



# Congressional Record

United States  
of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 86<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 17, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Father Patrick J. Nagle, Sacred Heart Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

In an age such as ours, so agitated, so afflicted, so affrighted, it seems right, just and meet that we humbly beg St. Patrick, on this his Feast Day, to intercede for us with our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, for peace of heart, mind, and soul.

St. Patrick lived in a time a little like our own—a time when Attila, the Scourge of God, threatened to destroy the then known Western World. Perhaps it was because of Attila that St. Patrick prayed as we can also:

"Christ with me;  
Christ before me, Christ behind me;  
Christ beneath me, Christ above me;  
Christ on my right, Christ on my left;  
Christ on the fort; Christ in the chariot's seat;  
Christ in the poop.  
Christ in the heart of every man who thinks of me;  
Christ in every eye that sees me;  
Christ in every ear that hears me."

This was the final prayer, so to speak, of the man who challenged a great culture, and brought to a nation that has never been entirely conquered the Christian religion, all alone by God's holy grace.

Through the intercession of St. Patrick, and all the saints, as well as all good God-fearing people, may God grant us peace in this, our troubled times. This great grace we ask: In the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Amen.

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

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1776. An act to amend the act of June 28, 1958, entitled "An act to provide for a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, and for other purposes."

### CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

CV—275

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 16]

|            |              |                |
|------------|--------------|----------------|
| Alford     | Gallagher    | Polk           |
| Barden     | Gathings     | Porter         |
| Barrett    | Glenn        | Powell         |
| Bowles     | Granahan     | Prokop         |
| Brademas   | Griffiths    | Ryce, Tenn.    |
| Byrne, Pa. | Hall         | Rivers, Alaska |
| Carter     | Hardy        | Rivers, S.C.   |
| Chelf      | Healey       | Rostenkowski   |
| Clark      | Hollifield   | Roush          |
| Curtin     | King, Utah   | Simpson, Pa.   |
| Delaney    | Lafore       | Spence         |
| Derwinski  | McGinley     | Taylor         |
| Diggs      | Macdonald    | Thompson, La.  |
| Dorn, N.Y. | Martin       | Thompson, N.J. |
| Durham     | Miller, N.Y. | Toll           |
| Feighan    | Moeller      | Weaver         |
| Forand     | Nix          | Willis         |
| Frazier    | Philbin      |                |

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and seventy-seven Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] for 1 minute.

### ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, today all of America celebrates St. Patrick's Day. From Key West to Point Barrow, from Point Loma to West Quoddy Head, a tinge of green colors our land. It can be seen in Chinatown and Harlem, Dallas and New Orleans, Denver and St. Paul, as well as in Philadelphia, Boston, and New York. For today, all Americans, regardless of origin or creed, pay their friendly respects to the Irish by wearing the emerald green.

This friendship and respect for the Irish results from a recognition of the great contribution of Irish Americans to the American way of life. These accomplishments are dramatically demonstrated by the number of Irish names on the roster of this honorable House—illustrating the affection, confidence, and trust of the people of America in the sons of Erin.

As in Government, so we find the Irish well represented in every chapter of the story of America. From the beginning of our country the Irish have played an important role in every war—they gave Washington the Pennsylvania line, Pershing the Fighting 69th. They walked with both Grant and Lee, rode the tanks with Patton, sailed with Barry, Dewey,

and Halsey, and flew with Rickenbacker and Arnold.

In music they gave us Victor Herbert and George M. Cohan; in sports, Gene Tunney, Connie Mack, and Ron Delaney; in business, Collier, Cudahy, and O'Sullivan; in the religious life, Spellman, Cushing, and O'Hara.

Besides using their muscle and sinew to build our roads, bridges, and tunnels, they supplied the imagination, skill, and courage that brought America from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

The immigrants of the eighties who came seeking freedom and opportunity, with their only possessions in the form of flaming faith, eternal hope, and unconquerable courage, fathered the law-makers, scientists, poets, and teachers of the 20th century. The love of God and country, brought from the Ould Sod, has grown stronger in the fertile soil of a free America, and today the Irish lead the way against any atheistic philosophy by whatever name it trades, which seeks to destroy man's faith and freedom.

Yes, gentlemen, it is good for all of us to celebrate St. Patrick's Day, for in noting the accomplishments of the Irish, we are reminded of the true greatness of America, still the land of opportunity, and truly the "land of the free and the home of the brave."

### PERMISSION TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may sit during general debate in the House today.

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

There was no objection.

### BLESSINGS UPON IRELAND AND THE IRISH

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Ireland and Israel, and their people, are as close together in fate and faith and fortitude as they are in the alphabet.

Each of the two countries, small geographically and in population, and weak

4343

in all the elements of political and military power, at least through most of the world's history, has exercised a tremendous effect on the world at large through the power of heroic faith and stalwart endurance. Each country, too, has scattered through the world its sons and daughters, who with varied genius, have taught and led and built and charmed the world. The Harp of David and the Harp of Tara are not so far apart. The Roman Patricius and Hebrew Michael are as close akin as Pat and Mike.

As I have said on each St. Patrick's day since I arrived here, the difference is only in spelling. The Sons of Erin and the Sons of Aaron are brothers, God's children working His will.

On this great day, I know that freedom-loving people all over the world, and particularly in America, are turning with warm hearts and glowing eyes toward the dear land of Ireland, and her children everywhere. With Ireland, and with the worldwide Irish, we pay honor today to that courageous and devoted man, St. Patrick, Apostle and Bishop of Ireland. May his followers be animated forever by his spirit of fierce anger against all injustices and oppression, of personal humility joined with stubborn insistence upon the right and the truth, and of unselfish, wide-spreading love. In this blessing, bestowed upon the Irish, all the world will be likewise blessed.

It is, indeed, good to note that today people of all faiths and origins join together in words of tribute and prayer.

#### ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include an editorial on St. Patrick's Day.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, today, St. Patrick's Day, is recognized and celebrated by people of good will everywhere. All the things that I might say in recognition of the Patron Saint of the Irish is embodied in an editorial in the Irish Echo and I am, for that purpose, inserting it in this RECORD for all to read:

#### ST. PATRICK'S DAY A TRIBUTE FOR SAINT'S GIFT TO IRELAND

It is difficult to realize what Ireland and the Irish would do without a St. Patrick's Day commemoration which has come to mean so much to their spiritual and temporal prestige. The racial and national significance of Ireland has for several hundred years depended to an exceedingly large extent on the religious truths which St. Patrick brought to its people and propagated among them. It was the adherence of the Irish to the Gospel verities which St. Patrick preached that caused their enemy to inflict his fiercest persecutions on them from the Tudor to the Hanoverian dynasties. In spite of all the enemy's machinations, however, to wipe out the religion which their National Apostle had spread among them, the Irish people clung with unflinching zeal to it. Every generation in Ireland has regarded it as its faith bequeathed by its fathers. That is one principal reason why St. Patrick's Day

is so intensely and honestly honored by the Irish at home and abroad. It recalls to them other times and other men valiantly upholding the precious treasures of faith and fatherland.

The dissemination throughout the world of the fundamental truths of life by Irish evangelists, which they garnered from St. Patrick's missionary labors among their native kindred, is the underlying reason why St. Patrick's Day is so universally observed. There is hardly any part of the world where the day is not celebrated in some form or other. Surely an extraordinary recognition of the Patron Saint of Ireland. And in those parts of the world where the Irish exile is very predominant among the inhabitants the atmosphere of Ireland is injected into the celebration, as in New York, for instance.

"Now they come with fife and drum,  
And their banners raised for Ireland,  
The young, the old, the brave, the bold  
All who have love for their emerald sireland."

To apply the words of the psalmist to the 17th of March, we who are of the Irish race may truthfully say: "This is a day that the Lord hath made, let us rejoice and be glad therein."

With all our hearts, with all the fervor of our devotion to the principles of faith which St. Patrick enunciated, let us, on his anniversary day, praise him as he deserves to be praised.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting and proper that we pause on this memorable day, St. Patrick's Day, to pay deserved tribute to the Patron Saint of Ireland, one who symbolizes all that is good and noble in the minds and lives of all persons, without regard to race, color, or creed.

May I make the observation at this time that if we had more of the missionary and crusading spirit of St. Patrick in the minds of men and women who want to be free under their own laws, we would be in a much better position than we are, affirmatively fighting evil as Patrick did in his day by fighting for God's justice and righteousness.

St. Patrick is linked so much to us, as Americans, and we hold dear this beloved Patron Saint of Ireland who has contributed so much to the institution and preservation, as well as the faith, patriotism, the courage, and the song and laughter of America.

But I think it is important for us to remember always how St. Patrick, in all the fervor of his deep and fiery faith, stood for an affectionate tolerance, rather than for bigotry, in spreading Christianity through pagan Ireland. He, who defied the Druids and the High King on Tara by kindling his Easter fire on the great hill of Slane over against Tara, at a time when the mystic Druid law, enforced by all the power of the pagan state, forbade the kindling of any fire—this bold missionary bishop, eloquent preacher, and daring strategist was the same man who adapted the rule of the Catholic Church in Ireland to local customs and traditions; diplomatically approached tribes through their chiefs and

sages, and worked diligently to maintain and cherish all that was not anti-Christian in the traditional customs and beliefs of the Irish people. For the strength of St. Patrick, like the strength of Ireland and America today, was the strength of all-embracing charity; a recognition of the right of people to live in accordance with the dictates of their own consciences, and a sensitive respect for each man's attachment to the heritage he has received from his parents.

