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, 1857.

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 P. ROBERTS, Clerk, United States House of Representatives.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1857

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]

Bailey, J. Hillings, B. Scherer
Baker, J. Holtzman, A. Simpson, Ill.
Beamer, C. Keen, H. Speaker
Bentley, J. McConnell, T. Taber
Bowler, W. McGovern, W. Walter
Griffith, A. Machrowicz, J. Williams, N. Y.

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 1857

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 propose the inquiry whether a gentleman who is absolutely opposed to the bill, who led the fight for the jury trial amendment in the Senate, 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 the gentleman 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 2707.

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 a gentleman who never intends to depart unless overruled by the House, that on a motion to recommit, if no one of them offer a motion to recommit the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Murdock. Then to the third party in the House. Of course he would have to qualify. The Chair will state his reason. The present occupant of the chair laid down a rule over a year ago that in making this preferential motion for recommitment the Speaker would recognize the gentleman 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 head 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. Mansfield, 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 man 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 reelection in 1938.

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 if I, too, am overruled, I do so in protest.

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 takes the privilege of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Poff).

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

The Clerk reads 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 with 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 where 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 of the 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 contempt proceedings for the nonappearance of witnesses near thereto as to interfere directly with the administration of justice nor to the misbehavior, misconduct or disobedience of any officer or court in respect to the writ of habeas corpus, 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 proviso moves to be inserted into the act, as it is inserted as an amendment to a section of the act. It is sought to insert this part in 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 might 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 on 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.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. Poff. Mr. Speaker, I make the present "yea" withdraw my vote and vote "present."
Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York, Mr. Williams. I voted "aye." If he were present he would have voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from California, Mr. HILLINGS. If he were present he would have voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I voted "yea." I have a live pair with the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. BEAMS. Had he been present he would have voted "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, I voted "yea." I have a live pair with the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. SIMPSON. Had he been present he would have voted "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above reconsidered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. My inquiry is this, Mr. Speaker: Can the Speaker inform the House when the bill will be messaged to the Senate after the passage of the measure?

The SPEAKER. That is a question the Chair has put to him today in a press conference, and he did not enjoy any part of it. This bill is going to take the same course and every other bill that is passed. Any suggestion from any source that it might be held up is utterly unjustified.

Mr. KEATING. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Does the bill in its ordinary course go to the Senate on the same day it is passed?

The SPEAKER. If it is engrossed it does.

The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 286, nays 126, answered "present" 2, not voting 19, as follows:

**ROLL NO. 113**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yeas</th>
<th>Nays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. ROBINSON. I have a live pair with the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. MACKIEWICZ. If he were present, he would have voted "aye." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from California, Mr. HILLINGS. If he were present, he would have voted "aye." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The Clerk announced the following vote:

On this vote:

Mr. KEAN for, with Mr. BAKER against.

Mr. HILLINGS for, with Mr. UTT against.

Mr. MACKIEWICZ for, with Mr. STEAD against.

Mr. BAKER for, with Mr. MURRAY against.

Until further notice:

Mr. HOLTZMAN with Mr. BENTLEY.

Mr. WALTER with Mr. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. MACKIEWICZ with Mr. GRiffin.

Mr. BOWLER with Mr. SCHERER.

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

The result of the vote was announced as above reconsidered.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1958

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 267) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments. The House disagrees to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. FOGARTY, LANDHAM, DENTON, CANNON, TABER, and LAIRD.
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 bill (H. R. 3742) 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 Hoczkam Muller Cathen.”

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, for 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 naturalization 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. DYCAGO

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding him as an instructor for the United States Armed Forces of the United States Code filed under section 2734 of title 10, during World war II, and for damage to such lands as the property of the said Antoine Vellemann, under section 3754 (3) of the said act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate amendment, as amended, was concurred in. 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, Tallahoma, 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 Tallahoma, 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 the enactment of a private law for the relief of the above-mentioned claimants (Private Law 498, 83d Congress, 1st Session) 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 above-mentioned claimants (Private Law 498, 83d Congress, 1st Session). 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. 1208) for the relief of Antoine Vellemann.

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 Vellemann, 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 Vellemann 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 his 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.
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 Franklin M. Young, United States Air Force, retired, of San Antonio, Texas, is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States a sum of $5,761.45. Such sum represents the unfunded portion of the retired pay (originally totaling $6,172.65) paid to 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 repairman. The pay in excess of $1,476.95 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 $1,476.95, representing the amount for which liability is relieved by this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, which 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, Phila- delphia, Pa., the sum of $1,476.95. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims, 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, which 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 Second Lieutenant Franklin M. Young, United States Air Force, retired, of San Antonio, Texas, is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States a sum of $5,761.45. Such sum represents the unfunded portion of the retired pay (originally totaling $6,172.65) paid to 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 repairman. The pay in excess of $1,476.95 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 $1,476.95, representing the amount for which liability is relieved by this act. 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, Phila- delphia, Pa., the sum of $1,476.95. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims, 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.

Antonio Ranalletta.

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

GILLIOUS 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 the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to reli- giate George W. Arnold, an employee of the Treasury Department, of all liability to re- fund to the United States the sum of $1,707.50. Such sum represents the excess cost of shipping from Boston, Mass., to San Antonio, Texas, of 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 "$1,101.29."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

PHILLYL L. WARE

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

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

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Boces). 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 Fullerton, 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, which 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 Saka- yo Hamamoto Dewa, Madison, Wisc., in the sum of $3,891.04. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the named plaintiff, Mrs. Harriet Sakayo Hamamoto Dewa, 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, and June 18, 1942, when it was seized by the United States Navy off the coast of Oahu, Hawaii).}

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, which was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.
With the following committee amendment:

Page 6, line 6, strike out the figures and insert in lieu thereof "$580.62.

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 Woon­
teiler.

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 Woon­kteiler, of New York, N. Y., the sum of $2,500, and to Sadie Woon­kteiler, 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 Woon­kteiler against the United States resulting out of an automobile accident which occurred on July 20, 1932, in Barranquilla, Colombia, in which the per­sonal injuries sustained by the said Harry and Sadie Woon­kteiler 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 such contract or agreement 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 "$582,-

500," and insert "$500."

Page 3, line 7, strike out the figures "$15,-

000," and insert "$4,500."

Page 2, line 3, strike out "United States Embassy in Colombia," and insert "Inter­American 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., pursuant to a verdict rendered in an action for personal injuries and damages suffered in an automobile accident involving a truck on November 29, 1953, in violation of the speed limit and a stop sign, in the City of Little Rock, Ark., involving damage to the Federal Army truck (an enlisted man of the Army) which his truck struck while the Army truck was waiting to turn at a stop sign. Such claim is not cog­nizable under the Federal Tort Claims Act because of the fact that the driver of the Army truck 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 $100, 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 such contract or agreement 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 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.

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 $1,000, which had been advanced to her in connection with this claim of expenses incurred by her in traveling to and from Hawaii, in violation of the so­called Whitten amendment. Such overpay­ment was made to her while employed by the Army Chemical Center, Maryland, entirely beyond her knowledge and without her consent. Such overpayment was in violation of the so-called Whitten amendment.

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, 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 $808.74. 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 cancel­led 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 $100, 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 such contract or agreement 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 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 ascertained by the Secretary of the Navy which was paid to the said William E. Heilmann, as night differential pay for the period from February 15, 1945, to June 15, 1945, had application for such pay been denied on or before July 31, 1948, as provided by the act of July 31, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 940) : 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 such contract or agreement 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 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 Tavarez.

Mr. HEMPILL. 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.

LESLEY 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, to 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. VX-1910493); 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 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. 6170) 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, Timmonsville, S. C., the sum of $500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of ex Fossil 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 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 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.

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 PETT. 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, against the United States, 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. VX-1910493); 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.

FOUAD GEORGE BAROODY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6170) 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 264 Reuben Street, Shamokin, Pa., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement for services rendered in connection with the bar of the 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 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 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.

