidential Box Score.

On May 27 this publication issued its news story on the presidential box score which mentions the degree of action which the Congress has given to the President's legislative program, and the story began as follows:

The Democratic 85th Congress has approved only 6.6 percent of President Eisenhower's legislative program thus far this year.

Many Republicans have used this story to belabor the Democrats who control this Congress. I wonder if they

think this is an unfair story from the Congressional Quarterly.

My colleagues' principal argument, however, is with a periodic analysis done by Congressional Quarterly called Presidential Support and Opposition. This analysis measures the individual performance of each Member of both Houses in relation to actual, specific requests made by the President.

I might point out that Congressional Quarterly analyses began during the Truman Administration and were not prepared merely to measure the current administration's program.

The support and opposition tabulation shows how the President fares when each Member has a chance to go on record with a ye or nay vote. That would appear to be another refutation of the allegations that absenteeism need count against a Member's support of the President.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I read from the Congressional Quarterly for the week ending May 17, 1957, page 600, in which they say "Support and Opposition." Then they analyze support and opposition and they say, and this is in that Congressional Quarterly itself in reporting on this analysis:

Failure to answer a ye-or-nay vote for whatever reason thus may serve to lower a Member's score because these scores as well as composite scores that appear below are tabulated solely on the basis of ye-and-nay votes, and pairs and other announced stands do not count.

Thus they clearly say in their own publication that where a person does not vote it does serve to lower a Member's support score.

Mr. SIKES. I repeat, it is my information that each Member who does not vote on a record vote is given an opportunity to state his position and be tabulated by being sent a printed questionnaire from the Congressional Quarterly on which he is invited to show how he would have voted had he been present. If he submits that information I am told it is counted in his score.

Mr. CRAMER. What happens if it is not sent in? Then it automatically goes against him; is that correct?

Mr. SIKES. If he does not declare himself I am at a loss to understand how he can expect to be listed as supporting the President's program. If any Member wants to be recorded as supporting the President, he has opportunity to do so.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. I, of course, am not familiar with the method of scoring in the Congressional Quarterly, but certainly I can see the merit of scoring if a person would miss nine votes on matters that were considered of importance, a part of the administration's program, for I certainly could not see how they could be construed as supporting that program.

Mr. SIKES. If he were very particularly interested in the President's program and were not prevented by illness it would appear he would attend and vote for it.

Mr. PRICE. That is right.

Mr. SIKES. The Senate and the House decide the issues on which they take rollcall votes. The Congressional Quarterly decides whether or not these issues represent part of the President's personal program based on public statements and messages issued by the President himself.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman has put his finger on the matter at issue: The Quarterly decides what issues are to be included in the tabulation and how support by Ike is to be determined. I trust that the gentleman appreciates that my whole approach to this situation is not one based upon whether the St. Pete Times endorses or does not endorse me, and on whether I am opposed in any way to the editor of the St. Petersburg Times or not. I will suggest to the gentleman though that when there appears in your district as appeared in mine in the Times an article of this nature based upon the Congressional Quarterly which clearly attempts to mislead the people into believing that there is a congressional revolt finding the Democrats stronger for Eisenhower than the GOP and your name appears in a column below showing that you supported the President according to the analysis of that Quarterly much less than some of your colleagues on the other side of the aisle—and I have no quarrel as to how they vote one way or the other—you, too, would be a little concerned about the basis for coming to this conclusion. I trust the gentleman appreciates that my approach was to try to examine the basis for these conclusions and to show in my opinion that the manner in which they are arrived at is not fair, realistic, or basically honest.

Mr. SIKES. May I say to the gentleman, I did not yield for a lengthy statement. The gentleman made his statement on this subject on June 11 and failed to accord me the courtesy of informing me he was bringing my voting record into the discussion. Now I would like to proceed. If the gentleman has a question to ask, I will be glad to yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. CRAMER. I would be delighted to ask the gentleman a question and appreciate his willingness to enter into this "give and take" on this matter.

Mr. SIKES. I am glad to yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. CRAMER. And I would be delighted to try to get my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN], to yield some of his time to you, if you see fit. But, do you believe it is a fair and impartial analysis where, as I pointed out in my statement, a \$30,000 appropriation cut is judged on the same basis as a \$50 million appropriation cut for the sake of weighing both votes equally?

Mr. SIKES. I must say to my friend, you cannot weigh a vote by the amount of money involved or by the magnitude of the question. The President has programs that have many facets. I am sure the gentleman does not limit his support only to those facets of the President's program which are of major magnitude; therefore, he must expect to be scored on all those things that the President has expressed an interest in.

All rollcall votes and issues where the President's position is known before the vote are included in the tabulation. That means big issues, little issues—all issues that are a part of the President's program. This method results in the inclusion of some noncontroversial votes as well as the exclusion of certain important rollcall votes on which the President's specific position is not publicly clear at the time the vote is taken. Any departure from this method would lead to a subjective weighing of the issues, and I fear this would result in even more serious and constant challenge by Members on both sides of the aisle who might disagree with the weighing.

I think I should remind my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that during the election campaign last fall the Republicans created what they called a truth squad. This Republican truth squad actually used the Congressional Quarterly figures to support their position. In Kansas City on September 27, for instance, the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] said, and I quote:

The Congressional Quarterly shows that Republicans supported Mr. Eisenhower 72 percent of the time on 99 rollcalls while the Democrats voted with the administration only 48 percent.

Now, I do not always like the results of the Congressional Quarterly studies, and I do not always agree with their findings. However, I do think it is unfair to point an accusing finger at the Congressional Quarterly and say that it is biased and unreliable. For more than 13 years, the Congressional Quarterly has been presenting the record of Congress, the rollcall votes, the activities of congressional committees, the record of pressure groups on Congress and so on in a way that has helped newspapers and others vitally interested in our activities to understand and present those activities in clearer and more intelligible form. It seems to me this activity has resulted in a distinct advantage to American citizens and that the Congressional Quarterly has played an important part in the improvement of citizen understanding of politics and congressional activity in the changing American scene.