In his post as Bishop, St. Patrick would stand before any king or chief as an equal; as philosopher and theologian, he would contend with superior ability with the learned Druids; as poet, his extant composition, known as "The Deer's Cry," proves that he could compete on equal terms with any bard. But his personal humility, and his memory of his youth, drew him closest to the lowest of the low among the Irish, the slaves and peasant shepherders. Facing them, he could speak feelingly from experience of days and nights, months and years, spent in abject destitution as captive and slave, clad in rags and bits of skins, hungry and shivering as he sought some rocky shelter from the rains, and from the wintry winds, on the hills where he was sent to pasture the sheep. No pride of place or power ever colors even a word or a phrase of the autobiography the Saint has left us under the name of his "Confession," and one of the most eloquent outcries of wrath and sorrow and moral feeling to be found in any literature is his "Letter to Coroticus," which springs directly out of his strong fellow feeling for people treated as he had been treated in his youth. For when he was a lad of 16, Patrick had been seized by pirates in a raid on his home and carried off to be sold into slavery among the pagans on the coast of Ireland. Now, years afterward, when a nominally Christian chief in Britain makes a similar bloody raid on his Christian Irish flock, the good shepherd Patrick is doubly outraged; indignant as he recalls the sufferings he himself had suffered as a captive, and his parents and neighbors in the terror and destruction of that long-ago raid, and still more indignant as he thinks of the goodness of these helpless people, snatched from his charge, and of the fact that their attacker and oppressor, Coroticus, is supposed to be of one faith and Christian family with them. That Patrick is thinking with particular bitterness of his own youth appears in the fact that he reproaches Coroticus for bringing shame upon him, as his compatriot.

The facts of St. Patrick's life are well enough known, however scholars may argue about the dates and geographic localities. In the fourth and fifth centuries, chronology was not considered so important as it is nowadays, and though St. Patrick was careful to give the locations of many happenings of his life, including his birth, the subsequent changing of place names have quite obscured the geography of the matter. We know with all definiteness the character of the man, and the scope of his achievement, as well as many details of his career that are recounted in his confession. We

know that St. Patrick loved, deeply, and from the days of his youthful captivity, the land and people of Ireland.

St. Patrick, laying claim to no deep learning, was able to defeat the learned in argument by common sense, by quick wit, by moral fervor, and, as he said, by the grace of God. Great himself in many qualities, he never lost sight of the fact that he was the bearer of a message that was greater than himself, or than any man. It is to the everlasting credit of the Irish people that they sensed this quality in him, this selfless devotion, and that they responded eagerly and in phenomenal numbers to the magnetism of his love of God, and his love for them. They saw and recognized Christ in the qualities of this man, His servant, and were drawn to share his loving service of Christ. But St. Patrick belongs to the world, not to the Irish alone—to the worldwide Catholic Church, and more, to all who share the Christian heritage and tradition, as well as to all, in any faith, who believe in and look upon the service of God and the love of man as the chief paths of virtue open to humanity. His is a name to be invoked, not in any national or racial or sectarian pride, but in humble appeal to what is best in the nature of all men.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and that all Members who desire to do so, without establishing a precedent, may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject of St. Patrick.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, the current visit of the President of Ireland to this country is an honor particularly heartfelt by all Americans on this St. Patrick's Day. The American people are ever-willing to greet the representatives of Ireland on friendly terms, for of all nations, Ireland and the United States are linked in an unbreakable emotional tie. And of all times to honor this relationship, St. Patrick's Day is obviously the most appropriate.

The destinies of Ireland and the United States are linked in many respects, but especially in their mutual emphasis on democratic and spiritual qualities. Among all the peoples on earth, the Americans and the Irish stand out for their jealously protected political and religious traditions. Both at one time politically weak, Americans and Irishmen, through an intense display of moral fiber, proved capable of challenging the oppression of political tyranny and of obtaining, through popular insistence, a status of national independence. The same element of national greatness that distinguishes Americans in the eyes of the civilized world also distinguishes the Irish. We stand united at destiny's threshold—may the tie that binds us never be severed.

In a world in which so little emotional unity exists, it is encouraging to witness such an intercontinental relationship as this. What is its basis? The answer is

vital, because the continued prosperity of the human race hinges thereon.

I propose the possibility—more than that: the probability—that the Irish and Americans nations coexist on such friendly terms as the result of their mutually devout respect for spiritual values. It is significant, I think, that St. Patrick, the patron saint of Ireland, is honored in this land to the extent that he is. Americans know of his history, and honor his name with no less reverence than the people of his own land. The reason is self-evident, for the story of St. Patrick is inspirational. Carried into Ireland as a slave while only in his teens, this saintly man reacted in a most remarkable manner. Instead of rancor for his slavemaster and the land of his captivity, St. Patrick, through conversion to Christian idealism, came to hold but one hope: the spread of Christianity to Ireland. To this end he devoted himself throughout his life, and with a success seldom witnessed on this earth, previously or since.

The task was not easy, for nothing is so difficult as bringing a new faith to a people. No fewer than 12 times were St. Patrick and his companions seized by the pagan enemy, and carried off as captives. On one occasion in particular, St. Patrick was loaded with chains and his death decreed. It is on account of these hardships which he endured for the faith that he is honored as a martyr. But from all his trials and sufferings St. Patrick was liberated by a benign providence and ultimately lived to see all of Ireland lit up with the brightest rays of divine faith, making the land famous for its seats of piety and learning.

Americans, with their own highly-revered spiritual traditions, honor the name of this man—this Irish saint—with a sense of understandable humility. His story is symbolic of Christian good works and good will. So long as we in this country and the people of Ireland continue to revere such traditions, our international unity is assured.

All Americans are honored to have the President of Ireland observe the great day in our midst. It is our hope that he will enjoy his stay here and will feel as welcomed as do Americans of all races and creeds when they visit his lovely country.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, we all know that the United States owes a debt of gratitude to the Irish who have, since colonial days, worked to build the Nation and fought to preserve it. St. Patrick's Day is the annual occasion on which it is fitting for every American to give expression, in the name of St. Patrick, bishop and apostle and patron of Ireland, to this gratitude and to the affection the Irish have earned from us all. The thought of the Irish in America brings to mind the songs of Thomas Moore and George M. Cohan, the lyric voice of John McCormick as preserved to us in records, the comic tales and witticisms that the Irish typically make at their own expense. The Irish laughter and the Irish courage go together, and it is characteristic of the Irish to laugh in the face of danger. In the Revolutionary War, when the ranks of the Continental Armies were swelled by an extraordinary

number of bearers of Irish names, the Irish won for themselves a reputation for their splendid fighting qualities. In the Civil War, the Irish poured out their blood on many a famous field, some fighting for the Union, some for the Confederacy. Even when Irish met Irish, their rival green flags waving proudly over them, there was no relaxation, but rather an intensification of their dash and ferocity. Every war since then has added to the glory of the Irish as fighters for America. Every list of fighting men, of officers, of men awarded promotions for skill and excellence or decorations for extraordinary heroism, has been musical with Irish names. When the United States had been in World War II but a little more than a year, for example, the Legislative Reference Service, being asked to compile a list of Navy and War Department citations and awards for bravery to persons whose names suggested Irish ancestry, came up at once with a list of 22 names. The Navy Department, it developed, had awarded these honors to men of Irish names:

Distinguished Service Medal: Capt. Robert B. Carney, U.S. Navy.

Silver Star Medal: Comdr. Francis J. Firth, U.S. Navy—Firth seems an Anglo-Saxon name, but two people of that name are in the Dublin telephone directory today; 2d Lt. Donald C. McGee, Air Corps; Edmund E. McGuire, chief fire controlman, U.S. Navy; Joseph O'Savage, boatswain's mate, 2d class, U.S. Naval Reserve.

Navy Cross: Lt. Wilmer E. Gallaher, U.S. Navy; Lt. (j.g.) John R. McCarthy, U.S. Naval Reserve; Lt. Cmdr. Clarence W. McClusky, Jr., U.S. Navy; Ensign Frank Woodrow O'Flaherty, U.S. Naval Reserve; Lt. (j.g.) Daniel Crysdale Sheedy, U.S. Naval Reserve.

Air Medal: Lt. (j.g.) William T. O'Dowd, U.S. Naval Reserve.

The War Department had awarded these:

Silver Star: Homer D. McGettigan, technician grade IV, Infantry; Cleo Quinn, corporal, Corps of Engineers; Sgt. George Ryan, Jr.

Distinguished Flying Cross: George F. Callahan, first lieutenant, Air Corps; Wilbert H. Grogan, sergeant, Air Corps; John D. Sullivan, Air Corps.

Air Medal: Sgt. Jack F. Delaney; James S. Doherty, sergeant, Air Corps; Robert L. Morrissey, lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; Capt. Carey L. O'Bryan, and Frederick D. O'Riley, Jr., first lieutenant, Air Corps.

All the awards listed were granted within a 6-month period, and eight of them within the month of March 1943 alone. And the list was prepared on March 12, 1943. Can you imagine what it would be like to sit through a reading of the Irish names in a calendar of awards since that time. We know the list is rich and resounding with names like Murphy and Kelly and Flannigan and O'Rourke, Loughlin and Driscoll and Shea. Heroism is a virtue for which there can be no reward but recognition and emulation. Let us recognize the brave record left by these Irish defenders of our Nation, and strive to emulate it.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, now is the time for all good men to come to the praise of St. Patrick. Disregarding party, creed, and race, let us do honor today to the great good man who spent his life in brave and energetic service to God, and in loving care for the barbarian people who had been his enslavers and oppressors. For though the precise date and place of St. Patrick's birth is not known, we do know that in his 16th year he was taken captive in a piratical raid, carried off from his homeland, and sold into slavery in Ireland. There he was made to work as a herdboys for 6 years or more, living in the most miserable conditions, ill-fed, suffering from the winter cold, against which he was protected only by such scraps of clothing and inadequate shelter as he could find. Making his escape, he worked his passage to Gaul, and then, after much wandering, was able to make his way home. But he could not forget the poverty, the ignorance, the heathenism of the people among whom he had lived as a slave. He therefore returned to Gaul, enrolled in a seminary, and prepared himself to go among them again as priest and missionary. Ordained, and commissioned by Pope Celestine I, as missionary to the heathens of Ireland, he was about to set out when word was received that Palladius, first bishop of Ireland, had died. Patrick was then consecrated bishop of Ireland, and proceeded to undertake his mighty task, armed with full authority to act on his own initiative. This gave scope to St. Patrick's daring, energy, diplomatic adroitness, and warm-hearted affection for the people. With the dramatic suddenness of the Easter beacon-fire he lighted on the hill of Slane, opposite Tara, in defiance of the edict of king and druids, the fire of faith kindled by St. Patrick's preaching and example lighted up the whole of Ireland with a glow of faith that has lasted in full strength into our own time, 15 centuries later. The world is the better that the Irish people, taught by St. Patrick, have imitated his example and followed his precepts. All honor to St. Patrick, therefore, and to his children, on his festival day.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to join with my colleagues today in remembrance and testimony of the Christian work of St. Patrick among the Irish people in devotion to the Lord and the glories of Ireland, herself.