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 to them when the automobile in which they were riding was struck by a station wagon in 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 were said to be the direct results of the grossly negligent operation of 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

MADAME HENRIETTE BUAILLON AND STANLEY JAMES CARPENTER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7014) for the relief of Madame Henriette Buillon 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 Buillon, against the Government of the United States, for reimbursement for services rendered in connection with the death of her son, Andre Achille Buillon, as a result of an accidental shooting on May 4, 1945, in Zeitz, Germany; and to Stanley James Carpenter, of Solleftehamn, 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 or any amount of any departure bond to 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 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.
of title 28 of the United States Code relating to the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut decided, on June 6, 1950, that it is without jurisdiction because the injury alleged to have been sustained by him was not occurring at the time of his employment.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of such act shall be acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act if he files such claim with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this act:

"Provided, That the benefits shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act, 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.

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 alleged to have been incurred during the period beginning May 6, 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 held and considered, and any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim asserted by him, to have been unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of such 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 "$3,000" and insert "$1,000."
Page 1, line 7, strike out "$8,000" and insert "$6,500."

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.

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, Elfinham, Ill., shall be held and considered to have served continuously on active duty with the United States Army during the period beginning May 20, 1868, and ending May 2, 1869, 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 of time on which such benefits are 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.

EGLIN MANOR, INC.

The Clerk called the 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.," which is hereby referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department, be reported to the House, to be expeditiously acted upon, and that the committee be authorized to further and more fully consider the provisions of such bill, and give further time for the consideration thereof as may be necessary to enable him, as a duly authorized agent or attorney, to present such evidence as may be necessary.

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

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

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 238. 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), Loutfi Kalil Nascimento, and Mercocergus Bar, have been lawfully admitted to the United States citizenship under the provisions of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 with the consent of any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 337 of the said act. And from and after naturalization under this resolution, the said Toha Bin Hadji Dulah, Hanna Rezmovic, Sister Emmanuel (Miss Margarete Fu), Loutfi Kalil Nascimento, and Mercocergus Bar, 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.

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, the said 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 section specified in the act, except in the case of medical or hospitalization expenditures which may be deemed reimbursable."

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 of 1952, 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 resolution, 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.
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.

Scc. 2. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to issue the outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bonds, which may have issued in the name of Chelsea, J. C., Michael Springer, Garay-Muro, Arcadio Navarro-Savala, and Vartuhi Parsejian de Carpenter (also known as Ross Carpenter). From and after the date of the enactment of this act, 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 Margarita Fu)”, strike out the name “Loutfia Kryla Noma”.

On page 1, line 6, after the name “Mercedes”, insert the name “Simeon Krammer”.

On page 1, line 7, after the name “Eri”, insert the name “Raffaele D’Aurila”.

On page 1, line 9, after the name “Denise Pahouri”, insert the following: “Su-Ying Wong”.

On page 1, line 9, after the name “Pippilina Huber”, insert the following: “Lino Agulon Reyes”.

On page 2, line 2, after the word “fee” 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 Loutfia Kryla Noma”.

On page 2, line 17, after the name “Navarro-Savala” strike out the word “and” and insert the following: “Margarite Holdy, Ohan Evenien, Venhausen Evenien”.

On page 2, line 18, after the name “Ross 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 consider 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., 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 issuing and use by or for the United States Government of packaging means developed and owned by the Padbloc Co., Inc., 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. The question being on the request to 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 Sec. Willie R. Love, a citizen of the United States.

Ssc. 2. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Jesus A. Meza, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Lois Henderson O’Biecunas, a citizen of the United States.

Ssc. 3. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A), 205 (a) (2) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Lurline Jackson, shall be held and considered to be the mother of the said David A. Jackson.

Ssc. 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 Jean M. Puller, citizen of the United States.

Ssc. 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, Dorothy Christine Fujimura, and John T. Michael Takezawa, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born children of Jean M. Puller, citizen of the United States.

Ssc. 6. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Anneta N. Thalisimos 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:

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

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

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

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

"Ssc. 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. Geppiella Murgia, a lawfully resident alien of the United States."

"Ssc. 8. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Machie Yoshiyama, the fiancée of Ralph Springer, and citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for the purpose 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 within the time allowed for so doing shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event 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 within 3 months of the payment by her of the required visa fee."

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. 3577) 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., etc. That patent numbered 1147303, 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, meridian, is declared to be valid as of the date of issue."

The act of August 1, 1955 (69 Stat. 597; 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., etc. That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to Floyd McMahan and to Louise McMahan all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following-described tract of land (together with any improvements therein), located within the Apache National Forest, N. Mex.: South half of the north half of the southwest quarter of the southwest

June 13
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.

RENOUCE 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, Gravina section 7, T 8 S, R 17 W, Harlowton, Gallatin County, Mont., which it may have obtained under the last will and testament of Edwin A. Patterson, of Harlowton, Mont., who died on May 13, 1923.

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 sufficient for the acceptance thereunder the Secretary of Interior for the act of March 20, 1922, as amended (16 U.S. C. 485, 489), in exchange for authority from the United States for the purpose of cutting and removing timber, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to extend for a period not to exceed the effective term of the act. The act of September 30, 1957, the right of the McClead River Lumber Co. to cut and remove merchantable timber reserved by it in deed dated September 30,
That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments and insert $750,000, and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment number 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 said amendment insert "$4,215,776"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment number 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 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, 26, 28, 31, 33 and 35.

Amendment No. 6: Authorizes $25 million for farm ownership loans as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER II
Panama Canal Company
Amendment No. 7: Deletes language proposed by the Senate amending $1 million for the Panama Canal bridge.

CHAPTER III
Department of Defense—Militarv 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 $383,000 for resources management, to be derived by transfer, instead of $138,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 19: Authorizes $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 $700,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $860,400 as proposed by the House and $1 million as proposed by the Senate. The conference do not approve the use of the Senate’s appropriated funds for official residence allowances for deputy chiefs of missions or for medical benefits for dependents.

CHAPTER X
Department of Justice
Amendment No. 26: Reported in disagreement.

Funds appropriated to the President
Amendment No. 28: 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, 29, 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 $1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount agreed to is $222,120 less than proposed, due to the

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, have 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.
Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the conference report, the statement I which has just been read from the desk, there are 15 amendments in technical disagreement, mere formalities, and 2 amendments in material disagreement, I 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, 51, 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,' $27,446,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Procurement and production,' Army."

Senate amendment No. 9: Page 9, 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 heading in the General Government Matters Appropriation Act, 1957, shall be available for the purposes of the act of 1952, 56 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, 1957, which is just 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 $1,500,000 to $2,000,000."
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 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the penultimate paragraph 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 discharging of ships at our port after 6 o'clock in the evening and on Sundays and holidays.

In unanimously agreeing to the language contained in amendment of the Senate at No. 21, the conferees are in unanimous agreement that nothing should be done to disturb the long-established practice affecting officers of the Customs and Immigration Service 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 taxpayers, and to the third party.

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.

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.

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: "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 1148a-2 of the Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590h), except as modified by the appropriation made available under this head in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1954 (80 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. 5: Page 5, 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 1148a-2 of the Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590h), except as modified by the appropriation made available under this head in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1954 (80 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 3, 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 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to contract with farmers who carry out emergency measures to control wind erosion on farmlands or to reha­bilitate lands 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, (4) will be so costly to rehabilitate that Federal assistance is or will be required to return the land to its productive capacity, and 5) for reimbursement to the appropriation to the President for 'Disaster relief,' for allocations to the Secretary of Agriculture for such pur­poses, for 1957, and the Soil Conservation Service, for "General operating expenses", fiscal year 1957, and $550,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "outpatient care," for 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, No. 127, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert the following amendment for "Outpatient care", $1,000,000, of which $725,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for the Federal General operating expenses, fiscal year 1957, and $275,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for the "Federal Housing Administration" program recommended by the President of the United States, which was 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 this 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 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 order.