I would say that it would be a distinct disservice for partisan forces to engage in a calculated attempt to destroy such a service, no matter how embarrassing the objective results of that service may prove to be from time to time.

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

Mr. SIKES. If the gentleman desires me to yield further, I shall be glad to.

Mr. CRAMER. I do not think we are actually in so much basic disagreement as might appear. My position, of course,

is that I do not agree with the basis used, the foundation for coming to the conclusion of the percentages that are published throughout the Nation as "from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD." As a matter of fact, I suggest the gentleman may have gotten as confused as I did in trying to follow some of the conclusions arrived at. The Quarterly tried to give the impression that the information came from Congress.

Mr. SIKES. Let me comment on that. My colleague made use in his statement to the House of studies prepared last year by the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPFEL], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON]. I should point out that these gentlemen prepared these analyses in practically the same way used by the Congressional Quarterly.

They did not weigh the issues; they included all rollcalls in which, according to their belief, the President stated his position; in fact their analyses resulted in the inclusion of more rollcall votes than the Congressional Quarterly did. The Senator from Kansas even included in his rollcalls the single vote cast when several treaties were ratified en bloc.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further at that point.

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. CRAMER. That is precisely the point I suggested to my distinguished colleague: The Senators who analyzed it felt that some determination as to the President's position should be based upon what position the leadership of the Democratic Party and Republican Party took on the floor of the Senate; that when the minority leader of the Senate takes a position that that should give some indication as to whether or not it reflected the position of the President of the United States. The Quarterly at no time considered any position taken by the leadership on the floor of the House as to whether or not the President was for or against a particular bill.

Mr. SIKES. And I stated very clearly that the Congressional Quarterly uses those issues in which the President has made a definite statement before a vote is taken to show whether he is for or against a particular program. The Republican leadership in the Congress frequently is in disagreement with the stated position of the President.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. PRICE. Would it not be very difficult if you were to base it upon the position taken by the minority leadership when we have had many instances of one party leadership going one way and the other party the other?

Mr. SIKES. That is very clear, and certainly it is true that it would be unrealistic for scoring to be based on any person's statements other than the President.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SIKES. I have yielded a number of times to the gentleman from Florida. I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Is it not generally felt that the President is considered as the leader of the Republican Party?

Mr. SIKES. I think that has generally been considered the case, but apparently there has been frequent confusion in the Republican Party about who is the leader or which way the leadership is going.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I will agree.

I noted with some amusement from the program of the young Republicans, who are in Washington this week, that they are having a beauty contest. Undoubtedly, they have many beautiful girls. I notice they have 7 contests, I suppose 1 for each of the wings of the Republican Party. But the fact is that the President is the leader and Congressional Quarterly has always used his policies and has never used a rollcall, to my knowledge, unless the President has had a stated position in regard to that particular matter. Is not that true?

Mr. SIKES. That is true.

Now, if I may proceed with my statement, I think that my friend from Florida has noted that his own score under the analysis of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, in which my friend appears to place considerable faith, results in a poorer showing than the gentleman from Florida made under the analysis conducted by the Congressional Quarterly which he has criticized rather severely.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I think that clearly shows the very point I am trying to make in reference to someone representing to the people they are making an objective analysis of how a Member votes as it relates to the President's position. I think that is a very tenuous proposition. The Congressional Quarterly analysis proves how misleading such an approach can be.

Mr. SIKES. What the gentleman would like to do is to prepare his own scoring method rather than to abide by one that has been set up to apply to all of us?

Mr. CRAMER. That is hardly a fair statement. The point that the gentleman brought out in regard to the Congressional Quarterly making a choice in the crux. It makes the choice as to what the President's position is.

Mr. SIKES. After the President has made statements or after he has sent messages to the Congress to show his position on an issue, there can be no question about his stand in these cases. Therefore, the Congressional Quarterly scores a Member on whether he votes for or against those items. That is about as plain as can be.

Mr. CRAMER. If we will assume that is correct for the sake of argument, can the gentleman explain why on that standard there was eliminated from this particular analysis of only 22 votes 3 crucial votes on H. R. 190 dealing with a resolution on the budget which was sent to the President and asking that he indicate where it should be cut?

Does the President need to make a statement he does not desire that resolution passed? Yet it was eliminated from the Congressional Quarterly analysis. This illustrates how foolish and misleading the requirement of a statement by the President as to support as used by the Quarterly is—it is about as foolish as eliminating all statements of support—as the lack of it—as stated by the Republican leadership in the House or Senate.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The fact is that the President, despite newspaper speculation and so on, acceded to the request of Congress and sent a message back here, which was a very helpful one, outlining some specific cuts, did he not?

Mr. CRAMER. May I ask the gentleman, Does he think the position of the President was in favor of that resolution or there was any doubt on the floor of the House to the effect he was against it, particularly due to the fact that practically every Republican opposed it and every Democrat voted for it?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. There is frequent doubt here as to exactly what the President wants because we have the gentleman from Indiana saying one thing and the gentleman from Massachusetts another, or one group doing one thing and another group doing another. It is awfully hard unless the President has taken a specific stand. It is even more difficult to determine what the President meant when he attempts to answer press questions. He did like the resolution regarding the budget.

Mr. CRAMER. There are many of those situations, but I submit again on this particular resolution there was no question in anybody's mind that the President opposed it and it should have been included in any fair and impartial analysis of voting up to that point. That is the only point I make.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVINS). The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida be given 5 minutes of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order heretofore entered, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized next.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. I thought the gentleman's time was vacated and put over to another day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Then the next previous order is for the gentleman from Massachusetts, who will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to withhold my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If there is no objection, the gentlewoman may yield her 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like my time later.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I am yielding 5 minutes of my time to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I was not aware that my time for today had been yielded. I did request my distinguished friend from Florida to ask for an hour tomorrow because I thought what I would say today would carry on for an hour.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman that I regret to advise my friend from New Jersey I misunderstood his desires and I did ask that his time be vacated today. He has time on tomorrow.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman and I hope he will be here tomorrow so that we can continue this discussion.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should ask what my status is at this time. I am a tenant in the well of the House by suffrage of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] and of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN]. I am grateful to both for their courtesy.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am just curious to know, Mr. Speaker, how a Member's vote would be analyzed by the Congressional Quarterly under these circumstances. The President supported the natural-gas bill. It came to Congress with the support of the administration, and those who voted for it, I assume, supported the administration. I happen to be one of those who voted against the natural-gas bill. Later the President vetoed it. I wonder if the gentleman could tell me how the Members were represented under those circumstances.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman has a keen mind, and this would be such a challenge to his own ingenuity that I would not deprive him of the opportunity to analyze that problem.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I propounded a question in the short time which was allotted to me the last time this matter was brought to the floor to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN]. I am interested in the question the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], raises: How are you going to weigh these things? I am rather disturbed by having a rather high support of the President. I do not like to have a 95 percent support of the President's alleged program. I would like to know how the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], would weigh these things. Is a vote on a \$15 million item 15 times as important as a vote on a \$1 million appropriation? I hope that when the

gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], comes in tomorrow or when the Gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN], is talking, we can get into this a little deeper, but I would like to hear from the gentleman from Florida, if the gentleman from Florida in the well now will yield.

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. CRAMER. I would like to say to my distinguished colleague that the thing that bothers him is exactly the same thing that bothers me.

Mr. SIKES. Will the gentleman tell us whether he would weigh a \$1 million vote only one-fifteenth as much as a \$15 million vote?

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman indicated very clearly by his question what the problem is. The question is not whether I would evaluate \$1 million as against \$30,000 or \$30,000 as compared to \$50 million, as occurred in the HEW appropriation bill. But, there is no one in the country that would weigh them both the same, does the gentleman not agree, particularly due to the fact that the President contrary to the Quarterly did not even favor the \$50 million appropriation?

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. It is entirely possible by reducing one item \$30,000 and reducing another item by \$1 million you may eliminate 2 important programs of equal importance in some way.

Mr. SIKES. Does my friend from Florida not realize that if you were to try to weigh these questions, try to establish a basis of the comparative value or importance of these programs, that you would never arrive at any system on which any two people could agree? Such a method of scoring would never be accepted by the public.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Everything being relative, it might be helpful if the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], were to devise some scheme whereby these things could be weighed, because it would apply equally to the Republicans and to the Democrats, and the percentage would be relatively the same.

I have some suggestion with reference to the Congressional Quarterly, and I hope to suggest to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], an amendment to his bill to prohibit them from using the name. There is an old bourbon whisky named Old Senator. I do not think that should be used. And, there is a distinguished restaurateur, Mike Palm, who calls his establishment Relaxatorium, and I think that is a little unfair to imply that we have part of Mike's business. There are numerous instances which I will cite tomorrow.

Mr. SIKES. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, an interesting revelation emerges from a comparison of the Schoepfel-Simpson analysis for the 1956 session of the 84th Congress and the

Congressional Quarterly analysis for the same period. It is illustrated by the following tabulation:

	GOP score	Congressional Quarterly score
SCHOEPFEL:	Percent	Percent
1956 Presidential support.....	67.5	69
1956 Presidential opposition.....	19.3	20
SIMPSON:		
1956 Presidential support.....	60.6	68
1956 Presidential opposition.....	9.8	17
CRAMER:		
1956 Presidential support.....	78.7	79
1956 Presidential opposition.....	19.7	17

While some of the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle are unhappy about the disclosure of their lack of support for the standard bearer of their party, I must say they cast their own votes, the record speaks for itself.

FLOOD CONTROL ON THE MERRIMACK RIVER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVINS). Under previous order of the House the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is rather late and the staff of the House and the Members have had long, hard days.

I want to call attention to the remarks that I have asked permission to insert in the RECORD during the debate on the flood-control bill, especially the letter from the head Army engineer of the New England division, General Fleming, in which he speaks of the fact that the money for flood control in the Merrimack River is the No. 1 project of importance in all of New England.

There are 50 members on the Committee on Appropriations and my prayers and my pleas are to them and also to the House that they will grant the \$600,000 that has been asked by the Army engineers, asked by me and other Members from Massachusetts.

This is a tremendously important and beautiful river and there are very valuable industries on it. Great damage both to life and limb and property have taken place in the last years through floods and hurricanes.

As I look around and see the Members, I know the ones who have always been helpful to me down through the years. They have always helped when I have gone to them for assistance. Sometimes I wonder how we succeed in the passage of certain legislation. There are many, many interests that are considered and that conflict, but flood control saves great suffering.

This amount of money was not budgeted because for 2 years no compact was signed between Massachusetts and New Hampshire.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentle lady yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to commend the gentle lady upon her excellent speech and upon the splendid effort she is making in behalf of what is indeed the No. 1 pending flood-control project in New England.

I should like very much to associate myself with the lady in the remarks she has made and also to assure her that, so far as I am concerned, I shall join her in doing everything I possibly can to bring about the results we desire.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know the gentleman has always been very helpful. Since 1925 I have watched the high water and the damage done in the Merrimack Valley. It is the only valley in the country that has local flood control as indicated by the Army engineers. It was the last thing that Senator Copeland ever did in the Senate before he died.

I remember the people who helped so much in various ways. General Clay, then Captain Clay, of the Army engineers, helped very much in the original work on the Merrimack River. I went to his office day after day and day after day and he helped. We know the great tragedy caused by floods and hurricanes to people in our area, when they are put in that danger. I shall plead with the Members to support an amendment, perhaps not an amendment in the House now, but when the bill returns from the Senate, because it will be very difficult to get that through at present.

I believe the Senate will put the six hundred for the Merrimack in the bill.

THE GIRARD CASE

Mr. Speaker, again I should like to express my deep appreciation of and pleasure at the fact that a district judge has refused to turn Sergeant Girard over to the Japanese for trial. I believe no foreign court should try our soldiers, and the status-of-forces law should be repealed. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bowl] has made a great fight for justice for our soldiers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

VALUES OF WESTERN CIVILIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire briefly to address the House on the subject of the values of western civilization.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is lamentable and deplorable that our way of life is beset and challenged in this generation by the organized forces of Marxist communism in a manner and to an extent which greatly threatens the basic values of western civilization. Age old human freedom has historically had to face many serious, if not desperate, challenges to the perpetuity of its institutions. Tyranny is an ever-restless evil thing which powerfully and relentlessly strives to compress mankind into the restricted channels of human slavery. The periodic onslaughts of tyranny on the weak and the helpless, and even on the powerful, are conducted through the spread of ideologies, the infiltration of

free institutions, and the threat or application of force or aggression.