The Christian work and triumph of St. Patrick among the Irish people has been already explained and expressed here much better than I could hope to reveal it and I will not burden you with repetitious recital. Rather, I would dwell, in these days of world danger and insecurity, on the strength of the Irish character as developed from the faith implanted in them and nourished by the teaching and example of their renowned patron saint.

That faith, and the five great loves of the Irish people emanating from it could, by imitation, well sustain us and the free world in these times of barbarous Communist challenge.

The first great love of the Irish is their intense love of country and the

hardship, suffering, and sacrifices they are willing to make in fulfillment of that love is legendary in the world's history.

The second great love of the Irish is their love for religion, for the things of the soul and the spirit. In these times, of exaggerated commercial materialism and unhappy demonstration of suffocating selfish self-interest our imitation of the Irish devotion to the things of the spirit, as against the material, could be the sustaining strength necessary to survival against an ungodly enemy.

The third great love of the Irish is their love of learning. In our continuing struggle with Communist advances on all fronts, and particularly in the field of technical science, we would be well advised indeed to imitate this special love of the Irish.

The fourth great love of the Irish is that of political freedom. Thank the good Lord, with the Irish descendants among us along with all our other good American people from every corner of the globe, we are still intensely devoted to and united in our determination, under God, to fight to the end to preserve that freedom for ourselves and the free world.

The fifth great love of the Irish people is that of poetry and song, and that is why, to them, the harp is the symbol of all the fine things the human heart aspires to. In these days of uncertainty, unhappy outlook, discouraging burdens, and even wise fear, it would add to our spirit, if, fortified with knowledge we are pursuing God's cause, we firmly resolve to endure every required sacrifice, with the song of heaven in our hearts and a toast on our lips to the persevering faith of the Irish.

In imitating the great loves of the Irish we can pray that the good St. Patrick will intervene for us with the good Lord and ask Him to bless our American destiny with success and triumph over every evil force.

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, St. Patrick is loved and admired the world over, but most of all, I think, by three nations: Ireland, whose apostle and patron saint he is; America, where his fame and glory have been growing since Revolutionary times; and Poland, where his stalwart faith and courage, his lifelong warfare on behalf of the enslaved and oppressed, seem to cry out for love and admiration and emulation. Some seem to think we do not know much about St. Patrick, just because we do not know the precise time and place of his birth, and are a little less than sure of the date of his death. But time and place, chronology and geography, are not the prime essentials of a man. What we need to know of St. Patrick is precisely what we do know, with the ringing clarity of a trumpet call. For we have from St. Patrick what is sadly lacking in the vast majority of the saints, his own words of exhortation and remonstrance, words in which his character appears plainly and even the tone of his voice seems to come through, and even an account of his life in his own words. Back in the fourth and fifth centuries, when St. Patrick lived and wrote, time seems to

have meant less to people than it does today, and the only date we can be anything like sure of is the date of his death, March 17, 493—and some historians give dates as much as 30 years off from that. But we do know the facts of his life, as narrated in his autobiography, and his humility and piety, courage and vigor, as they appear in the manner of his narration.

The world knows well, and will never forget, that Patrick, seized by pirates and sold into slavery at the age of 16, served a heathen Irish master as herdsman for 6 years, escaped to the Continent, and, after long wanderings, returned to his home. May the world never forget, too, how the divine call came to Patrick, at home and in safety, to plunge himself again into the discomforts and dangers of pagan Ireland, and to save those very people who had been his masters. Whether at Auxerre or under St. Martin at Tours, he studied for the priesthood, was ordained, and sent as a missionary to Ireland, in accordance with his call and desire. With his burning love for God, and his self-sacrificing devotion to the people of Ireland, he threw himself heart and soul into the task of bringing his beloved people to the foot of the cross of Christ. In this task, he succeeded so completely that today, in the eyes of the world, the patriotism of Ireland, and the catholicity of Ireland, are alike personified and typified in the well-beloved figure of St. Patrick.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the world today pays tribute and homage to the patron saint of Ireland, St. Patrick. While St. Patrick was a son of Ireland, people of good will of all ethnic backgrounds join in paying tribute to the great son of God. Even though my own heritage finds its roots in my grandparents who migrated from Poland, I join in paying tribute today to St. Patrick, and I wish to call the attention of the House to the striking parallel between the struggle for freedom by the Irish and the similar struggle for freedom by my own ancestors, the Poles.

This day honors St. Patrick, the patron saint of Ireland, on the anniversary of his death, March 17, 493. St. Patrick's Day has long been celebrated by Christian and freedom-loving people, not only in Ireland but throughout the world. Since the early history of the United States, Americans have commemorated the ascension of this great servant of God from his calling here on earth.

The life and accomplishments of St. Patrick exemplify the great human struggle to surmount oppression which stands in the way of advancing the work of God. As a youth St. Patrick was captured, sold as a slave, and held in bondage for 6 years. After escaping he entered a monastery and began to prepare himself for his divinely inspired mission. During his life of preaching, teaching, building churches, organizing parishes, and performing miracles, he was taken prisoner 12 times and was once loaded with chains and condemned to die.

In our time when much of the Christian world is enslaved by Communist totalitarianism, the Christians of the free world help to keep alive the hopes

of their oppressed brethren within the Soviet bloc for the restoration of religious liberty and national independence. On hallowed days such as this, when free nations are especially thankful for their liberties and subjugated people are denied their rights to human dignity, we are profoundly impressed by the parallel struggle of the now independent Irish nation and downtrodden nations like Poland for religious freedom and national independence.

Both the Irish and the Poles are rightfully proud of their ancestry. Neither would be worthy of their heritage if they were not. Every people should preserve those memories which are peculiar to them and commemorate those events which have molded their heritage. It is as right for us to emulate our historic virtues as it is for us to criticize and overcome the mistakes of the past.

Both Poland and Ireland are among the greatest daughters of the Catholic Church. Under British domination, the Irish people suffered the suppression of their rights to freedom of worship. In Poland the persecution of the church has been carried out by the Communists since 1945, with the intent of eventually uprooting all religious faiths and institutions.

Both Ireland and Poland have long and invincible traditions of greatness, which cannot be extirpated by foreign conquest. The union of the Polish and Irish minds with Christianity has yielded marvelous fruits. Poland by the end of the Middle Ages, was a large kingdom, forming an integral part of Western Christendom and contributing to the common cultural and religious life of Europe. Ireland, already a rich culture at St. Patrick's birth, became an island of Christian saints and scholars. Christianity inspired both the Irish and the Poles with a collective dynamism, a great national purpose, and an inspired sense of destiny.

Ireland endured exploitation for centuries before her fight for national independence triumphed in 1922. Poland has several times undergone and is now suffering the hardships of being ruled by alien despotism.

When Henry VIII withdrew from the Church of Rome, a program was inaugurated to confiscate the estates of the Irish noblemen. As this campaign was pursued more vigorously, Englishmen who loaned money to the Crown to defray the expenses of subjugating the Irish were repaid with grants of landholdings in Ireland. In 1649 Oliver Cromwell invaded Ireland with a large army that was followed by a horde of fortune seekers. The oppressive domination of Ireland by the English landlords, known as the plantation system, became solidly entrenched. Thereafter her people were ruthlessly exploited, starved, and decimated.

Virtually all of Ireland was Catholic at this time. Catholics were not permitted to own land or to hold seats in Parliament. The Irish Parliament could not consider any legislation without the approval of the British Privy Council. There emerged an organization whose membership was comprised primarily of

the descendants of those who followed Cromwell, and this group was fostered and protected by the British rulers.

Throughout the period of British rule, the Irish people clung to their forbidden language, stoutly resisted political domination and economic oppression, and remained loyal to their Catholic faith, against whatever repression their masters might devise. The deeply symbolical Easter Rebellion of 1916, the brutal methods used to crush it, and the execution of its leaders aroused in Ireland a national spirit of revolt which had been dormant but never dead since the time of the great O'Neill. Ultimately, the cause of freedom and independence was victorious in Ireland.

Poland was divided among Russia, Prussia, and Austria between 1772 and 1795. From 1795 until 1918, the Polish state disappeared from the map of Europe, but the Polish Nation, like the sons of Eire, remained alive and vigorous. The Poles never accepted the dismemberment of their country and took every opportunity to fight for the restoration of their national independence. Inside Poland there were insurrections in 1831 and 1863, both of which were suppressed with savage reprisals. Many Poles took refuge in exile during the time when Poland was yoked by foreign rule. After 123 years of enormous effort and sacrifice, Poland was restored as an independent country in 1918.

In 1939 Poland was again partitioned, this time by its totalitarian neighbors, Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia. After the German offensive was launched against the Soviet Union, all of Poland was occupied by the Nazis, who methodically proceeded to liquidate a large part of the population by massacres, starvation, and extermination in concentration camps. Five million Poles, including three million Jews perished. At the end of the war, there were 1½ million orphans in Poland.