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 outlay for Federal funds outlay, consisting of $3 billion plus $2 billion more on presidential approval. I would like to deal directly with that argument because in my eagerness, I 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 for 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 advantageous than 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 this problem in New England. It would have been the same problem in any other state 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 program, 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 his contents or his dwelling, for $10,000 coverage. This is the kind of coverage that is not available generally in the insurance industry, 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 it is an opportunity to the Federal Government to get into the insurance business on a plane on which it ought to come in, because this is a private cooperative basis.

On the basis of the private commercial companies, and the Federal Government 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 farms 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. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman if he 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 that argument because some of my colleagues might have been influenced by such statements.

To begin with, there is no likelihood that the Government would ever be called upon to pay that amount of money for 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 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 of coverage adopted to avoid insuring risks when 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 well 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, will contain a deductible of $500,000 in any one property and the maximum liability for any one insured flood, even if the flood should be in a single major river basin, will not exceed $250,000.

As indicated previously, losses may be lower than the amount paid by the policyholders under the 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 minimum premium paid by the property holders, and if in the opinion of the Secretary of Commerce, the program is a success and there is a general desire to extend it, another appropriation can be obtained in the next session of Congress.

The underwriting and distribution of the contracts will be controlled so that there will be no undue concentration in any one area. Floods will be paid off 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 the 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 will 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 paid off, and that is the maximum liability that the Government would be called upon to pay in losses in any one 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 $2% billion. As a practical matter, we are not therefore in a position to say what the premium income for that purpose would be, or whether the amounts payable will fall below the amounts under the program. The Secretary of Commerce, in his statement to the House, estimated that the maximum liability on any one 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.

The flood-insurance system is ready to operate, but the House voted to deny it the necessary funds.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore urge the House to authorize the $14 million appropriation in order that we can give the American people some measure of self-protection.
Members had an opportunity to understand the real issues. There was some confusion because of the practice of saying that a fact came forth during the heat of the debate. If we are to deal intelligently with this matter, those errors must be corrected.

Let us be clear on that. The $14 million we are now considering—which was suggested. It goes into a disaster insurance fund—which is the point that was made in the debate of the House—had this to say during the heat of the May 7 debate:

"The Government will use normal private enterprise channels to get insurance 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 very large 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 figure we are dealing with 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 companies forming a valuable service for the government—in place of government employees.

Some Members have implied that the insurance companies will make money on this. 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 Melstrell, Commissioner of the Federal Flood Indemnity Administration, has an option on the services of the entire American insurance industry for the advantage of the people. If these companies perform 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 insurance fund—along with the property owner's 60 cents of premium payment—towards losses as 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 money for the disaster insurance fund? By borrowing from the Treasury.

The borrowing authority is provided in the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956. During the course of 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 premium on insurance borrowed to a cool $5 billion. And how often? Every 12 months. Five billion dollars every 12 months. Now think about that.

I did think a little 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 can actually know that there is flood protection—how many people under insurance? The Government's flood-insurance policies only permit $10,000 coverage on a home and $250,000 on commercial property. Do they know that? Do they carry the 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 congratulate the gentleman from New Jersey. Mr. Thompson of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania—Mr. McCormack.

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

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

Mr. THOMPSON. 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) on his very fair action. But the gentleman from New York (Mr. McCormack) 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. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?
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 an opportunity that has never been offered before. 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. 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 you who have spoken. Outside 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 country. 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 to pay out as much money 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 be operated on a 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 insurance business 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. Speaker, I hope the House will agree to the motion to recone 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 boat, and I 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 terrible 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 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 insurance 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, the program is a national one. 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 can cancel it.

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 two seconds.

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 decision 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

OCTO, Tex., May 24.—A sneak tornado swept down out of a driving rain here today to destroy 25 homes—1 twister of more than 20 that boilled 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 persons or 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, and across the Panhandle to Fort Worth and Denton—flash floods from rains, of more than 8 inches in places, drove additional home­owners fleeing for safety.

In my district in Connecticut, we have about 50 families were driven from their homes. Early today, the second deluge in 2 days soaked 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 is insurable. It is not included in the 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 flood.
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 complete solution to the problem; but 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 on Appropriations 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 object, S. 1740, and I understand that it is the belief of the Committee on Appropriations that this year's 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 and another 16.

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. CRAMER. Yes; I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my interrogating the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee the purpose was, to make a statement 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 care of 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 does not 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 the 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 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 80,000 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 recognizing them in the manner which would rescue them from disaster.

Mr. MARTIN. 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 80,000 policyholders. My purpose was to bring light to the bill before 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 the 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 current nuclear explosions, I impressed myself very definitely on the point that any worthwhile flood-insurance program would have to apportion the risk over the entire period of experimentation in order that it would not be the case by passing the 1955 act giving some relief.

It is not expected that Congress would rescue all the beneficial associations from this period of experimentation in order that it would not be the case by passing the 1955 act giving some relief.

As a result of the Appropriations Committee's action they are covered in the Senate bill when it is enacted.

Mr. MARTIN. 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 relief which it is clear will have to be done. 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 broadened approach, but it seems 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 anxious 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 many- sided problem regarding 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 that would seem to be on the increase.

None of us can be sure of the degree of urgency that is involved in this legislation because great, fearsome, natural disasters 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. None of us can be sure of the degree of urgency that is involved in this legislation because great, fearsome, natural disasters 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, destructibility and instability. In the light of 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 this question at all. The occurrence of so many of these holocausts serves vividly to bring forcibly to our attention the need of 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 with which the Federal Government, 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 and the Government has spent a large part of the money which 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 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 definite within the range of possibility, however much we may wish to exclude ourselves from 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 a comprehensive, cooperative 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 to the breach wherever the need arises.

I am convinced that Congress should consider these matters in the very broadest sense, I particularly urge the adoption of legislation dealing with flood control, and I refer to the legislation 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 experiment program that will point out the ways and means by which we can finally solve the flood control problem.

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. But as we practice economy and efficiency, let us not be blind to the stern fact that we must achieve these desirable needs without paralyzing or impairing legitimate expenditures 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 stifling 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 live up to 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 merited and excellent speech of 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-
We are being asked today to start an experiment in a 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 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 them 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 [Mr. CANNON] who is now 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. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CANNON. 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 floods. 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 enabling legislation 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 which participate in this program must share a part of the subsidy or cost. This 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. Vessels).

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I was just thinking, when they were talking about the terrible damage that had been done by floods, that if we had had this insurance in very ast of that time it would not have been a $3-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 companies who were quite willing to cooperate, and out of those conferences it was mutually agreed that it would not be necessary 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 $56 million. This would make the Government's 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-insurance-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 estimated that premiums 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 $63 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 dealt to 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 have to be written by 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 the least, they will not write it because, conversely, 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.

But 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 whole premium 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 $50 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 of all—what we propose to insure property against flood danger—all of which is the 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 do not wish to believe will happen.

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.

And possibly persuade 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, be a threat to the financial solvency of our Government."

Because of these objections and many others, we felt and advised the Housing and Home Finance Agency to spend $335,000 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. 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. That is the practice.

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 it. 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? $400 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. BOLAND. 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 asked. Mr. Mitchell or Mr. Blythe said 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. When we get into this kind of 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. This 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. I do not understand this authorization 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 bill, or else he becomes 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 plan.

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

Mr. 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 before this House 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 demands that these new authorities ought to be 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 demanding that we keep the Government out of business. On all and sundry occasions, in season and out of season, they march into this Chamber making it manifest 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.

Our 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 children, your brother-in-law, your dog, your tent, your horse, your home, your life. 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 flood they can also make a business. And who but Uncle Sam would like to be able to insure your life? And who but Uncle Sam would like to be able to insure your home?

And Uncle Sam has already tried. The farmers took out a policy. And after a late flood farmers would drive in a raft 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, the farmer who knows they will have a crop failure, it is worth the risk to throw around a little seed and collect the insurance. But the Government is getting into the insurance business.

Thereupon everybody joins in apostatizing the legislative committees and demands that these new authorities ought to be 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 demanding that we keep the Government out of business. On all and sundry occasions, in season and out of season, they march into this Chamber making it manifest 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.