What is at stake in this conflict between the free and the slave world? What are the values which we seek to preserve as free men? First, from a historic and philosophical standpoint comes the dignity of the human being and the sacredness of the human soul. Free governments were established to insure and protect these values. Every effort to destroy these values has been perpetrated by a ruthless tyranny. Thus, our religious concepts and political ideals are assailed and jeopardized, and the status of the individual as a free physical and spiritual entity is gravely threatened. Communism is atheistic; it defies the living God.

Secondly, the Marxist Communists assail and attack the acquisition of impartial knowledge, the pursuit of free inquiry and the development and practice of that objectivity and disinterestedness in the free body politic that accords equal rights to all and prohibits discrimination against any. Communism is a ruthless dictatorship; it fights against freedom.

The third value we cherish is our free system of enterprise, and this in turn involves not only the protection, but the proper utilization from a social standpoint of the huge mass production machinery, which, in its effects, has elevated working and living standards of the average American to the highest peak of all recorded time. It is with regard to our mastery of the machine, including the latest technological innovations, that the real test lies for our system for, being free, we cannot allow the machine or the mass-production system to enslave our people. We cannot permit cold science, gross materialism, or pure reason, for that matter, standing by itself, to dominate the life of America, since that life affects human beings entitled to be judged and treated on the basis of human values rather than by the rigid, ruthless formulas of science and the material world. Our whole system is based on the freedom of the human spirit under the rule of law and not upon the savage rule of the jungle. Communism is antisocial; it seeks to destroy initiative.

Hence, it is essentially the things of the spirit that free governments are designed and destined to preserve in the first instance, if they are to fulfill their aims of keeping alive and real the opportunities of the people to be free and to be left alone by government, so long as they remain within the legal boundaries. Preeminently, the things of the spirit are primarily the things which differentiate democracy from absolutism wherein men and women become pawns of the absolute state subject to the whims and caprice of its arbitrary rules. Communism is materialistic and greedy; it converts the individual into a helpless pawn of the godless superstate.

It is free inquiry, free pursuit of knowledge, free, boundless, spiritual independence of the ruthless restraints of the police state which give strength and vitality to the democratic system. It is this freedom of opportunity, combined with institutions of justice protecting it,

which the Marxists have been unable to find a substitute for, because there is no substitute for freedom that will make serfdom palatable to the average man or woman. Creativeness and ingenuity follow naturally and logically in the wake of the free way of life. Free people, left to their own devices, not only create and produce better; but they can fight better; they have more real inspiration and incentive to defend their institutions than those who are enslaved under Marxist rule. Communism is a reversal; it would stifle the human soul.

Our great problem is to preserve the values of Western civilization, to prevent them from deteriorating and degenerating under the sustained assaults of the Marxists into the weak, enervating patterns of collectivism. To this extent, we must ever be conscious of the age-old truth that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty; and that, if men and women want to retain their freedom, they must make up their minds to be ready to fight to protect and preserve it in every generation. Brave men and women worthy of the name "American" will never surrender their great heritage before the atomic threats, nefarious plots, and the countless efforts being made by the Communists to intimidate and terrorize them, for they well know that the battle for freedom must have stanch hearts moved by faith in the Creator and firm intent at all costs upon preserving the things of the spirit upon which freedom depends. Communism is the greatest menace that has ever confronted free nations; we must combat it with all our energies—with all our hearts and souls.

Vigilance and determination will enable us to protect those value of civilization and liberty upon which lasting peace, security, and freedom depend.

GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call the attention of the House to a State Department action, which, I believe, raises serious questions of propriety and legality.

The State Department has announced that public hearings will be held on June 18, by the Committee for Reciprocity Information relative to freezing for an unspecified period the United States right to modify or withdraw tariff concessions made in conjunction with the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, or GATT, except under certain conditions. This would be an extension of arrangements now in effect under GATT, a so-called executive agreement never brought before Congress.

I object to this action. My objection is premised on two principal grounds:

First, questions surrounding a 6-month arrangement: The Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as amended, expires on June 30, 1958. The freezing arrangement in question would start on January 1, 1958. If the freezing of concessions is to be for 6 months only—that is, coterminous

with the underlying and basic body of law—there seems to be little point in it. In fact, the mere idea of putting American business, both domestic producers and those involved in foreign trade, to the trouble and expense of making presentations at hearings on such a short-term matter would be outrageous. So, too, would be the expenditure of public time and public moneys in any negotiations at Geneva, Switzerland.

Second, question relevant to a long-term arrangement: If the extension is to be beyond the date of June 30, 1958—say for 3 years, like similar arrangements in the past—that would mean an extension of the arrangement beyond the present terminal date of the underlying body of law. That, too, would be outrageous. Such an extension would commit the American Government, or the Executive, at least, under GATT for 2½ years beyond the date by which Congress must act on the whole matter. And we can be sure that Congress will undertake a thorough reexamination of the entire trade agreements program next year. It might be argued that the Executive has residual authority to make such an arrangement beyond June 30, 1958. Such authority would relate to existing trade agreements, negotiated in the past, pursuant to previous directives from Congress. However, I believe that such a contention is highly questionable as a matter of law.

And as a matter of propriety, there is no question at all. It is certainly not proper conduct for the State Department to engage in negotiating an executive arrangement extending past the date on which Congress will review the entire underlying body of law. This is particularly so when Congress may well discard the entire program. And even if Congress does not discard the entire program, it will, beyond question, modify the program in major respects. Hence, the State Department would be going ahead and committing the United States Government in an area of responsibility from which Congress may well foreclose the Executive after June 30, 1958. Such an advance committal would be highly irresponsible.