Like Ireland, Poland was forced to fight for its independence. To combat the Nazi reign of terror during the World War II occupation, the Poles organized a powerful underground state with secret courts, a secret administrative apparatus, a secret press, secret schools, and a brave partisan army which grew to considerable strength and conducted guerilla warfare against the Nazi oppressors. Then, toward the end of the Second World War, the Soviet Union drove the German armies from Poland and then aborted the restoration of freedom and national independence for Poland by installing in power a stooge government of Polish Communists loyal to Moscow.

Now Poland is shackled by the Red chains of Communist tyranny. But neither the brave and fearless people of Poland nor the conscience of the free world will rest until the bonds of slavery are broken. The Polish people have risen before. They will rise to freedom again.

Today we honor the saint who escaped from slavery and, armed only with the love of God, returned to his former masters and conquered them. We honor, too, all people who have main-

tained their national faith under alien control. May all oppressed nations now enslaved by foreign dictatorships soon breathe the free air that blows over the Republic of Ireland.

#### PRIVATE CALENDAR

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

#### APPOINTMENT OF ROBERT WESLEY COLGLAZIER, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3412) to authorize the appointment of Robert Wesley Colglazier, Jr., as permanent brigadier general of the Regular Army.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, may appoint in the regular grade of brigadier general in the Regular Army, Robert Wesley Colglazier, Junior, as a member of the Army Reserve presently serving on active duty in the grade of major general.*

(b) The person appointed under subsection (a) shall, while on the active list, be charged against the authorized strength of the Regular Army in general officers on the active list.

(c) The person appointed under subsection (a) may not be retired, other than for physical disability, before he becomes sixty years of age.

(d) The Secretary of the Army may retire the person appointed under subsection (a) after he becomes sixty years of age. The person appointed under subsection (a) may be retired, upon his request, after he becomes sixty years of age.

(e) If the person appointed under subsection (a) is retired under subsection (d) with less than twenty years active service as a commissioned officer, he is entitled to retired pay computed under formula numbered 3, section 1401 of title 10, United States Code. However, if the person appointed under subsection (a) is retired after he has twenty years of active service as a commissioned officer, as defined by section 3926 of title 10, United States Code, he is entitled to retired pay computed under formula C, section 3991 of title 10, United States Code.

(f) For the purpose of determining the rank and eligibility for promotion of the person appointed under subsection (a), his name shall be placed at the foot of the permanent recommended list for promotion to the grade of brigadier general in the Regular Army existing on 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.

#### APPOINTMENT OF PHILIP FERDINAND LINDEMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3413) to authorize the appointment of Philip Ferdinand Lindeman as permanent colonel of the Regular Army.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a)*

notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, may appoint in the regular grade of colonel in the Regular Army, Philip Ferdinand Lindeman, a member of the Army Reserve presently serving on active duty in the grade of major general.

(b) The person appointed under subsection (a) shall, while on the active list, be charged against the authorized strength of the Regular Army in colonels on the active list.

(c) The person appointed under subsection (a) may not be retired, other than for physical disability, before he has at least twenty years of active service as a commissioned officer as defined by section 3926 of title 10, United States Code.

(d) The Secretary of the Army may retire the person appointed under subsection (a) after he becomes sixty years of age.

(e) If the person appointed under subsection (a) is retired under subsection (d), he is entitled to retired pay computed under formula C, section 3991 of title 10, United States Code.

(f) Upon appointment, the name of the person appointed under subsection (a) shall be placed on the Army promotion list existing on the date of his appointment at the foot of the list of colonels of the Regular Army.

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. ELBA HAVERSTICK CASH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1434) for the relief of Mrs. Elba Haverstick Cash.

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

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

There was no objection.

#### MRS. SUE PYLE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1457) for the relief of Mrs. Sue Pyle.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, 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 \$10,000 to Mrs. Sue Pyle, of Miami, Florida, in full settlement of all claims against the United States. Such sum represents compensation for the death of her son, Ray Sweeton Pyle, who was killed as the result of an accident involving United States soldiers from Camp Forrest, Tennessee, on maneuvers near the home of the said Ray Sweeton Pyle, on June 22, 1943; Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.*

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.

#### CESAR GARCIA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1531) for the relief of Cesar Garcia.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to credit the account of Cesar Garcia, of Wilmington, Calif., in the sum of \$751. Such sum represents the balance allegedly due the United States for overpayment of compensation paid him as a prisoner of war for the period of August 6, 1942, to January 10, 1945.*

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

#### GEORG GAHN AND MARGARETE GAHN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1546) for the relief of Georg Gahn and Margarete Gahn.

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

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

There was no objection.

#### FRANCIS M. HAISCHER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1600) for the relief of Francis M. Haischer.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit the account of Francis M. Haischer, of Albany, New York, of the sum of \$2,037.72. Such sum represents an overpayment of retired pay which was paid by the Department of the Navy which he received in good faith.*

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

#### THOMAS A. HOWE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1601) for the relief of Thomas A. Howe.

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

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

There was no objection.

#### HARRY F. LINDALL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1605) for the relief of Harry F. Lindall.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harry F. Lindall, Fort Orchard, Washington, the*

sum of \$2,273. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Harry F. Lindall against the United States for reimbursement for medical, hospital, and other expenses incurred and paid by him in connection with the treatment of a recurring fungus infection of his hands and feet, beginning in May 1946, which necessitated his disability retirement under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, from the civilian service of the Department of the Navy (Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Washington): *Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction 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.

#### OLIN FRED RUNDLETT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1611) for the relief of Olin Fred Rundlett.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That sections 15 to 20 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act are hereby waived in favor of Olin Fred Rundlett, 1725 Mercer Avenue, Northwest, Roanoke, Va.; and his claim for compensation for the loss of sight of both of his eyes alleged to have begun while he was working as a draftsman at Frankford Arsenal, Philadelphia, Pa., in 1918, shall be acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act in the same manner as if such claim had been timely filed, if such claim is filed within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this act: *Provided, That no benefits shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act for any period prior to its enactment, except in the case of such medical or hospitalization expenditures which may be deemed reimbursable.**

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.

#### DEAN E. FOSMOE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1632) for the relief of Dean E. Fosmoe.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 1008, as amended), relating to the period within which applications may be made for insurance by individuals after separation from the service, Dean E. Fosmoe, of 893 Fisher Road, Grosse Point, Michigan (insurance number RS17647405) is hereby authorized to make application to the Veterans' Administration for insurance under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended: *Provided, That the application must be made within one hundred and twenty days of the enactment of this Act. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall require two monthly premiums and submission of evidence satis-**

factory to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs showing the said Dean E. Fosmoe to be in good health.

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.

#### EVELYN ALBI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1653) for the relief of Evelyn Albi.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Evelyn Albi, of 711 Elizabeth Street, Denver, Colorado, the sum of \$500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of said Evelyn Albi against the Government of the United States, in connection with the \$500 departure bond posted by the said Evelyn Albi on behalf of Elvira Bartolin on November 17, 1952: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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.

#### OATHER S. HALL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1718) for the relief of Oather S. Hall.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That Oather S. Hall, Clarkville, Arkansas, is hereby relieved of all liability to pay to the United States the sum of \$1,270.45 and any interest accrued thereon. Such sum represents the unpaid balance of a loan secured by a Farmers' Home Administration mortgage (dated February 20, 1951) which, through the negligence of the clerk of the local circuit court, was never signed by the borrower. The borrower subsequently sold the livestock, which constituted security under the mortgage, and left the United States; and the said Oather S. Hall has been held financially liable for such sum because the mortgage was executed by the Farmers' Home Administration in Johnson County, Arkansas, while he was serving as Farmers' Home Administration county supervisor for that county.

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

#### JOHN C. MATLON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1736) for the relief of John C. Matlon.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of*

*America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John C. Matlon, of Forest Lake, Minnesota, the sum of \$731.99. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said John C. Matlon against the United States for reimbursement of expenses incurred in the travel of his wife and two sons and the transportation of his household and personal effects from Augusta, Georgia, to Saint Paul, Minnesota, in September 1955. Payment of this claim has been denied by the Department of the Army on the ground that such expenses were incurred for personal reasons although the said John C. Matlon would have been entitled to such travel and transportation allowances at the time of his separation from active duty on January 31, 1956: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 7, strike the words "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.

#### MR. AND MRS. MOSES GLIKOWSKY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1766) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Moses Glikowsky.

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

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

#### ESTATE OF RICHARD ANTHONY NUNES, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2044) for the relief of the estate of Richard Anthony Nunes, Jr.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Richard Anthony Nunes, Junior, deceased, the sum of \$10,000. Such sum is in full settlement of all claims against the United States, on account of the death of Richard Anthony Nunes, Junior, on August 3, 1946, as the result of the explosion of a dud left by the United States Army at Nanakuli, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: *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.

#### NISSIM S. TAWIL AND FAMILY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2050) for the relief of Nissim S. Tawil, Esther Tawil (nee Goldman), Solomn Tawil, Isaac Tawil, Kathy Tawil, Jacqueline Tawil, and Sarina Goldman.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That Nissim S. Tawil, of Brooklyn, New York, is relieved of all liability and responsibility to the United States based upon departure bond numbered 231,307, issued April 8, 1949; and that Esther Tawil (nee Goldman), his wife, is relieved of all liability and responsibility to the United States based upon departure bond numbered 229,618, issued October 1, 1948; and that Solomn Tawil, his son, is relieved of all liability and responsibility to the United States based upon departure bond numbered 231,308, issued April 8, 1949; and that Kathy Tawil, his daughter, is relieved of all liability and responsibility to the United States based upon departure bond numbered 229,620, issued October 1, 1948; and that Sarina Goldman, his daughter by adoption, is relieved of all liability and responsibility to the United States based upon departure bond numbered 231,309, issued October 1, 1948; and that Isaac Tawil, his son, is relieved of all liability and responsibility to the United States based upon departure bond numbered 229,619, issued October 1, 1948; and that each of said bonds is canceled as of the date of its execution.