Our 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 children, your brother-in-law, your dog, your tent, your horse, your home, your life. 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 flood they can also make a business. And who but Uncle Sam would like to be able to insure your life? And who but Uncle Sam would like to be able to insure your home?

And Uncle Sam has already tried. The farmers took out a policy. And after a late flood farmers would drive in a raft 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, the farmer who knows they will have a crop failure, it is worth the risk to throw around a little seed and collect the insurance. But the Government is getting into the insurance business.
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 day after day. I have been looking for 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 bill. 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 which was 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 that the flood is the only thing that we will have in the years to come regardless of any act of God or any natural catastrophe. Floods are terrible 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 back in 1951 when they had all the top private insurance companies in America 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. Is it not really making us look a little bit foolish? These 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 the Missouri 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 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 out of Government out of business. Get us out of business." I can hear them hollering all the way from Houston up here about getting the Government out of business; and my friends from Massachusetts and South Carolina and the gentlemen from the West have been about the same thing. They would like to embark on a business where the probabilities are the loss will exceed $500 million a year. If anybody can contradict 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 New York about the most persuasive men in the House. He kills us with kindness most of the time but wins 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 would not be large. Why is it going to 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 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 does.

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 to the river. If this bill is passed where the Government would pick up the check, you will 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 this gentleman claimed this Government Insurance program would do? What was it?

Mr. THOMAS. It is $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? $80 million. Now my friends take a third bite at it and they set the figure for you. 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 think the gentleman for bringing that point out. We have had these terrible floods in the past and are in business for days looking, and your guess is as good as mine, for five to one-hundred million dollars more.

Mr. CANFIELD. 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 it to A, B, or C. It 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 into another program?

Mr. THOMAS. We did 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 $390,000 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 terrible 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 what this act does?

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. 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. 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 sought insurance and to other forms of insurance.

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

Mr. JACOBSON. 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 from New York.

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

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. FOUGARTY) there were—ayes 55, noes 124.
Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ENGLE moves that the House reconcile its disagreement from the amendment of the Senate No. 17 and concur therein with an amendment agreed to by the Senate with the following dissenting votes: "Chapter VI, Department of the Interior, Office of the Secretary, acquisition of strategic 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 amendment 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 a 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 prospect 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 meeting where the president of the corporation that produced tungsten primarily told these people that they were going to be able to produce tungsten and sell it at the market price, which price is affected by importations, and that price and that they could do it longer continue a subsidy on tungsten.

Mr. Speaker, I, for my part, cannot agree.
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; prices are somewhat 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 gentle- man from Ohio [Mr. Kirwan].

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

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 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 congres- sional district—are desparately depend- ent upon what action we take here today. But it is not only the people of my congressional district, but the people of the State of Idaho—who have their eyes on Congress right now. Good citizen 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 when we appropriated $21 million to finance the purchase of strategic minerals—including tungsten, asbestos, fluorpar, and columbium-tantalum—for the remain- der 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 current 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 pro- ducers 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 I betray them; or, should I say, 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 in this amendment provides.

Let me tell you briefly how serious the situation is for Custer and Lemhi Counties. If we close them down, we will devastate the stimulus of the original stockpiling and complicate matters; but we should proceed with appropria- tions.
that the project in which they invested was entirely sound and profitable under the approval of the House Appropriations Committee. As the sole result of the refusal on the part of the House Appropriations Committee to reconsider the approval of the appropriation of $59 million, the process has failed, debt has been accumulated, the investors have lost their hard-earned savings, and I have lost my job.

If, as I have above, I have qualified myself to speak out, then I would say that the issue here is betrayal, inexcusable and unforgivable. I am of the view that the issue is not whether or not our Government has stockpiled enough tungsten concentrates to meet an obligation it incurred by the passage of Public Law 733, but rather if it intends to purchase tungsten in an amount sufficient to meet an obligation it incurred by the passage of a law of the land, after inducing a country to abandon a cause of a law of the land, after inducing a country to abandon a cause.

The Department of the Interior has cleared this amount of money but has failed to do anything about it. As the Senate Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the House Committee on Interior has testified, the tungsten mining industry cannot be turned on and off as a water tap. If our foreign supplies are cut off in an emergency, will our domestic operators be expected to produce our needs by re-opening 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 all this. In the process, it is being discriminated against, 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. When will the American taxpayer be able to pay his 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 concentrate, 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 its tracks before it has started. The efforts of the industry are being wasted on a defensive posture 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 Recession will show, there are outstanding some $62 million tungsten contracts to purchase tungsten from foreign producers, at an average price of $55 a unit. I am advised that these 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 to support tungsten, the industry will likely find itself twice as many as its 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 country to abandon a cause.

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 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 timber's 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.

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 am of the view that the issue is not whether or not our Government has stockpiled enough tungsten concentrates to meet an obligation it incurred by the passage of Public Law 733, but rather if it intends to purchase tungsten in an amount sufficient to meet an obligation it incurred by the passage of a law of the land, after inducing a country to abandon a cause.
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 Program in 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 superheaters, 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 the heat-pumping 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 as rapidly as is 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 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. It is estimated that we are underscoring some of our stockpiles at rates as fast as that is concerned. And there is reason to believe that any further gains which might be realised in the high-temperature properties of these types of alloys will be marginal at best, and, therefore, it would appear that any further development of the properties 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 utilizing 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 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 given in degrees centigrade and are taken from the Reactor Handbook published by the Atomic Energy Commission:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Melting point (°C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carbon</td>
<td>3,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tungsten</td>
<td>3,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tantalum</td>
<td>2,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molybdenum</td>
<td>2,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbium (niobium)</td>
<td>2,415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 example, in the letter written on December 13, 1956, by Hon. Reuben B. Robertson, Jr., Deputy Secretary of Defense, to Dr. Arthur S. Fleming, Director of Defense Mobilization, Mr. Robertson said:

Furthermore, 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 extent of these revisions upon the current inventories, and while it is obvious that the military is 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, and sago, as well as values for many of the materials which have been stockpiled, but certainly the effect of these new advances must be that requirements for the high-temperature refractory metals, including tungsten, columbium and tantalum are in the 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.

Asbestos is one of the best high-temperature insulating materials, while fluorine, produced from acid-grade fluor spar, 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 the country is depending 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 vital materials to work harder to get these materials out of the ground because it appeared at the moment that the domestic production of these vital minerals takes place at real costs that can compare favorably with present prices for foreign mining endeavors.

To sum up, then, there are defense, moral, and economic justifications for the proper implementation of the domestic mineral-purchase programs set forth by 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 with the undue dalliance that has already caused great hardship among the miners of the 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 of our great country, by our willingness to spend, our preparation for the defense of our country, and our ability to carry on the program of our great Nation, are reasserted that we ourselves established less than a year ago, so that the confidence of the citizens of 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 country and for our 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, are made of 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 140 pounds for each engine. 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. It is true on the average of jet engines.

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. It 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 weigh 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 each J-57 engine 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 which are not vital materials or even 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. Mr. Speaker, 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 materials in the custom law commerce at prices that are likely to be the gentleman if this amendment is not adopted, will the Government's purchasing program on columbium and tantalum also be eliminated?

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 House, if for the $10 million is put in this bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Ryozski].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, would I 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 a whole list of asbestos from the San Carlos Indian Reservation in Arizona which would not be there except for this particular program. This mine is affording employment to some 450 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 in 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 mobilization base. We will not have to do this if we do the right thing.
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 purchase program will say that 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 the government and the interested producers of these materials had then, and should have 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 mining details that 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, it is my opinion that some $200,000 of our bought ores might 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 a saleable, 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 equalize 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 and a proper consideration 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 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 Public Law 733. Someday, you know, we are going to be able 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 me 1 additional minute?

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. Would this have 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- tions 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 here in Colorado, I do have 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 and a mines history.