COMMITTING CONGRESS IN ADVANCE

Aside from the outrageous aspect of entering into such a long-term arrangement, one other matter troubles me deeply. Is the State Department here attempting to enter into an arrangement designed to commit the Congress of the United States in advance? Will the Congress be told next spring when it is debating the underlying body of law that the United States is morally obligated to extend this program, because the State Department has already agreed to do certain things in conjunction with it for a period going several years beyond the terminal date of June 30, 1958? Will not an effort be made to coerce Congress by this advance commitment?

RECIPROCITY

I would be remiss were I not to tell you that supporters of the State Department maintain that there is a theoretically good reason or purpose for these proposed negotiations. That is to freeze

other nations' tariff concessions as well as our own. In other words, the purpose is to prevent other nations from running out on the concessions which they have made under GATT. That sounds reasonable enough, but only in theory.

In practice, it is quite another matter. The arrangement in question relates mainly to tariffs—not to a host of practices in which many other nations engage. The United States agrees to freeze its tariff concessions and to give what is called compensation if we deviate from such a freezing. Other countries do the same.

The hitch, however, is that tariffs are too often only a minor method which other nations use in restricting their imports. On the other hand, tariffs are a principal method in our control of imports. As this House knows full well, practically all other nations place their major reliance upon more stringent controls than tariffs. And these would not be touched by the instant arrangement. Other nations use import licensing, embargoes, currency restrictions, state trading, cartel mechanisms, and a host of other devices, of which tariffs are very often a very minor element. Since the United States does not normally employ such practices, the forthcoming negotiations are of much greater importance to us than to other nations. This is because the freezing of concessions that we will undertake is meaningful. For many nations, the freezing of tariffs is but a hollow gesture. In other words, while in theory the anticipated negotiations will be reciprocal or on a quid pro quo basis, these negotiations will in fact amount to little more than a unilateral action by the United States.

CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the previous remarks of my colleague from Florida [Mr. SIKES] amply demonstrated a number of things:

No. 1, the Congressional Quarterly is human. It has its bias just like an editorial in a newspaper. No two groups of people agree on what is a weighted vote and what is not.

No. 2, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] amply demonstrates that the people of the First Congressional District of Florida are endeared of their Representative, BILL CRAMER, for he was returned, Congressional Quarterly or no Congressional Quarterly, by an even greater majority than before.

No. 3, I am curious to know how the Congressional Quarterly will weight the vote on civil rights this afternoon since more Democrats voted for the jury amendment than against it, and only 52 percent of the Democrats supported the President on this one whereas 90 percent of the Republicans did.

I now yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I want to say for the RECORD, as I have stated

before, that my objective on June 11 in analyzing the Congressional Quarterly with regard to support or non-support of the President was in order to demonstrate how perilous it is for this group who are in charge of the Congressional Quarterly to try to determine, on a basis of what they think is a vote in support of the President how much support each Member of Congress gives the President.

I attempted to show in my analysis of June 11 that three crucial votes on House Resolution 190 were left out. That resolution dealt with a question about which there could be no doubt whatsoever as to what the position of the President was and what the position was on the part of the House, largely the Democratic side, that the President should send up a new budget. Could anyone, by any stretch of the imagination, say that was something the President would not be opposed to? Yet, those 3 crucial votes out of a total of some 22 analyzed were eliminated. That shows very clearly how perilous the Congressional Quarterly method of doing this is.

Second, it was pointed out very clearly in the Congressional Quarterly analysis that there was no attempt to evaluate or weigh in any way the different votes regardless of the amount of money involved, regardless of the crucial nature of the issue involved, regardless of the support or lack of it on the part of the Democrats or Republicans on either side. With regard to that latter point I pointed out that there were three votes on the Mideast resolution, and the only one about which there was any controversy whatsoever was the first vote on adoption of the rule. Outside of that, practically everyone, Democrats and Republicans, on the following 2 votes, supported the resolution, yet on all 3 votes they were equally weighed and the vote for the resolution was given the same weight as the vote on the initial question of whether or not to consider the resolution. That shows how Congressional Quarterly using the method they do, just do not reflect the support of the President.

The crucial issue is just simply this: Is the standard or test being used by the Congressional Quarterly a fair one? In my opinion, as demonstrated particularly in this instance, where they took 14 votes from 1 bill alone, 1 of which votes was for \$30,000 and another for \$50 million, weighing them equally—and on the \$50 million vote the President himself had indicated he did not support that particular program of sewage control—to take the position that each of those are weighed equally, and that anyone who opposed either program, the \$30,000 or the \$50 million program, opposed the President, is just asinine. I say that advisedly.

Then to take those 15 votes on appropriations and add to them only 7 votes for that early part of the session, and to try to come up with a tabulation, obviously wanting the people of America to believe it reflected the Democratic versus Republican votes in the House and support for the President, is just unfair. It is not realistic. That was my charge, and I repeat it.

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

Mr. DEROUNIAN. I yield.

Mr. LAIRD. Do you not think this was an attempt on the part of the Congressional Quarterly, which is recognized as a New Deal mouthpiece to cover up the deep split which we saw demonstrated on the floor of the House today in the Democratic Party?

Mr. CRAMER. Well, it is one of the cleverest techniques to accomplish that, if that is their objective. There is no question but that you can take figures and juggle them around and accomplish any purpose.