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.

#### ARTHUR J. DETTMERS, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2065) for the relief of Arthur J. Dettmers, Jr.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* 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 \$7,776.03 to Arthur J. Dettmers, Junior, of 5208 Baltimore Avenue, Green Acres, Maryland, in full settlement of all claims against the United States. Such sum represents compensation for personal injuries and all expenses incident thereto sustained as the result of an accident involving the crash of a United States Army airplane at Olmsted Field, Middletown, Pennsylvania, on August 14, 1944: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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.

#### ALFONSO GIANGRANDE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2104) for the relief of Alfonso Giangrande.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Alfonso Giangrande, Brooklyn, New York, the sum of \$500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of Alfonso Giangrande against the United States for reimbursement of the amount of a departure bond which was executed by him and posted on September 27, 1949, in connection with the admission of the alien, Mrs. Anna Valenti Aiese, to the United States. Such bond was declared breached when Mrs. Anna Valenti Aiese failed to depart from the United States on December 27, 1949, even though she subsequently became a lawfully admitted permanent resident of the United States: Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.*

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. TYRA FENNER TYNES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2279) for the relief of Mrs. Tyra Fenner Tynes.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act are hereby waived in favor of Mrs. Tyra Fenner Tynes, New Orleans, Louisiana, and her claim for compensation for the death of her husband, Tyra Fenner Tynes, a former civilian employee of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, who died in the Canal Zone on September 23, 1942, shall be acted upon under the remaining provisions of such Act if she files such claim with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Department of Labor, within six months after the date of enactment of this Act. No benefits shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this Act for any period prior to the date of its enactment.*

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.

#### ADELE M. PARKER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2280) for the relief of Adele M. Parker.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of Amer-*

*ica in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Adele M. Parker, of Springfield, Massachusetts, the sum of \$5,000 as a gratuity for the death of her son, George J. MacDonald, Junior, United States Naval Reserve, who died on February 4, 1944, while on active duty: 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.

#### MISS MAME E. HOWELL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2586) for the relief of Miss Mame E. Howell.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the designation on April 2, 1940, by Lucy Howell Netherton, deceased former employee of the Veterans' Administration, of Miss Mame E. Howell, Louisville, Kentucky, as the sole beneficiary entitled to payment of the amount of \$4,954.85 in the civil service retirement and disability fund to the credit of the said Lucy Howell Netherton, shall be held and considered to be, and at all times on and after April 2, 1940, to have been, in full force and effect.*

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 C. HUTTO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2602) for the relief of William C. Hutto.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to pay to William C. Hutto, Atlanta, Georgia (Veterans' Administration claim numbered C-19062031) out of current appropriations for the payment of compensation, an amount equal to the amount of disability compensation which would have been paid to him on account of the loss of his right ring finger, if he had filed application for such compensation with the Veterans' Administration on February 11, 1933, for the period beginning on February 11, 1933, and ending on the effective date of the award of disability compensation made to him on account of such disability: Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.*

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 11, strike out "February 11, 1933", and insert in lieu thereof "April 1, 1946".

Page 1, line 11, strike out "February".

Page 2, line 1, strike out "11, 1933", and insert in lieu thereof "April 1, 1946, through August 3, 1955".

Page 2, line 4, strike out "in excess of 10 per centum 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.

#### JOHN R. COOK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2668) for the relief of John R. Cook.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John R. Cook, Alameda, California, the sum of \$1,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of John R. Cook against the United States on account of expenses incurred by him in successfully defending himself against a criminal prosecution brought by the United States, based on acts alleged to have been committed by him in the performance of his duties as an employee of the Post Office Department. Such prosecution was dismissed on February 21, 1956, and the Post Office Department has since determined that he should not have been removed from his position with the Department and has reinstated him with back pay for the period of his suspension: Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.*

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 6, strike out the words "in excess of 10 per centum thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

#### EBER BROS. WINE & LIQUOR CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2717) for the relief of Eber Bros. Wine & Liquor Corp.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding any statute of limitations, including the limitations of section 322(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, the Eber Brothers Wine and Liquor Corporation of Rochester, New York, shall be permitted to file its claims under section 322 of the In-*



ternal Revenue Code of 1939 for the refund of overpayments of income taxes for fiscal years 1947 and 1948 which resulted from the fact that profit from the sale of certain warehouse receipts was treated as ordinary income when, subsequently, it was established that such income should have been accorded capital-gains treatment under the law; and if those claims are found to be meritorious, authority is hereby provided for the payment of such refunds.

SEC. 2. The United States shall not be liable for any interest on any portion of any such claim for any period prior to the date on which such claim is filed with the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate pursuant to 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.

#### DORMAN WILLIAM WHITTON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2846) for the relief of Dorman William Whitton.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of the War Claims Fund, to Dorman William Whitton, Anacortes, Washington, the amount certified to him under section 2 of this Act. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of Dorman William Whitton against the United States for detention benefits under section 5(a) through 5(e) of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended by the War Claims Act Amendments of 1954: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

SEC. 2. The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission shall promptly determine and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount which would have been payable to Dorman William Whitton as detention benefits under section 5(a) through 5(e) of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended by the War Claims Act Amendments of 1954, if Dorman William Whitton had filed a claim therefor within the period prescribed by law.

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.

#### JOSEPH E. MILLER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2954) for the relief of Joseph E. Miller.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin? There was no objection.

#### MRS. DOROTHY (HYMAN) MONK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3093) for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy (Hyman) Monk.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That Mrs. Dorothy (Hyman) Monk, McLean, Virginia, is relieved of liability to repay to the United States the sum of \$1,190. Such sum represents the amount of the class E allotments which were erroneously paid to her by the United States for the period beginning August 1, 1942, and ending May 31, 1945, both dates inclusive, incident to the military service of Herbert Hyman (Army serial number 31003722). 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.

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

#### COL. JOHN T. MALLOY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3104) for the relief of Col. John T. Malloy.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Colonel John T. Malloy, O-18576, United States Army, the sum of \$1,347.59, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of expenses incurred by him in connection with the payment of ocean freight transportation on his private automobile from San Francisco, California, to Java and return. The Army orders issued incident to these shipments authorized the transport of one privately owned automobile by Army transport subject to availability of space, and, inasmuch as no Army transport service to Java existed and the Department of the Army had no discretion to ship the automobile by other means, and it was found after Colonel Malloy's arrival in Java on or about January 29, 1949, that the automobile was necessary to the establishment of a new military liaison office and the performance of his duty as assistant military attaché, Batavia, Netherlands East Indies, shipment of his automobile by commercial transport was arranged on or about May 13, 1949, at a cost of \$634.47, and also at the time of his return on or about March 18, 1950, at a cost of \$713.12, as Army transport service to Java had not been established: *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.

#### RACHEL NETHERY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3111) for the relief of Rachel Nethery.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of*

*America in Congress assembled,* That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act are hereby waived in favor of Rachel Nethery, Seattle, Washington, and her claim for compensation benefits arising out of the death of her daughter, Maud L. Nethery, who was fatally injured on March 29, 1919, while employed at the United States Navy Yard, Puget Sound, Washington, shall be acted upon under the remaining provisions of such Act if she files such claim with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Department of Labor, within the six-month period which commences on the date of enactment of this Act. No benefits shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this Act for any period prior to the date of its enactment.

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. CLARE M. ASH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3240) for the relief of Mrs. Clare M. Ash.

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

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

There was no objection.

#### WILLIAM S. SCOTT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3249) for the relief of William S. Scott.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the Act entitled "An Act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes", approved September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U.S.C. 765-769) are hereby waived in favor of William S. Scott for compensation for disability caused by an injury allegedly sustained by him in November 1937 while an employee of the Internal Revenue Service of the Treasury Department at the Custom House, Bowling Green, New York City, New York, and his claim is authorized and directed to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such Act, as amended, if he files such claim with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, not later than six months after the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided,* That no benefits shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this Act for any period prior to the date of its enactment, except in the case of such medical or hospitalization expenditures which may be deemed reimbursable.

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. MARTHA NICOMETI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3252) for the relief of Mrs. Martha Nicometi.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the

Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Martha Nicometi, Akron, New York, the sum of \$500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Martha Nicometi against the United States in connection with a \$500 departure bond which she posted on behalf of Anna Francesca Masiello (nee Terabassi) on November 18, 1953, and which was declared breached (with consequent loss of the collateral posted with the bond) as a result of the failure of the said Anna Francesca Masiello (nee Terabassi) to depart from the United States as directed by May 23, 1954: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

#### THOMAS FORMAN SCREVEN, ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3254) for the relief of Thomas Forman Screven, Julia Screven Daniels, and May Bond Screven Rhodes.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, in equal shares, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Thomas Forman Screven, Julia Screven Daniels, and May Bond Screven Rhodes, the total sum of \$8,975. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of each of such persons against the United States for the reasonable value, as of October 1, 1943, of block numbered C-37, Pine Gardens Subdivision, Brewton Hill Plantation, Hulin Ward, in Savannah, Georgia, which property was taken by the United States in condemnation proceedings (Civil Action Numbered 204, Savannah division) begun June 11, 1942, the final order in which was entered October 1, 1943, without actual notice of such proceedings being given to any of such persons: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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 H. PEARLMUTTER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3406) for the relief of William H. Pearlmutter.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of*

*America in Congress assembled*, That William H. Pearlmutter, of Brookline, Massachusetts, be, and he is hereby, relieved of all liability to pay to the United States the sum of \$606.43. Such sum represents a penalty assessed in connection with an admission tax for the period October 1950 through May 1951 collected by the Tributary Theatre of Boston, Incorporated, and not paid into the United States Treasury.