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 lost in the argument for this appropriation unless we consider it as a defense activity, and we also lose it if we start at the word "depository" and do not consider the future. We probably do not know now, and the testimony would indicate that they are not quite ready for an overall and all-inclusive measure program. But what are you going to do? Listen to what Dr. Flemming had to say here unconverted. 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 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 re-affirmed 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 program to be cut off in view of the administration intends to recommend and the Congress to consider long-term policies for minerals 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 offered this as a part of our crop 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 had 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 how 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 here, but can you say whether or not, without violating security, that is a realistic figure?
Mr. REDWIN. Correct, sir.

Dr. FLEMMING. The answer to that is "No, we do not have anything approaching that on hand." 

Mr. REDWIN. 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. REDWIN. 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 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, I am consistent with this committee where we have made in effect a holding out that we will require certain quantities of certain things. The fact that the Government is then under obligation to acquire those quantities provided they come in within the time period set.

Mr. REDWIN. I am looking forward, with the circumstance it is, that it has made an implied contract with the producers of these 4 metals, if they come in within the time period set, 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 my opening statement I just read, we feel for a number of reasons that it is important for Congress to go through with the policy 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 come back in the high-temperature properties of these types of alloys will be marginal at best and, therefore, it would appear that there is a further development of these materials is still 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 present time the worst time to go very clear; we are not supporting, we do not support Public Law 733, and we are not supporting it for defense grounds; that is, in terms of the need these materials had 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 it is our best bet now, at this time period, between now and the time there is agreement on the long-term policy, it just does not make good sense that in the meantime we close down our 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 doubt if the emphasis has been sufficient on that point.

Dr. FLEMMING. Senator, as you know, it is difficult to comment on that in a specific way because we do not know what Defense plans are. We would hope that the producers feel if the Government had once reneged on them.

Dr. FLEMMING. Senator, as you know, it is difficult to comment on that in a specific way because we do not know what Defense plans are.

Senator MALONE. Yes. I doubt if the emphasis has been sufficient on that point.

Senator MALONE. Mr. Redwine, I would like to develop one point with Dr. Flemming.

Dr. FLEMMING. Doctor, are you familiar with the research that is going on now to develop higher heat-resistant alloys and base 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.

Senator MALONE. That is the position, of course, I am consistent with this committee where we have made in effect a holding out that we will require certain quantities of certain things. The fact that the Government is then under obligation to acquire those quantities provided they come in within the time period set.

Now, if you believe that is really right on top of us, what would you say about your stockpile plus?

Dr. FLEMMING. Senator, as you know, it is difficult to comment on that in a specific way because we do not know what Defense plans are. We would hope that the producers feel if the Government had once reneged on them.

Dr. FLEMMING. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I just want to call your attention to this statement of that kind, but I would like to develop one point with Dr. Flemming.

The Senator from Idaho, and express my own thoughts in support of this whole oil-in-unlimited-quantities competitively with oil out of the ground. We should find ourselves in another war, nuclear or otherwise, we will rue the day that we did not march through and complete this oil-shale program.

There is another thing I want to speak out strongly about, and that is we do have to trade with other countries some. I do believe that we serve our own interest of purchasing our resources at home. I think in a broad sense we help ourselves by purchasing some of them abroad. And where the balance will be, Mr. Chairman, I have no question of that, is 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 fluor spar to compete as we did with our own dollars, while we recognize the advisability, as I say, of trading somewhat with those people and making it more likely that some of our exports will find their way into the United States market with reasonable men a balance. But to take that when we have the production in the United States and we have the competition to our own is something which I do not think can be justified, and I want to express myself as opposed to it.

Mr. Chairman, pointing out to members of the committee, for this opportunity to say these few words, because I could not let this opportunity go 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 approval into effect.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Allott.

Mr. KIRKWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. Sisk].
Mr. SIJSK. Mr. Speaker, I raise to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. Engel). 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 it 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. I appeal to the Members and I ask them to appropriate. They are far in the hole, overburdened 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 defense and the strength of our nation.

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 a good friend from 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 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 imported tungsten. The Government adopted a program of trying to stimulate the production of tungsten in this country. At that time we were paying $65 per pound for钨 from the tin deposits.

We entered into long-range contracts with foreign sources for tungsten at that price. Then we came along and stimulated the domestic mining industry to provide tungsten. The price dropped 100 percent under the amount we were paying to our foreign friends. The industry, of course, sprung 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 the gentleman's statement. 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 misconception 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 wells 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. Speaker, 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 collapse.

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 shut down.

Mr. Speaker, 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 funding 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 alternative 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 dramatic 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 flared into a raging conflict in Korea.

Deprived or major sources of tungsten from abroad, this Nation saw the world market price increase to over $65 per pound as foreign producers began to use the techniques of charging all the traffic which 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.

Mr. Speaker, 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.

Secretary Seaton. Mr. Chairman, in the first place, I would not like to think in terms of being unsuccessful. I said this morning the administration is for the program in the first instance. It was part of the President's budget in this session of the Congress in 1957. The administration has supported it time and again.
I said, as delicately as I could, that I did not think it would be wise or advisable to have the steel companies that were using 72,000 pounds 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 made the electric light work. 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 found that 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 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. The gentleman from Iowa.

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 a committee that was handed to some of the Members there 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 or not? If 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. That is a fact.

Mr. Kirwan. I again tell the gentleman this. I heard Mr. Fleming's name mentioned here a while ago. Fleming said, "I again tell you that no national tungsten is 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 get the Administration to stop fooling, 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, $2,000,000 worth of tungsten and all of it was surplus to the strategic and critical stockpile. We paid $83 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 assure only substantial additional assistance to 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 supporting 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
used by industry. Do you think that is correct?

Mr. LONG. Not a single pound.

Senator RUSSELL. 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 they themselves 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 $56.

For example, Union Carbide, one of the largest users of tungsten, has received $1,966,541 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 $1,575,000 under Public Law 733, reported a net profit of $15,625,000. It was claimed that $352,000 of this was for tungsten.

In addition, this corporation received a certificate of necessity for rapid tax amortization on its tungsten production. The public subsidy, the President in the State of War, the Haile Corp., including the Hailey Mining Co. currently have contracts for Government assistance totaling $355,000 to discover more tungsten under the defense minerals exploration program.

The fourth company, the Bradley Mining Co. currently have contracts for Government assistance totaling $355,000 to discover more tungsten under the defense minerals exploration program. The Government now has 21 such contracts in force at a cost to the taxpayer of $1,011,050 to discover more tungsten.

Senators 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 much 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 $532,000 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; or 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 the Mexican laws 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 the program. He stated:

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 proceeds were supposed to be carried into 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 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.

A recent 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 have the 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 Appropriations Committee tested to strike all funds for Public Law 733 in conference and that report was agreed to by the Senate without any dissent. The Senate, however, rejected this conference report and the House conference, in the closing hours of the last session, ordered an appropriation of $21 million to carry the program until they had an opportunity to review the program. There was no assurance, in the conference report that any additional funds would be appropriated. On the contrary, the action by the conference could not be construed to have been either 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 sponsors of this subsidy that funds to carry out the programs were expected to be forthcoming and that the miners should therefore continue 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 case the same formula was used 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. The purpose of these payments was to keep submitting offers to be on record if they could pressure Congress into appropriating funds and authorizing the backdating of purchases to December 18, 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 another smoke screen 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 used 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,” 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. This $219,555,000 will have to be spent 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 obtaining. The Government at one time was paying $30 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 817,582,000, about 40 percent was of the quality that would go under Public Law 733 you would expect that they would have at least shipped us better stuff. But GSA figures show that 18 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 Steel at about $80 a unit above the market price 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, 1956, from the Deputy 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 on 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 of 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, 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 nondefense tungsten. He has said that the United States will need about 8,000 pounds of tungsten in excess of the long-term strategic stockpile objective. Just for example, let us see what this surplus tungsten will do.

Mr. Chairman, let us think 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 per engine at 1,500 pounds per engine, we are not talking to the long-term stockpile objective for 2,300,000 airplane engines. With the present defense requirements of about 13,000 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 relatively 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 would still have a surplus alone to build 5,750 atomic aircraft.