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

Mr. DEROUNIAN. I yield.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Do you not think this is another obvious attempt on behalf of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] to cover up for the utter failure of 80 liberal Democrats who proposed a program earlier in this session and so far, well here it is almost July, and they have not done anything about it? So rather than try to concentrate on the Democratic program, are they not involved in this?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am a little surprised that this debate occurred at this time. I had expected to be here anticipating an hour's discussion on the part of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], not realizing that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] was going to discuss the same subject. My interest in this matter, of course, is derived from the fact that on Thursday, May 23, I put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement of position of the Congressional Quarterly being neither authoritative nor non-partisan, and I called upon the publishers to cease using the term "Congressional," and certainly to stop using the byline "The authoritative reference on Congress," because I do not believe in either instance that is accurate and it tends to mislead the public. I said at that time that I would be glad to put an answer to the charges I made, an answer from the publishers of the Congressional Quarterly in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, if they chose to have me do so. I did receive a reply from Thomas N. Schroth, executive editor of the Congressional Quarterly, on May 29, 1957, in which he enclosed a lot of data and information which I thought was pertinent. However, the letter was not in a form in which it could be put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have answered that letter as of June 17, 1957, pointing out that I did not believe his, Mr. Schroth's, answer to those charges, would hold water, again offering, however, to put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD his statement of position or the position of the Congressional Quarterly. If the publishers thought the letter they had written was in sufficient form, I would put that in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, although I believe Mr. Schroth would agree that it was not designed for that purpose. Essentially, the charges against the Congressional Quarterly still remain unrefuted. No. 1, the very business of taking a test vote on presidential support right in the middle of a Congress-

sional session was a little unusual, particularly where there were only 30 rollcall votes and 14 of those, as has been pointed out, were on one particular appropriation bill which in itself, as the House well remembers, was quite extraordinary. I do not think the old-timers have ever seen anything like that. According to what I hear them say, in their memory they have never known an appropriation bill or any bill for that matter to have 14 rollcall votes, particularly on what we would call minor items as so many of them were. But, the essential basis upon which I charge that the Congressional Quarterly is partisan and unfair is the fact that the publication failed to list in that particular issue the votes on which it was contended the President had expressed himself. These votes were listed in the May 31 edition of the Congressional Quarterly after these charges had been made of partisanship and unfairness. But, even the May 31 edition, although it lists the votes used, is not adequate because the 8 votes, and there were only 8 other votes, that they did not use, were not listed and should have been listed so that the readers also could judge whether or not the President had expressed himself on those subjects. As a matter of fact, anyone reading, I believe, or going down the list of these 8 items which were not included will find 6 of them were very obvious items upon which the President's position was known. Now, I did receive a letter because I circulated my original remarks to a number of publications that might use the Congressional Quarterly and one replied by saying—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVINS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The statement was whether selecting test votes of the Congress on the basis of "the President's own messages, public statements prior to the votes that the President supported or opposed the proposal in question" was fair; and my answer in the letter to that person was that I thought it was perfectly fair to both those who supported and who did not support the President. However, I added this, that I would add to that those votes—a vote on an issue—where the President's position is so obvious that a formal statement on his position was unnecessary. There are five votes in that classification. They are rollcalls Nos. 17, 18, and 19 of March 12, 1957, on the rule, the motion to recommit, and final passage, respectively, of a resolution by the Democratic leadership requesting the President to tell Congress where the budget could be cut.

This was obviously an anti-Eisenhower move by the Democratic leadership. No one denies that; everyone, including the press, knew that was the case. The entire debate in the House stressed this fact.

On what possible grounds could the Congressional Quarterly say that these votes were not test votes and should not be included?

And also on rollcall No. 60, of April 11, 1957, giving the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce the power to investigate all the boards, commissions, and so forth, of the Federal Government. That, too, was partisan and a slap at the Eisenhower administration. Certainly, it did not require a formal statement from the President to let any person know that he was opposed to it. The Members knew it at the time of the debate on the floor of the House; the debate was all along that line. These votes were not used by Congressional Quarterly. Rollcall No. 23, on March 13, 1957, on final passage of the corn and feed grain program was not used as a test vote although rollcall No. 22, on the same day, which was on recommitment of this same bill, was used. Why?

Finally, I find out that the Congressional Quarterly did not use, as they certainly should have used, the very first vote that was taken in the beginning of the Congress, a vote in which everyone was interested, certainly a partisan vote, the vote for Speaker. There was no question of how the President stood or which nominee for Speaker he would have desired.

In the campaign of 1956, and later, he made it very clear that, of course, he preferred the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the Republican.

From these facts it is quite clear that the Congressional Quarterly was partisan and was so obviously unfair as to warrant the charge that this was deliberate. Certainly the publication is not authoritative.

And finally, and developing further the point made of these 14 votes on the 1 appropriation bill, I would challenge the Congressional Quarterly to show any Presidential statement that was clear that he was opposed to those individual 14 cuts. As a matter of fact, the President's general views on the subject of the budget were to the effect if the Congress could find any areas where it could reasonably cut that he would expect the Congressmen to do their constitutional duty, if you please, to go over that budget to look for items that could be cut.

When the Congressional Quarterly uses 3 items, incidentally, of sums below \$50,000, can it be said these cuts are ones to which the President was opposed? The President, of course, could not give his position on details of that sort.

As a matter of fact, in analyzing those 14 cuts, as I have, it shows, I think, that 3 of those cuts were less than \$50,000 and less. Six others were for less than \$500,000. Three were for \$1,500, or less.

Only 2 were of substantial amounts, 1 for \$12 million and 1 for \$50 million; and on the \$50 million item the President's position was thoroughly known to be opposed to that particular thing.

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

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. LAIRD. And I would call the gentleman's attention to the fact that \$10 million of that reduction was reflected in a point of order raised by the gentleman

from New York [Mr. TABER], against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], and \$10 million was knocked out on that point of order.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman.

The point I am making is that in the total appropriation bill you are talking about, sums of money of that size are relatively minor amounts; and no President of the United States, not even President Eisenhower, could possibly go into those details so that he could have expressed a clear view on it.

That is supposedly the test that the Congressional Quarterly was using. As I pointed out, the one glaring instance, the one which was a major item the President was on record as being opposed to that particular program, which was grants to States for sewage disposal plants, and so forth.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The statement was made earlier to the effect that I am attempting some sort of a cover-up for an alleged previous statement. I do not precisely understand this, but I have never used the Congressional Quarterly, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or any other device for that purpose. I should like to refer, for instance, to what myself and my colleagues who signed that statement did on behalf of the President's civil-rights bill which passed this House only today. I may say further this was undertaken as an analysis. We accepted it. I do not pretend that the Congressional Quarterly is entirely correct nor do I agree that it is in any sense partisan. Frankly, I was disturbed by issue No. 15 of April 12, 1957, where on page 444 the Congressional Quarterly stated:

Despite the Democratic talk about the need for economy in Government, it is the Republicans who wield the shears when pruning time comes around.