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. LEONARD O. ERICKSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3410) for the relief of Mrs. Leonard O. Erickson.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That Leonard O. Erickson shall be deemed to have elected under section 3(b) of the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of 1953 to provide the annuity specified in paragraph (1) of section 4(a) of such Act to his wife. Notwithstanding his expressed intention to do so, the said Leonard O. Erickson was prevented by physical disability from exercising the right of election granted him by section 3(b) of such Act during his life.

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.

#### AARON GREEN, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3522) for the relief of Aaron Green, Jr.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That Aaron Green, Jr., of 24 Wakullah Street, Roxbury, Mass., is hereby relieved of all liability to repay to the United States the sum of \$1,045 representing the total of allotment payments made to his wife, Mrs. Sarah E. Green, in the period from April 1, 1942, through October 31, 1945, inclusive, which have been ruled to have been overpayments because only two deductions were made from his Army pay in accordance with the authorization he executed directing that the proper deductions be made from his pay in order that a class E allotment would be paid to his wife.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 3, after "Junior" insert "and Sarah E. Green, his wife".

Page 1, line 4, strike out "is" and insert "are".

Page 1, line 5, strike "\$1,045" and insert "\$1,030".

Page 1, line 6, strike "his" and insert "the".

Page 1, line 11, strike "his pay" and insert "the pay of the said Aaron Green, Jr".

Page 1, line 13, after "wife" add the following sentence "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."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

#### MRS. ALBERTA S. ROZANSKI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3797) for the relief of Mrs. Alberta S. Rozanski.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the national service life insurance (FV1217165, V1241985) granted in the amount of \$10,000 to the late Doctor Frank S. Rozanski, effective January 26, 1951, shall be held and considered to have been in full force and effect at the time of his death on March 5, 1951, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to pay such insurance to Mrs. Alberta S. Rozanski, widow of the said Doctor Frank S. Rozanski and designated beneficiary of such insurance.

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

#### PAUL NELSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3798) for the relief of Paul Nelson.

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

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

There was no objection.

#### DR. GORDON D. HOOPLE, ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3825) for the relief of Dr. Gordon D. Hoople, Dr. David W. Brewer, and the estate of the late Dr. Irl H. Blaisdell.

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

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

There was no objection.

#### WINTFORD JESSE THOMPSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4142) for the relief of Wintford Jesse Thompson.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Wintford Jesse Thompson, Chief Aviation Electronics Technician, United States Navy, the sum of \$222.62. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Wintford Jesse Thompson against the United States for reimbursement of the cost to him of registration fees, books, and equipment paid by him from his own funds on account of courses taken by him from the University of Tennessee, Division of University Extension, Memphis Center, between the fall quarter, 1954, and the spring term, 1956. Reimbursement of such sum to the said Wintford Jesse Thompson has been denied by

the Veterans' Administration on the ground that his failure to continuously pursue the training program he had initiated in 1950 under Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, because of being transferred overseas by the United States Navy in 1952, was not for a condition which normally would cause interruption by any student: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 10, strike out "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

#### SAMUEL ABRAHAM ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4314) for the relief of Samuel Abraham, John A. Carroll, Forrest E. Robinson, Thomas J. Sawyers, Jack Silmon, and David N. Wilson.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That Samuel Abraham, John A. Carroll, Forrest E. Robinson, Thomas J. Sawyers, Jack Silmon, and David N. Wilson are respectively relieved of all liability to the United States in the amounts of \$1,181.81, \$1,135.47, \$1,197.13, \$1,144.13, \$1,169.55 and \$1,156.11. Such sums represent the amounts by which they received pay in excess of that authorized by law during the period from February 20, 1955, to August 31, 1957, while they were employed as civilian firefighters at the Hampton Roads Army Terminal, Norfolk, Virginia. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for the amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each person named in the first section, an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the claim of the United States for refund of the amount specified in the first section: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act for the payment or any one claim in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 14, strike out "for the payment or any one claim in excess of 10 per centum thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

#### WILLIAM R. AND ALICE M. REARDON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4893) for the relief of William R. and Alice M. Reardon.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William R. and Alice M. Reardon the sum of \$904.07, such sum being the difference between \$958, the price they actually paid the United States for the forty-three and fourteen one-hundredths acres of land described in section 2 of this Act, and \$53.93, the price at which they could have purchased such land under the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain lands in Wisconsin bordering upon inland lakes or rivers", approved August 24, 1954 (43 U.S.C. 1221-1223), had they been able to defer such purchases until the date of enactment of such Act, as was the case with other landowners in the same locality.

Sec. 2. The land referred to in the first section of this Act is more particularly described as follows: "Lot 8 in section 8, township 39 north, range 18 east, located in Florence County, Wisconsin, being 43 $\frac{1}{4}$ <sup>100</sup> acres of land on the shore of Lake Emily in said county".

Sec. 3. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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. BETTY L. FONK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4964) for the relief of Mrs. Betty L. Fonk.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, 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 \$10,000 to Mrs. Betty L. Fonk, of Bloomington, Indiana, in full settlement of all claims against the United States. Such sum represents compensation for personal injuries, and all expenses incident thereto sustained as the result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle in Frankfurt-am-Main, Germany, on June 22, 1955: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

#### D. A. WHITAKER AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4318) for the relief of D. A. Whitaker and others.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That, notwithstanding any statute of limitations or lapse of time, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of D. A. Whitaker, Route 1, Pulaski, Virginia; Marvin D. Worrell, Route 3, Hillsville, Virginia; Kenneth Frost, 109 Alleghany Street, Christiansburg, Virginia; Robert R. Beard, 200 Round Hill Drive, Christiansburg, Virginia; Warren C. Reed, Box 506, Christiansburg, Virginia; A. E. Hall, Route 1, Dublin, Virginia; Clarence L. Knepper, 10 Pulaski Avenue, Fairlawn, Radford, Virginia; Paul K. Bird, 1034 Carson Street, Radford, Virginia; Glendy Quessenberry, Route 2, Box 48, Dublin, Virginia; Charles D. Worrell, Route 1, Woodlawn, Virginia; Jessie H. Smith, Route 2, Radford, Virginia; James C. Hutton, Senior, 2 Jackson Avenue, Fairlawn, Radford, Virginia; E. Ray Liddle, Route 3, Box 62, Galax, Virginia; Lester L. Maupin, 29 Ridge Road, Fairlawn, Radford, Virginia; Marlin E. Campbell, 9 Dudley Ferry Road, Radford, Virginia; James E. Trammell, 17 Brandon Road, Route 2, Radford, Virginia;

K. L. Munsey, 514 Roanoke Street, Christiansburg, Virginia; Alexander Wirt, Route 1, Box 43, Cambria, Virginia; C. E. Hutchins, Station A, Box 181, Radford, Virginia; Charles Walker, Box 895, Pearisburg, Virginia; R. M. Shelburne, Route 1, Christiansburg, Virginia; L. C. Anderson, 12 Jackson Avenue, Radford, Virginia; E. A. Melton, Hillsville, Virginia; Robert Altizer, Christiansburg, Virginia; Eugene H. Wheeler, 706 South Main, Blacksburg, Virginia; R. E. Martin, 6 South Driver, Radford, Virginia; W. A. Miller, 1035 Carson Street, Radford, Virginia; G. P. Hatcher, 32 Dudley Ferry Road, Radford, Virginia; Harold E. Semones, 300 Clement Street, Radford, Virginia; Forrest F. Farley, 812 Twelfth Street, Radford, Virginia;

Cordle McCoy, Radford, Virginia; Harry E. Strupe, Route 2, Radford, Virginia; William G. Moore, Box 114, Parrott, Virginia; Charles W. Fortner, Pulaski, Virginia; Glen D. Tolbert, Floyd, Virginia; Roy A. Brumfield, Route 2, Cambria, Virginia; Clyde C. Bruce, Box 117, Belspring, Virginia; Olas Jennings, Box 714, Dublin, Virginia; Leo S. Stanger, Route 1, Cambria, Virginia; David W. Hearn, Dublin, Virginia; Roy V. Crawford, Box 605, Blacksburg, Virginia; Irving N. Akers, Rural Retreat, Virginia; Booker C. Linkous, Radford, Virginia;

Pete H. McKee, Christiansburg, Virginia; Paul Whitaker, 1003 Ninth Street, Radford, Virginia; O. S. Hunt, 614 Clement Street, Radford, Virginia; Grover Page, Parrott, Virginia; B. P. Thompson, 46 State Street, Radford, Virginia; Edward W. Farmer, Mounted Route, Enola, Pennsylvania; Grover A. Teel, Christiansburg, Virginia; Clarence E. Henley, 953 Clark Street, Pulaski, Virginia; Hoy H. Hopkins, 1005 Lyle Street, Radford, Virginia; Irvin S. Howard, 300 Lee Street, Blacksburg,

Virginia; Carl C. Blair, 16 Ridge Road, Fairlawn, Radford, Virginia;

Kester L. Akers, Progress Street, Blacksburg, Virginia; James E. Brunner, Route 1, Box 23, Riner, Virginia; Jimmie A. Bishop, Peterstown, West Virginia; Garland C. Blackburn, 10 East Brandon Road, Fairlawn, Radford, Virginia; Everett H. Graves, 1006 Fifth Street, Radford, Virginia; William R. Hall, Route 1, Blacksburg, Virginia; Joseph K. Harless, Peterstown, West Virginia; Charles B. Moye, Box 444, Grove Street, Cambria, Virginia; Wythe C. Morris, Box 56, Max Meadows, Virginia; William P. Morris, Box 113, Max Meadows, Virginia; Herbert M. Phillips, Vicker, Virginia; George K. Poe, 407 Valley Street, Pulaski, Virginia; Robert A. Reid, Box 701, Blacksburg, Virginia; James L. Tate, Route 2, Radford, Virginia;