Now here is what a Member of the body said a year ago during the Senate hearings on the authorizing bill on nondefense tungsten. This is the question of the necessity 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 on this doubt. Even as late as May 24, 1957, the Interior Department was still producing twice as much tungsten for the normal civilian needs and that you have a 5-year stockpile contract (it is now 6 going on 7 years) for supplying tungsten at such a low price that it will supply us with over 10 tons of tungsten a month for the stockpile, so that coupled with the stockpile it is so far ahead of needs that there is no need of worry about it.

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 tungsten project. It has been patiently for over 2½ years for the administration to come up with a solution to this 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 a long-range project long past was recommended by the administration. Well, last week on June 4, the administration finally submitted its long-range mineral programs 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. For example, let us say the Interior Department buys another $33,850,000 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 their tungsten to the United States Government at $80 a unit over market price, while foreign tungsten is used in the United States. It is useless to buy 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, and so I urge the Members of Congress not to give it to us. It is true that they don’t know what to do with, and more is still coming in. The taxpayers would be a lot better if we sold this $80 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 we can get along without going. Now is the time to stop this so-called interim assistance.

I spoke 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 Westinghouse 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 that we are being asked to continue to support 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 about almost to give these tungsten people $30 a unit. Have the farmers ever gotten a break like that?

Mr. TATTER. 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. Mr. Speaker, 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 the Government. I identified 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, would you be doing?” Why, they would have us in the as can—this, the general 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 tell 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-term minimum objective in most categories.

Mr. BOLAND. I ask my colleague if this is true that, not one dime was appropriated here for the fiscal year 1943 for the purchase 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. You do not have to produce any tungsten, but in the conference they were unable. . .

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 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. EVINS. 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 have the testimony 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. 882, 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 am not interested in 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.

Mr. KIRWAN. 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. The 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 over 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 only 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, if you will. I only hope the American people will realize how I feel and 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 1956 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 keep up. People are willing to spend these essential expenditures unless we stop needlessly subsidizing a few individuals.

I have no objection to providing additional nickel, molybdenum, asbestos, and columbitum-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 private conversations 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 wasters on all of us.

I ask you all to support the committee in stopping this tungsten subsidy for I know it is the right thing for us to do.

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

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 appropriation of the production 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 bring 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 involved thought these foreign contracts 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 by a financial argument that if 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 Congress and 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 squandered 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.

Opponents of the appropriate 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.

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 order to provide 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 more than 23 percent of the national income in tax revenue. The loss of tax revenue on the national income created by tungsten production will approximate $65 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 Congress has a natural right to 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 and 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 the cost of living to 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 raw materials. They cannot be met by importing cheap raw materials from other nations as a reciprocal market to buy the output of manufactured goods. The currently prevailing price 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 payroll, 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. To 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 certainly, Mr. Chairman, 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.

Certainly proponents of a project reveal the poverty of their cause when they try to make capital for its 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.

We welcome reductions which can be justified. We see no possible need for any increase.

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 7 percent below the fiscal year 1957—$52,521,977 below similar appropriations for the fiscal year 1958.

It goes back to 1908 and beyond. That time, although the revenues of the Government were largely from excise taxes, we were already beginning to appreciate the limitations of old hazardous methods of handling appropriations.

In 1908 a National Monetary Commission was appointed under the chairmanship of Mr. 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 1918 a special committee of the House under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Indiana, acting 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 approach to the budgetary system cannot be justified. Avoidance of budgetary bills, with the exception of the mutual security bill, will be the most satisfactory public works appropriation bill inserted in this year's budget, it must be deficient indeed.

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides every expenditure for public works submitted either by the Bureau of the Budget, or by the committee, or by the House, legitimately needed at this time.

We welcome reductions which can be justified. We see no possible need for any increase.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the House adjourn at 12:15 p.m.

The SPEAKER. The House adjourned at 12:15 p.m., to reassemble on June 18.
tion of minerals and metals and the conservation of soil in every area of this country, which will also be 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 at this point that overwhelming majority of these 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 "Power Projects".

The committee is seriously concerned about the lack of local contribution on many of the local flood protection and harbor projects. It is true, as the gentleman from Iowa has already said, that a major flood-control problem on large interstates is one in which the Federal Government logically can assume the greater portion of the cost. On those sections where the cost is intrastate and of a strictly local origin and benefit, the local interests should rightfully provide a substantial portion of the cost of the project. If the project is the intent of this committee, we give more consideration to those projects where local interests are willing and able to make the necessary contributions, 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 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 going into it.

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 its construction rate and Farwell 40 percent. The Secretary's 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 percent. However, under reclamation law the power revenues are applied. I am a little puzzled how the Secretary can pay for a thousand 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 a rate which actually they are paying back far more than the average project in the United States. There is no flood-control money in here because flood control pays back not one penny. It will help me understand that 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.

Mr. JENSEN. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, generally speaking, reclamation projects are not pay back contracts, 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 report which the committee was quite critical of the Bureau of Reclamation regarding the transfer of funds without coming to the Appropriations Committees members to make a report.

I have a statement here from Mr. Deyheimer, 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 the Department of the Army, civil works of the Corps of Engineers, and the following agencies of the Department of Interior: Bureau of Reclamation, Bonneville Power Administration, Southeastern Power Administration, and Western 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 in the committee's recommendation there is an appropriation of most of the money requested by them. However, it is noted that except for funds for the Bureau of Reclamation, an appropriation of 7 percent were made in the Bureau of Reclamation request. For example, planning funds for the Bureau were cut 25 percent. The Appropriation recommended to the Congress for the Bureau of Reclamation is over 12 percent.

This is most difficult to understand because, first, the report of the committee 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 lending work done by the Bureau of Reclamation is most essential to development of water resources of the Pacific states and should be protected by 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 our 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 statement here indicates that the bill contains money for other features of the project, it contains no money for power facilities. So that settled the point that I wish to make. 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 project and project or irrigation project in the State of California contains this provision:

Provided, That the Secretary is authorized and directed to continue to a conclusion the engineering studies and negotiations with respect to proposals to purchase falling water, and not later than 18 months from the date of enactment of this act and in accordance with the terms 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 the Trinity River 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 incorporated in the bill 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 requirement 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 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 enumerated 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 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 language is taken. 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. Therefore, it is the right course to follow the clear and cut positive statement
of Clyde Spencer, regional director of the Bureau of Reclamation, Sacramento, contained on page 442 of the hearings.

Mr. RABAUT. Are there any funds in the bills that would implement construction of 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 would be in 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 good 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 chairing the committee which has to do with such matters.

The paragraph reads as follows:

During the course of the hearings, a number of the Bureau witnesses demonstrated an almost complete lack of preparedness and an excusable 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 his full view on what 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. 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. Drexheimer in his statement, which I will make a part of my remarks, explains that that reduction is going to work as a multipurpose project, will I hope that the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation, whoever testifies before the Senate committee, will make a better showing there on the matter. I trust that the Department will do more to the satisfaction of the Senate committee than they did to our committee.

Mr. ASPINALL. Then may I ask this additional question? Is it 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. LANDON. 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 to the Department of the Army, it is my firm conviction that appropriations of civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, and agencies of the Department of the Interior, are urgent and those that could be delayed might not be as significant.

I suggest that my colleagues consider the bill that provides appropriations for civil functions, 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, 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 workable 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 $1,000,000 appropriation is not enough. It would be very desirable if we 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.
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] 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 matter of policy, 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 an 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 stages and been marked as suitable for all areas of the country. It was 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 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.

I always stimulate and refresh 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, Mr. JENSEN, Mr. CANNON, 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.

Funds are provided for the management and operation of the Bonneville Power Administration, Southeastern Power Administration, and Southwestern Power Administration, in accordance with the provisions 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 for the fiscal year 1957, 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, that 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 economy and thrift of this country 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 Administration.

Our committee has heard testimony and sympathetically considered projects for all areas of the Nation—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 Colorado, the Southwestern 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 mean more than a trillion dollar export and commerce. This overall plan calls for construction of 32 hydroelectric power-producing units within this project—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 totaling $1.2 million—almost $1.5 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 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 appropriate projects, 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 nation-wide water control. In this history of achievement, the corps has completed some 2,500 projects authorized by the Congress—at a cost of more than $34 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 embankments.