They went on to relate the story and said that when the chips were down it was the Democrats as a party who defended the domestic welfare spending requested by the Republicans.

That characterized us with their subscribers all over the land, including one in my district, the Democrats, as being spenders. I did not hear any objection to that.

Tomorrow I propose to relate instances where the Congressional Quarterly has been quoted by leaders of the Republicans and by the Republican press and by, in fact, the Republican Senate Campaign Committee and the national chairman of the Republican Party.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I would say probably they have, because it has been well known that in their opinion the Congressional Quarterly has been partisan. If they can demonstrate that even a partisan publication would say these things, it might lend weight to a particular position. Tomorrow we can continue this.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I would rather continue it tomorrow.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The charge I am making, at any rate, is not against the Congressional Quarterly exercising its own views. I am happy to have the various publications do that. Of course, that is the right of freedom of the press. My objection is that it is going under the guise of being nonpartisan and using such as a color of authority, as if they are the authority. Somewhat like the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is an authoritative publication of the Congress. It seems to me that this slant, as I call it, has been quite deliberate and can be explained in no other fashion.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I might point out to the gentleman from New Jersey that he and his 79 cosigners of that little manifesto made this statement:

We believe also, that unless the world situation improves significantly, there should be no reduction of the personnel in the armed services. We will support legislation and appropriations necessary to accomplish these purposes.

Day by day the Democrats tell us we are falling apart, that we have never been at a lower prestige. But what did these 79 liberals do on the vote of May 29 to add \$313 million, or to put that amount back into the President's defense budget? The gentleman from New Jersey and 66 of his cohorts voted against putting that money back. Five of them were absent. Only five of this group who had committed themselves in morality and in honesty to support this type of program voted to put this money back.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. We pledged support where we felt support was necessary. I am sure that the majority of the committee did not consider that a 3-percent cut was going to result in anyone being dropped from the armed services.

Now, if the gentleman can at this late stage of the game show us where one man is going to be taken out, then we can discuss this further.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

NEW REPUBLIC

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Gilbert Harrison, editor of the New Republic, asked that I correct the RECORD. I assume he means apologize, because I said that that paper went out of existence. I was mistaken about that. He tells me that they are still publishing the New Republic. And, one of the girls in the office said what I should have talked about, because it was farther to the left than even the New Republic, was the PM. If the gentleman was here in years gone by, he would recall it was not the authorized Communist publication, because that was the Daily Worker.

It was just one of those hangers-on; sort of a barroom loafer.

What I wanted to put into the RECORD was this: On page 81 of the Congressional Quarterly Almanac, volume 9, 1953, we find this language:

Failures to vote are counted as "times at bat," so that such failure reduces effective support score as much as an "anti-Eisenhower" vote.

And, over on the next page, 82, we find this language:

Failures to vote are counted as "times at bat," so that such failure reduces effective support score as much as an "anti-Eisenhower" vote.

Now, that is not the way to score, is it? If I were scoring in the annual baseball game between the Republicans and the Democrats, and every time a fellow did not go to bat, I would mark one down for our side, you would kick right away, would you not?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have been advised that the method of scoring now used by the Congressional Quarterly has been improved, but I cannot place too much reliance on that, because of their demonstrated inaccuracy.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi (at the request of Mr. COLMER) for the balance of the week on account of official business.

Mr. SADLAK for the remainder of the week on account of attending a funeral.

Mr. LOSER for June 19, 20, and 21 on account of official business.

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. PHILBIN, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of California, for 30 minutes, on Friday next.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. SIKES) that his special order for today be vacated and that he may address the House for 60 minutes on tomorrow.

Mr. TOLLEFSON, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. DEROUNIAN, for 15 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WIDNALL.

Mr. TEAGUE of California in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOGGS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VANIK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. HERLONG.

Mr. KILGORE.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, and include some of the testimony she gave

before the Appropriations Committee on the Merrimack River flood-control project. Also to include a very important letter from the head of the Corps of Engineers, saying that it is a No. 1 project in importance in New England, and to include other material from the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. GRIFFIN.

Mr. SCHERER (at the request of Mr. DIXON) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COOLEY (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1451. An act for the relief of Cecelia Vaccaro;

H. R. 1765. An act for the relief of Ellen G. Marinas;

H. R. 1837. An act for the relief of Elda Mondillo;

H. R. 6548. An act to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, as regards persons in the medical, dental, and allied specialist categories;

H. R. 7143. An act to amend the act of August 3, 1950, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions relating to the authorized personnel strengths of the Armed Forces;

H. R. 7505. An act to permit a retired officer of the Navy to be employed in a command status at Port Lyautey, Morocco;

H. J. Res. 185. Joint resolution to implement the convention between the United States of America and Norway, which entered into force on November 9, 1948, for disposition of the claim against the Government of the United States of America asserted by the Government of Norway on behalf of Christoffer Hannevig;

H. J. Res. 272. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 289. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain alien children; and

H. J. Res. 308. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 19, 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:

957. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1958, and for other purposes, in the amount of \$64,701,500 for various agencies and \$1,167,388 for the District of Columbia (H. Doc. No. 198); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

958. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Material), relative to the Department of the Navy proposing to transfer a contact mine of the type used in the North Sea barrage of World War I to the Mariners Museum of Newport News, Va., pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 7545; to the Committee on Armed Services.

959. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, pursuant to the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

960. A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide Federal contributions and authorize payroll deductions for prepaid health insurance for Federal employees and their dependents, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 8214. A bill to provide for a judicial review of administrative findings of the Secretary of Labor under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, and chapter 23 (Federal Unemployment Tax Act) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED:

H. R. 8215. A bill to provide for a judicial review of administrative findings of the Secretary of Labor under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, and chapter 23 (Federal Unemployment Tax Act) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 8216. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to prevent unjust enrichment by precluding refunds of alcohol and tobacco taxes to persons who have not borne the ultimate burden of the tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED:

H. R. 8217. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to prevent unjust enrichment by precluding refunds of alcohol and tobacco taxes to persons who have not borne the ultimate burden of the tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 8218. A bill relating to the administration of certain collected taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED:

H. R. 8219. A bill relating to the administration of certain collected taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ABERNETHY (by request):

H. R. 8220. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 8221. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide coverage under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system for certain employment and self-employment performed before 1937; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 8222. A bill to provide an alternative acreage adjustment and price support program for the 1958 crop of cotton and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 8223. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to make a preliminary examination and survey of the Missouri River to determine the practicability of rehabilitating

the water supply of western Iowa; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 8224. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it unlawful to destroy, deface, or remove certain boundary markers on Indian reservations, and to trespass on Indian reservations to hunt, fish, or trap; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 8225. A bill to amend section 1733 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 8226. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that certain military service of a veteran entitled to a civil service retirement annuity may be counted for social security purposes if he irrevocably elects to exclude such service from the computation of such annuity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PORTER:

H. R. 8227. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 8228. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide books for the adult blind"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 8229. A bill to authorize the restoration of times taken from patents covering inventions whose practice was prevented or curtailed during certain emergency periods by service of the patent owner in the Armed Forces or by governmental controls; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWENDEL:

H. R. 8230. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. YATES:

H. Con. Res. 195. Sustaining the principle of religious freedom in treaties between the United States and other nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Res. 281. Authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 1661, 82d Congress, 2d session; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to control the import of dried figs and fig paste to the extent necessary to protect adequately the American fig producing industry located in California; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the land-use program for the lower Colorado River; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to pollution of San Francisco Bay; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to adopt legislation providing that United States Armed Forces have complete criminal jurisdiction over all members thereof who are in service in a foreign country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the

President and the Congress of the United States requesting enactment of legislation relating to Status of Forces agreements; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to refrain from the passage of legislation concerning registration of trucks crossing State lines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation designed to secure for the country a body of judicially experienced and in every respect qualified persons for positions on the United States Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Joint Resolution No. 76, relating to the life and public service of William H. Stafford; former Congressman from the Fifth District; to the Committee on House Administration.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the admission of Hawaii to Statehood; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 8231. A bill for the relief of certain employees of the Department of the Navy at the United States Naval Gun Factory, Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 8232. A bill for the relief of Istvan Ural and Sandor Mayr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 8233. A bill for the relief of James L. McCabe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H. R. 8234. A bill for the relief of Yee Kung Sun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8235. A bill for the relief of Yee Mah Mee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 8236. A bill for the relief of Carlos J. Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 8237. A bill for the relief of Adam Billings, also known as Adam Billinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8238. A bill for the relief of Petar Rudolf Valentic, also known as Peter Valentic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 8239. A bill for the relief of Maria Dittenberger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

288. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution adopted at a mass meeting of Lithuanian American Council on June 15, 1957, in Racine, Wis., appealing to the highest authorities of the United States to exert to the fullest the American leadership in the fight for peace, justice, and freedom by inaugurating a positive and dynamic program of foreign policy to thwart the evil Communist designs for world domination and to abolish the fruits of all past Soviet aggressions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

289. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Secretary, Lithuanian American Council, Racine, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to pledging their wholehearted support to the Government of the United States in its efforts to secure peace and stability in the world and to promote the cause of freedom and justice for all nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Civil Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1957

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, in order to fulfill a firm and longstanding commitment, it was necessary for me to be back in the 9th Congressional District on Monday evening, June 17. I had hoped to return to Washington in time to cast my vote today on the civil-rights bill—H. R. 6217.

However, because the House was called into session at 11 a. m. this morning instead of the usual hour, 12 noon, it was impossible for me to be present in time to answer to my name.

Mr. Speaker, I wish for the record to reflect that I would have cast my vote in favor of the civil-rights bill on final passage. I wish to state further that I would have voted against the so-called jury trial amendment, and, accordingly, I would have voted "No" on the motion which was offered to recommit the bill.

Under the Taft-Hartley law, and under 29 other Federal statutes now on the books, injunctions are authorized in a manner similar to that provided in the civil-rights bill, and there is no right to trial by jury for contempt of court.

While we are concerned about securing to every citizen his constitutional right to vote—at the same time we would not, and should not, deprive anyone of a constitutional right to trial by jury in the cases where it applies.

However, the plain fact is that the civil-rights bill, as proposed by President

Eisenhower, does not take away any constitutional right of jury trial—Congress could not effectively pass such a law—the simple reason that if it did, such a statute, of course, would be unconstitutional.

I regret that circumstances made it impossible for me to cast my vote in person, but I am pleased that the bill carried without crippling amendments by such an overwhelming majority.

Senate Salad Luncheon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1957

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, California, I believe, is conceded to have the lead over the rest of the Nation when it comes to salad making and salad eating. The Sunshine State also grows more of the produce—lettuce, celery, ripe olives, and so forth—that go into salad, than any other State.

Therefore, it is fitting that California should take an active part in introducing to the Nation a new salad, "Senate salad."

I do not think it is too wishful to express the hope that Senate salad will shortly take its place next to the famous Caesar salad and chef's salad among Californians.

I also feel that after Mrs. American Housewife in the East, the South, the North, and the Midwest tosses her first

Senate salad, it will become a regular feature on tables across the Nation.

Therefore, it is a distinct pleasure for me to joint with a number of my distinguished colleagues in both Houses to invite all of you to walk across the Capitol between 1 and 3 tomorrow afternoon and drop in at the Senate District of Columbia Committee Room, just off the Senate floor, to partake of a dish of Senate salad served to you by Mrs. America of 1958.

Senate Salad Luncheon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1957

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the ingredient the State of Louisiana is contributing to Senate salad, which will be served between 1 and 3 o'clock tomorrow on the other side of the Capitol, is salad oil.

The State of Louisiana is responsible for the production of the largest amount of salad oil—and, in my opinion, the finest salad oil—in the United States.

Senate salad will be a real treat for my colleagues tomorrow. It is made of lobster, avocado, two varieties of lettuce, watercress, celery, green onions, ripe olives, grapefruit, tomatoes.

But, as Oscar Wilde once said, "To make a good salad is to be a brilliant diplomatist—the problem is entirely the same in both cases. To know exactly