Moir C. Weeks, A5, Glenmary Apartments, Salem, Virginia; Willard Wood, Route 2, Box 2, Copper Hill, Virginia; J. Hampton Witt, Peterstown, West Virginia; Richard L. Cupp, Blacksburg, Virginia; Charles D. Payne, Box 103, Houston Street, Blacksburg, Virginia; James E. Conner, 1009 Fifth Street, Radford, Virginia; Thomas P. Webster, 205 Adams Street, Radford, Virginia; Wilmer B. Abbott, New Castle, Virginia; Horace H. Colley, 14 Spring Avenue, Radford, Virginia; Robert E. Freeman, 508 Wadsworth Street, Radford, Virginia; Kenneth W. Johnson, McCoy, Virginia; Daniel P. Jett, 1015 Downer Street, Radford, Virginia; Clinton C. Jett, Hillsville, Virginia; Delton R. Jett, Hillsville, Virginia; John M. Hall, Mashburn Avenue, Pulaski, Virginia;

James P. Bowden, 85 Peppers Ferry Road, Fairlawn, Radford, Virginia; Everett L. Graham, Route 1, Christiansburg, Virginia; Lewis H. Harrison, Dublin Road, Pulaski, Virginia; Garland K. Bane, 304 Radford Road, Radford, Virginia; Horace M. Farmer, Hillsville, Virginia; Theodore R. Craft, New Castle, Virginia (deceased); Charles E. Dudley, Route 2, Cambria, Virginia (deceased); Walter T. Fowler, 505 Sixth Street, Radford, Virginia; Grover C. Agee, Highview Terrace, Christiansburg, Virginia; Norman N. Goad, Route 1, Cambria, Virginia; W. Orville Hamlin, 508 North Main Street, Blacksburg, Virginia; Barger M. Shutt, address unknown;

John D. Lawhorne, Warrenton, Florida; Joseph E. Everly, Richmond Quartermaster Depot, United States Army, Richmond, Virginia; Elmer Bruner, address unknown; James C. Colley, Saltville, Virginia; Richard W. Long, 71 Polk Street, Monroe Terrace, Radford, Virginia; Kenneth J. Turner, Eddie Park, Christiansburg, Virginia; James W. Shumate, Route 1, Dublin, Virginia; Junius C. Tate, address unknown; Frank F. Bass (deceased); W. W. Worrell, Hillsville, Virginia; Paul J. Reynolds, Route 1, Blacksburg, Virginia; Harrison Gregory, Pulaski, Virginia (deceased); Buford H. Woodyard, Trinkle Avenue, Dublin, Virginia; Leslie Martin, Junior, Fox, Virginia; James E. Conner, 1009 Fifth Street, Radford, Virginia; and Andrew A. Hawkins, 3 Lee-Hy Court, Christiansburg, Virginia, for basic and overtime compensation and shift differential pay as governed by the provisions of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended (U.S.C., title 5, sec. 84 and secs. 901 through 958), for services performed since 1945 by them at the Radford Arsenal, Radford, Virginia: *Provided*, That actions on such claims shall be brought within one year from the date that this Act becomes effective.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 13, insert "Wesly D. Chumbly, Route 1, Box 51, Shawville, Virginia;"

Page 3, line 15, insert "Robert C. Willis, 108 Lee Avenue Northeast, Roanoke, Virginia;"

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANE: Page 5, line 22, after the name "Virginia", insert "Joseph E. Everly, Richmond, Virginia;"

The amendment was agreed to.

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

#### CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES OR THEIR SURVIVORS WHO WERE CAPTURED AND HELD AS PRISONERS OF WAR IN THE KOREAN HOSTILITIES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4121) for the relief of certain members of the Armed Forces of the United States, or their survivors, who were captured and held as prisoners of war in the Korean hostilities.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That, notwithstanding the expiration of the period prescribed by Public Law 615, Eighty-third Congress (68 Stat. 759) for the settlement of claims authorized under subsection (e) of section 6 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States is authorized and directed to determine the validity and amount of each of the claims, filed by or in behalf of the following former members of the Armed Forces of the United States, or by any eligible survivor of any such individual who may be deceased, which claims are presently docketed and numbered as follows:

| Claim No.  | Claimant  | Amount Involved |
|------------|---|-----------------|
| K-256,993. | Ackerman, Mrs. Lucille, as legal guardian for the use and benefit of Karl D. Ackerman, minor child of Jack M. Ackerman, deceased. | \$252.50        |
| K-257,364. | Newman, Henry, sole surviving parent of Jack D. Newman, deceased.   | 172.50          |
| K-257,406. | Morrisey, Maurice C., and Vera L., surviving parents of Richard W. Morrisey, deceased (in equal shares).                          | 2.50            |
| K-257,627. | Reese, William T., and Edna, surviving parents of Richard T. Reese, deceased (in equal shares).                                   | 147.50          |
| K-257,628. | Tinsley, Mrs. Mabel C., surviving mother of George M. Tinsley, deceased.  | 2,600.00        |
| K-257,629. | Thompson, Jackie Ray  | 2,495.00        |

Any award made by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States with respect to any such claim shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment, in accordance with applicable provisions of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated.

Sec. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the payment of any award or awards that may be certified by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States pursuant to this Act, including amounts required by such Commission and the Secretary of the Treasury for the payment of their respective administrative expenses in connection therewith.

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.

#### PATRICK W. GOWAN AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3960) for the relief of Patrick W. Gowan, David Dooling, Harlie L. Mize, James J. Blaes, and William L. Perkins.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to pay, out of current appropriations available for the payment of severance pay, to Patrick W. Gowan, who was discharged from the United States Navy on June 30, 1957, and to David Dooling, Harlie L. Mize, James H. Blaes, and William L. Perkins, who were discharged from the United States Navy on June 30, 1958, respectively, an amount equal to the difference between (a) the amount of severance pay which would have been paid to each such person upon his discharge from the United States Navy if the computation of such severance pay had been based upon his actual commissioned service in the United States Navy, and (b) the amount of severance pay actually paid to him.

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

#### VIRGINIA E. SPEER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3939) for the relief of Virginia E. Speer.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That Virginia E. Speer, 1876 Allendale Avenue, Cass Lake, Pontiac, Michigan, is relieved of all liability to repay to the United States the sum of \$200, which was erroneously paid to her as mustering-out pay upon her discharge from the United States Air Force in 1955.

Sec. 2. The Comptroller General of the United States, or his designee, shall relieve any disbursing or certifying officer, including any special disbursing agent, of the United States from accountability or responsibility for the erroneous payment described in section 1 of this Act, and shall allow credits in the settlement of the accounts of such officers or agents for any amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

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

#### JOSEPH E. GALLANT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2286) for the relief of Joseph E. Gallant.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, 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 \$25,000 to Joseph E. Gallant, of Mexico, Maine, in full settlement

of all claims against the United States. Such sum represents compensation for personal injuries sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Army jeep in Bremen, Germany, on September 9, 1948: *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.

OTIS PARKS, W. B. DUNBAR, AND  
J. C. DICKEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2063) for the relief of Otis Parks, W. B. Dunbar, and J. C. Dickey.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to pay, out of money heretofore made available for the eradication of the disease vesicular exanthema in swine, to Otis Parks, of Crockett, Texas, the sum of \$483, to W. B. Dunbar, of Groveton, Texas, the sum of \$315.50, and to J. C. Dickey, of Groveton, Texas, the sum of \$48.56. Such sums represent amounts heretofore paid said persons by the State of Texas. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims of the named persons arising out of the destruction of swine in July 1953, because of the infection and exposure of these swine to the contagious disease, vesicular exanthema. Such swine were destroyed by order of the Department of Agriculture of the State of Texas, cooperating with the United States Department of Agriculture, under an agreement whereby such losses were to be indemnified on the basis of 50 per centum by the State and 50 per centum by the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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.

JOSEPH B. KANE, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1631) for the relief of Joseph B. Kane, Jr.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

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

There was no objection.

LOGAN DUFF

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1462) for the relief of Logan Duff.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That section 212 of the Act of June 30, 1932 (5 U.S.C. 59a), is waived for the period beginning February 16, 1946, and ending May 23, 1954, both dates inclusive, insofar as it applied to First Lieutenant Logan Duff, retired (Army serial number O109736), and he is relieved of liability to repay to the United States the sum of \$6,677.08, which was erroneously paid to him as retired pay and as civilian salary during such period while he was employed by the officers' open mess, Fort Benning, Georgia. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for all amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

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

T. V. CASHEN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1411) for the relief of T. V. Cashen.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to T. V. Cashen, Jacksonville, Fla., the sum of \$433.66. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said T. V. Cashen against the United States for compensation for services rendered by him in good faith in the period beginning July 16, 1957, the date of the expiration (without his knowledge at the time) of his former appointment as United States commissioner and ending August 2, 1957, the date of his reappointment as United States commissioner by nunc pro tunc order of the United States District Court, Southern District of Florida, Jacksonville Division. Compensation for such services was not allowed or paid by the United States for the reason that the said T. V. Cashen was acting only in a de facto capacity as United States commissioner during such period: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 11 strike out "commissioner", and insert "Commissioner."

Page 2, line 2, strike out "commissloner," and insert "Commissioner."

Page 2, line 9, strike out "In excess of 10 per centum 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.

JIM B. HILL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1471) for the relief of Jim B. Hill.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Jim B. Hill, of Bakersfield, California, the sum of \$12,500. The payment of this sum shall be in full settlement of all his claims against the United States for expenses, losses, and damages incurred in moving his business enterprise as a result of the acquisition of land by the Government at Edwards Air Force Base, California, on or about July 20, 1953: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike "\$12,500" and insert "\$22,500."

Page 2, line 1, strike the words "in excess of 10 per centum 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.