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. The Missouri and Tennessee Valleys 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 part of the total appropriation which will be expended for developments in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River basin in the Northwest; 10.59 percent will be expended on the lower Mississippi; 9.30 percent for the Columbia River Basin; 8.82 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 would like to mind the statements of Assistant Secretary Aandahl of the Department of Interior who appeared before the committee. Mr. Aandahl appeared to present the 1956 recommendation 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 reclamation of unproductive lands, and the production of electric power 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 a great advantage for 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 Water Project. If, 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 and provide benefits to 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 urgent passage of this needed bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
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 number of people—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, I estimate, that they only tried to come 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 pork-barrel. If it is, we are 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 have to be decided and I believe 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.

Then I want to be able 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 reasonably balanced view of the many projects over the years.

Each project of which there was any testimony was a subject of criticism but use $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 1,788 pages may be at times tedious, but use $61,639,977 from the budget estimate, it is nevertheless a bill that we believe can be justified.

Now I relate those things, not in the spirit of criticism but rather to point out the many projects in favor of economy; it is just as harmful as for the inhabitants of the involved areas are concerned.

We hope that the appropriate committees and the 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 bills can be justified. We hope that the appropriate committees and the 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 bills can be justified. 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 they 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 come to the conclusion 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 they should 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 the many projects in favor of economy; it is just as harmful as for the inhabitants of the involved areas are concerned.

The budget estimates for the functions under the jurisdiction as you know—$676,453,000 for fiscal year 1958. Broken down as follows:

| Corps of Engineers | $638,905,000 |
| Bonneville Power Administration | $33,772,000 |
| Southeastern Power Administration | $25,283,000 |

As I said before the Committee cut the budget estimate by $51,639,977, broken down as follows:

| Corps of Engineers | $31,708,200 |
| Bonneville Power Administration | $24,623,777 |

As far as I am concerned we had 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. Fentos], 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. Rabaugh]. Those gentlemen sat for many, many days 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. RABba], who have done on this particular bill.

Mr. FENTON. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlemen from Washington [Mr. MACNURSON].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to add my word of appreciation particularly to the chairman and the senior member 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. This term is 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 office. Congress, that we do not consider this of interchange of electric energy, to interchange power.

I should like to call attention particularly to the word "pork barrel" and the tendency to catch on and of the pork barrel principle, 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..."

This pooling principle to which I have referred.

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 Defense center at Hanford, which reaches into all the northwestern States. Wheeling over the Federal grid specifically was contemplated in the Congressional deliberations preceding the enactment of the Federal Power Act: "Such transmission lines shall be utilized without such wheeling, I feel sure that the act would not have been passed." For full utilization of the benefits of the Federal 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 licensees 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 accomplishing these generating and transmission systems would be preferable.

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 California, a part of the interchange 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 by an interchange agreement entered into 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, change hands in the course of such interchange; 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 is also not new. The Northwest Power Pool has been contemplated many times in the past. There are only 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 busiest voltage level in the world, by far the biggest 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 line is one of direct advantage to the Government, to the Pacific Northwest region, and, in fact, to the Congress itself.

In the report on this bill, the position is taken that the wheeling of non-Federal 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 Dam by Bonneville would be 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:
Total revenues to the Government for the two items mentioned, 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 from Federal and non-Federal power, and the cost of this wheeling is many. For example: An increased stability of the northwest grid, reduction in the line losses, savings in reactive power, economy resulting from the integration of Rocky Reach power, and a reliable service. This line will be required to transmit Federal power even if there are no wheeling contracts.

Chief Joseph-Rocky Reach-V alley line, item 180, in the House 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, and construction in some sections would be difficult. The only 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 Puget Sound Water & Power System. The lines have not been constructed 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, the appropriate Government will negotiate appropriate reimbursement of any expenditures on this item.

The 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 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 defer high-cost 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 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 from Federal and non-Federal power, and the cost of this wheeling is many. For example: An increased stability of the northwest grid, reduction in the line losses, savings in reactive power, economy resulting from the integration of Rocky Reach power, and a reliable service. This line will be required to transmit Federal power even if there are no wheeling contracts.
of non-Federal power and that this is fully reimbursable.

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 item 17, Rocky Ford-Tacoma line for $1,863,000 and item 160,Chief Joseph-Rocky Reach-Valley line for $5,658,000.

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 withdraw that point of order. We are just about through with the general debate.

Mr. BRAY. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. Saylor. Mr. Chairman, it is with reluctance that I come to the well-digested point of order. I refer to a project in the Budget Act of 1935. The figures from 1936 to date, I think, are particularly important to the Members of the House, because with the passage of previous contracts by which it was intended that the bulk of these Federal dollar power is on a fully reimbursable basis. The figures from 1936 to date make it possible for public agencies, private utilities, and municipalities to purchase economical Federal power at reasonable costs.

Mr. Cannon. 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 withdraw that point of order.

Mr. Bray. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. Saylor. Mr. Chairman, it is with reluctance that I come to the point of order. I refer to a project in the Budget Act of 1935. The figures from 1936 to date make it possible for public agencies, private utilities, and municipalities to purchase economical Federal power at reasonable costs.

Mr. Cannon. 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 withdraw that point of order.

Mr. Bray. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. Saylor. Mr. Chairman, it is with reluctance that I come to the point of order. I refer to a project in the Budget Act of 1935. The figures from 1936 to date make it possible for public agencies, private utilities, and municipalities to purchase economical Federal power at reasonable costs.

Mr. Cannon. 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 withdraw that point of order.

Mr. Bray. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. Saylor. Mr. Chairman, it is with reluctance that I come to the point of order. I refer to a project in the Budget Act of 1935. The figures from 1936 to date make it possible for public agencies, private utilities, and municipalities to purchase economical Federal power at reasonable costs.

Mr. Cannon. 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 withdraw that point of order.

Mr. Bray. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. Saylor. Mr. Chairman, it is with reluctance that I come to the point of order. I refer to a project in the Budget Act of 1935. The figures from 1936 to date make it possible for public agencies, private utilities, and municipalities to purchase economical Federal power at reasonable costs.
ously falling behind other nations in the development of nuclear power to the extent that Dr. Federal scientists tell us that they 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 could ever 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 resumed the chair.

Mr. CANNON, 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. 3217) 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.

HOUR 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 the House how much time has come to 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 do 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, Thursday night and Friday, 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 recognize the T and T Club, but I would like to 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, fairedness 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 members of the United Press, by 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 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 very objective of those who are 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 unimaginitive 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 under 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 thought the floor was—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

Mr. HOFFMAN. But 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 is, I believe, of the nature of the recommendation was as backhanded as I suggested if he will read the statement on page 82 for the Senate, where they said they counted roll calls 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 that he is referring to. 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 record, they expect no 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 she would have voted her support on the President's policy if he is absent on roll call 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 10, page 95, I 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.

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. In the Congressional Record, volume 102, page 11, page 15070, in the remarks of Senator Schoeppel, 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 have referred to. I think the studies of Congressional Quarterly is the Presidential Box Score.

As to the vote in the Senate. Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Had the gentlelady 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 that organization could have expected to assume she supported the President in cases in point. Perhaps there is a better way to handle the matter of absence. I do not think the Congressional Quarterly's procedure is.

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 comprised independent and each of whom votes his own mind and conscience all the time.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman.

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 study to belabor the Democrats who control this Congress. I wonder if they...
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 for I certainly could not see how they could be construed as supporting that program.
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, Congressmen. I 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. S Corporis] 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 Quarterly orderly 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 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 their 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. When that minority leader of the Senate takes a position that is in disagreement with the stated position of the President, the President 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 Quarterly customarily takes those issues in which the President has made a definite statement before a vote is taken to show whether or not the President 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 your position on 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 way?

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. Un­ fortunately, it did not appear to be a 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 state­ ment, I think that my friend from Flor­ ida 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 Quar­ terly 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 Quar­ terly analysis proves how misleading such an approach can be.

Mr. SIKES. If 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 gentle­ man brought out in regard to the Con­ gressional 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 tax cut? Furthermore, is it not sent to the President and asking that he indicate where it should be cut?
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, 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 think the gentleman and I hope he will be here tomorrow so that we can continue the 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 the gentleman from New York [Mr. DeRou najan]. 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 these 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 pro pounded 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. DeRou najan]. 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. We do not like to have a 98 percent support of the President's allegations. I would like to know how the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer], would weigh these things. Is a $30,000 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. DeRou najan], 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 concede, 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 a comparative program 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 acceptable to 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. It is not fair to abort another part of Mike's business. There are numerous instances which I will cite tomorrow.

Mr. SIKES. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my distinguished friend from Florida [Mr. Cramer], perhaps I will the gentleman and I hope he will carry on for an hour. Mr. SIKES. I have permission to insert 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 competing, 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 1928 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 me. We know the great tragedies and floods and hurricanes that have befallen us. We are aware that 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 an amendment in Congress, in 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.

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 gentlewoman 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 by a 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 not death but challenges to the perpetuity of its institutions. Tyranny is an ever-restless evil thing which powerfully and relentlessly strives to mankimg 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? Are they not a historical and philosophical standpoint comes the dignity of the human being and the sacredness of the human soul. Free governments were established to insure and amplify this dignity, and that personal status of the individual as a free physical political 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 that enables one and all of us to accord 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, and 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 us, that 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 a great social evil; it seeks to destroy initiative.

Hence, it is essentially the things of the spirit that free governments are designed and destined to preserve. If they are to fulfill their aims of keeping alive and realizing the opportunities of the people to be free and to be left alone by government, so long as they remain within the legal boundaries. Precedence, to the spirit and primarily the things which differentiate democracy from absolutism wherein men and women become pawns of the absolute state subject to the whims and caprices of its arbitrary rule. 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, freedom of choice, mutual 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, the preservation of the individual 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 to have more and more things. It is then an incentive to defend their institutions than those who are enslaved under Marxist rule. Communism is a reverberation; it would stifle the human soul.

I ask you to think of the values of Western civilization, to prevent them from deteriorating and degenerating under the sustained assaults of the Marxists into the weak, enervating pattern 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 Marxists, neither will they tolerate 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 to sustain it. Vigilance and determination will enable us to protect those values 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 the 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, cotermi...
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 changes of that magnitude to their business, 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 the 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 revision 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 an arrangement would be contrary to past 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 disengage before 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 such a manner as to prevent the Congress from being 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 Administration wants 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 committal? I hope not.

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 the short run. 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 underlying body of law in the tariffs is much less precarious 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 methods of restricting, e.g., 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 ability to exist in these is largely dependent upon the maintenance of 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 have made in the past may undervalue our point of view. For one national, 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 an 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; yet the President was accused as being in favor of a 96 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 nonsupport of the President was in order to demonstrate how pernicious it is for this group who are in charge of the Congressional Quarterly to try to come up with a tabulation, 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 whatever as to what the position of the President was.
Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERO UNIAN. 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 State planning for a Federal Government that completely controls the floor of the House today in the Democratic Party?

Mr. CRAMER. Well, it is one of the cleverest techniques to accomplish that, if there is such a subject. 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. Thomson], not realizing that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Schroth] 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 partisan, and I called upon the publishers to cease using the term "Congressional," and certainly to stop using the byline "The writer's reply to a question of the gentleman from Missouri." Because I do believe that 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 those 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, 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 nature of taking a test vote on presidential support right in the middle of a Congressional session was a little unusual, particularly where there were only 30 roll call votes, 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 saying that one vote will spell the death of the other is true. 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, partisan or otherwise. As a matter of fact, any list of important 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 votes which were taken, were not listed and should have been so that the readers also could judge whether or not the President had expressed himself on those subjects. As a matter of fact, 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. My argument is that it would have been very difficult for me to circulate my original remarks to a number of publications that might use the Congressional Quarterly and one reply by _yning._

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.

The President pro tempore. The 15 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 that the votes of the President 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 was fair if the President was on an issue—where the President's position is so obvious that a formal statement on his position was unnecessary. There are 5 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 call 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 President, indeed, wants to cut the entire budget. However, a million of that reduction was reflected in a point of order raised by the gentleman
from New York (Mr. Taft), 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 past, I have heard you 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 we are 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 just a few days ago. 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 become known that quite possibly 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 right to publish that statement, but I have the various publications that 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. DEROUINIAN. Mr. Speaker, I might point out to the gentleman from New Jersey that he and his 78 signers 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 more united. 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 58 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 put 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 61 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 the other 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. WOODS 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. LORER 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. PHILLIPS, for 90 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. DEROUINIAN, 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. Boge and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VANK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. HEILBERG.

Mr. KILLORE.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, and include some of the testimony she gave.
before the Appropriations Committee on the Merrimack River flood-control project. Also, very important, a 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. COOLY (at the request of Mr. McCormack) and to include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. BURLISON, 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 Viscaro.


H.R. 1887. 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 change 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. 7605. An act to permit a retired officer of the Navy to be employed in a command station at Post Kuantey, Morocco.

H.J. Res. 165. 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 Hannevigg.

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:

H.R. 877. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy concerning the action of 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 the act approved July 6, 1943 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 305. 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 referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 3124. A bill to provide for a judicial review of administrative findings of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, under the Social Security Act, as amended, and chapter 28 (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. 3153. 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 Old Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance Act of 1954) 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. 3161. 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. 3171. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain collection procedures shall not be used to collect amounts due for certain types of tax transfers by the Internal Revenue Service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOPER:

H.R. 3181. A bill relating to the administration of certain collected taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 3191. A bill relating to the administration of certain collected taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ABERNETHY (by request):


By Mr. H. 3221. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide coverage under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program for those in employment and self-employment performed before 1937; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H.R. 3223. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct 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. BURKE:

H.R. 3224. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it unlawful to destroy or injure, or cause to be destroyed or injured, certain boundary markers on Indian reservations, and to trespass on Indian reservations to hunt, fish, or trap; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H.R. 3225. A bill to amend section 733 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULDER:

H.R. 3226. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act for the relief of alien children who, as regards persons in the medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, have complete criminal jurisdiction over all members thereof in the United States.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 3229. 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. FISHER:

H.R. 3229. A bill to authorize the restoration of times taken from patents covering inventions whose proprietor was not entitled to or dispossessed from his patent by precluding refunds of alcohol and tobacco taxes to persons who have not borne the ultimate burden of the tax; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWENKEL:

H.R. 3230. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 3235. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 3281. Authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 1601, June 8, 1957, to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorial resolutions were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and 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 Congress of the United States to extend the jurisdiction of the United States over the Colorado River to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to extend the jurisdiction of the United States over the Colorado River to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislation of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress of the United States to extend the jurisdiction of the United States over the Colorado River to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislation of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the United States of America and the United States to extend the jurisdiction of the United States over the Colorado River to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H.R. 3225. A bill to amend section 733 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
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 Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation designed to secure for the Territory of Hawaii a court of judicature 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. BROTHILL:
H. R. 6231. 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. 6232. A bill for the relief of Istvan Urai and Sandor Myer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:
H. R. 6233. A bill for the relief of James L. McCabe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:
H. R. 6234. A bill for the relief of Yee Kung Sun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6235. A bill for the relief of Yee Mah Sun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6236. A bill for the relief of Maricel J. Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania:
H. R. 6237. A bill for the relief of Adam Billings, also known as Adam Billinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6238. A bill for the relief of Peter Rudolf Vaten; also known as Peter Valentic; 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:

386. 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.

389. 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.

CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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— for 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.
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HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 18, 1957

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, 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 California's reputation.

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 join with a number of my distinguished colleagues in both Houses to invite all of you to walk across the Capitol between 1 and 3 o'clock 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.
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Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the ingredient of 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