OLIVER O. NEWSOME

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1691) for the relief of Oliver O. Newsome.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That Oliver O. Newsome, of San Bernardino, California, is hereby relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of \$1,782.58 received by him, in good faith and upon assurances given him by responsible administrative officials that his employment was proper, as compensation for services rendered by him as a supply inspector, San Bernardino Air Materiel Area, San Bernardino, California, during the period February 1, 1956, through July 31, 1956, inclusive, such employment having been unlawful by virtue of his status as an Air Force warrant officer retired for length of service. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for any amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Oliver O. Newsome, an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the claim of the United States for refund of the amount for which Oliver O. Newsome is relieved of liability to repay under the first section of this Act: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to

the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 14, strike out "in excess of 10 per centum thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

#### LT. COL. JOHN M. BRIZZARD

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1739) for the relief of Lt. Col. John M. Brizzard.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to relieve Lieutenant Colonel John M. Brizzard, Signal Corps, of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of \$380. Such sum represents stations quarters per diem paid him for the period December 22, 1949, to June 29, 1950, while he was stationed at Fort Richardson, Alaska.*

Sec. 2. 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 any aggregate amount paid or withheld from him.

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.

#### GORDON E. MARTIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1744) for the relief of Gordon E. Martin.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Gordon E. Martin, San Diego, California, is hereby relieved of liability to pay to the United States the sum of \$235.44, representing the amount paid by the United States for temporary storage of his household effects for the periods April 8, 1952, to October 7, 1952, and April 7, 1953, to October 7, 1953. The said Gordon E. Martin could have avoided such liability by having such household effects shipped, at a cost to the United States in excess of \$1,500, to his new duty stations at the time of his changes of permanent duty stations during his active service with the United States Navy in 1952 and 1953. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer, full credit shall be given for all amounts for which the said Gordon E. Martin is relieved of liability by this Act.*

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

#### MRS. MAXINE L. COWAN HARRISON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1749) for the relief of Mrs. Maxine L. Cowan Harrison.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Comptroller General of the United States be and he is hereby authorized and directed to relieve Mrs. Maxine L. Cowan Harrison from all liability to refund to the United States the sum of \$350 as social security payments which was erroneously paid her as the survivor of Lamar Flint Harrison, a United States naval aviator who was killed when his airplane crashed into the ocean off of Coronado, California, on October 7, 1955, for her two minor children.*

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. PAUL M. TEDDER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2099) to provide for a posthumous cash award in recognition of the scientific contributions in the field of electronic ordnance made by the late Paul M. Tedder.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Paul M. Tedder, Gainesville, Florida, the sum of \$15,000, in recognition of the scientific contributions of her husband, the late Paul M. Tedder, in the field of electronic ordnance while he was employed as a research engineer by the University of Florida. Such contributions were highly significant to the successful prosecution of World War II by the United States and, although he was directly employed by the United States, the inventive and creative abilities of the late Paul M. Tedder were utilized by the United States for a thirteen-year period through contracts with the University of Florida and, successively, the National Defense Research Committee, the National Bureau of Standards, and the Diamond Ordnance Fuze Laboratories. During such period the late Paul M. Tedder conceived many ideas and inventions of major importance to the proximity fuze design art which have resulted in savings to the United States of many millions of dollars and for which he received no compensation other than his salary from the University of Florida: *Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.**

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 2, after the word "was", insert "not."

Page 2, line 5, after the word "contracts", strike out "with" and insert "between."

Page 2, lines 14 and 15, strike out "in excess of 10 per centum 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.

#### MILO G. AND PATRICIA WINGARD

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2281) to provide for the payment of relocation expenses to Milo G. and Patricia Wingard.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Milo G. and Patricia Wingard of Longmeadow, Massachusetts, an amount not more than \$1,106 in full settlement of their claim against the United States for expenses, losses, and damages incurred in moving as a result of the acquisition of their land by the United States at Cape Canaveral Auxiliary Air Force Base, Florida. The exact amount to be paid under this Act shall be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force in the manner set forth in section 401(b) of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 624): *Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.**

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. GERTRUDE E. SHETLER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2289) for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude E. Shetler.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Mrs. Gertrude E. Shetler, of Columbus, Ohio, is hereby relieved of all liability to refund the amount of \$3,057.55 to the United States. Such sum represents the difference between the retirement pay of a lieutenant colonel and a colonel, United States Army, erroneously paid to her late husband, Lieutenant Colonel John S. Shetler (serial number O139215), from October 1, 1949, to February 28, 1957, both dates inclusive, minus the amount which was applied against this overpayment at the time of his death. 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.*

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.

#### ELLIS TIMBER CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2294) for the relief of the Ellis Timber Co.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to settle and adjust the claim of the Ellis Timber Company on account of losses sustained in recovering salvage timber purchased from the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, pursuant to contract No. 14-11-001(14)-268, dated August 20, 1957, and to allow in full and final settlement of the claim the sum of not to exceed \$9,593.70. There is hereby appropriated the sum of \$9,593.70 for payment of said claim.*

Sec. 2. That the Ellis Timber Company is hereby relieved of all liability to pay to the United States the sum of \$2,118 which is due and payable pursuant to contract No. 14-11-001(14)-268 as the unpaid balance for salvage timber purchased under said contract.

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.

#### STERILON CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2295) for the relief of the Sterilon Corp.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to settle and adjust the claim of the Sterilon Corporation on account of certain expenses incurred by the corporation incident to a bid which it submitted in response to invitation No. MPA-30-287-md-56-368, issued on November 30, 1955, by the Armed Services Medical Procurement Agency, 84 Sands Street, Brooklyn 1, New York, covering the purchase, by that agency, of a quantity of culture petri dishes and to allow in full and final settlement of the claim the sum of not to exceed \$3,593.75. There is hereby appropriated the sum of \$3,593.75 for the payment of the said claim.*

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

#### AMERICAN HYDROTHERM CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2603) for the relief of the American Hydrotherm Corp.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury be and is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$2,617.37 to the American Hydrotherm Corporation of Long Island City, New York, in full settlement of all claims against the United States. Such sum represents expenses incurred by the said company in connection with Air Force contract bids numbered 21 (602)-296 and 297, dated on or about July 8, 1957, and subsequently canceled by communication from the Air Force dated July 12, 1957.*

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$2,617.37" and insert "\$1,910.13."

CV—276

Page 1, line 12, strike out the period and insert "": *Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.*

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.

#### LOIS K. ALEXANDER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2949) for the relief of Lois K. Alexander.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Lois K. Alexander of New York, New York, be relieved of all liability to repay to the United States the sum of \$105.95, representing reimbursement of actual transportation costs incurred by Lois K. Alexander in transporting her household effects from Washington, District of Columbia, to New York City as a result of her being transferred by the Housing and Home Finance Agency from Washington, District of Columbia, to a new duty station in New York City.*

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.

#### LT. COL. JAMES A. BEPLAT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2950) for the relief of Lt. Col. James A. Beplat.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lieutenant Colonel James A. Beplat, O43694, United States Army, the sum of \$2,953.07, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the loss sustained by the said Lieutenant Colonel James A. Beplat as the result of damage to and destruction of his personal property in the warehouse of the Guardian Moving and Storage Co., 6603 Pulaski Highway, Baltimore, Maryland, by a flood that occurred on August 13, 1955: *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, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating any of the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.**

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

#### HILARY W. JENKINS, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3095) for the relief of Hilary W. Jenkins, Jr.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Hilary W. Jenkins, Junior, Falls Church, Virginia, is hereby relieved of liability to pay to the United States the sum of \$627.42. Such sum represents the amount of indebtedness of the said Hilary W. Jenkins, Junior, to the United States resulting from the non-deduction, without fault on his part, of certain amounts of his voluntary allotments and statutory contribution, as a soldier in the Army of the United States, during the period from October 1, 1942, to September 30, 1945, both dates inclusive. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I offer two amendments.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. LANE: Part 1, line 3, strike the word "is" and insert "Mrs. Lillian Hawes, Mrs. Mable L. Jenkins, and Mrs. Minnie N. Graham are."

Page 1, line 11, strike the period following the word "inclusive" and insert "and paid to the other persons named in this Act."

The 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.

#### COMPENSATION TO CERTAIN CLAIMANTS FOR THE TAKING OF PRIVATE FISHERY RIGHTS IN PEARL HARBOR, HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3248) to provide for the payment of just compensation to certain claimants for the taking by the United States of private fishery rights in Pearl Harbor, Island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, 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 \$8,234.28 to the clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii, for deposit in the registry of the court to satisfy any and all awards and judgments of the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii in Civil Numbered 292, United States of America against J. Lawrence P. Robinson, et al.: *Provided, That payment shall not be made by said court to any claimant until he has consented to the dismissal with prejudice of all pending litigation wherein the right to compensation for the taking of such fishery rights and of any interest therein or part thereof has been or is claimed or asserted against the United States in a manner satisfactory to the Attorney General, has conveyed to the United States any and all right, title, or interests in said fisheries, and has released all claims to damages or compensation against the United States with respect to alleged rights in said fisheries; and has consented to the entry of a final order of judgment of condemnation in the condemnation proceedings instituted by the United States and pending in the United States District Court for Hawaii for the condemnation of claimant's rights in said fisheries: *Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof***

shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this bill, 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.

#### COL. FRED E. DUEKER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3243) for the relief of Col. Fred E. Dueker.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That Colonel Fred E. Dueker (Army serial number O32051) is hereby relieved of all liability to repay to the United States the sum of \$561.48 which was originally paid to him as reimbursement of amounts expended by him for essential basic utilities such as electricity, water, and fuel for heat during the period beginning October 1, 1949, and ending on March 12, 1951, both dates inclusive, while he was serving as a member of the United States military mission with the Imperial Iranian Gendarmerie, Teheran, Iran. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for any amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Colonel Fred E. Dueker, an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the claim of the United States specified in the first section: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 11, strike out "in excess of 10 per centum thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

#### BERTA REITBERGER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1400) for the relief of Berta Reitberger.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212(a)(9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Berta Reitberger may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise ad-

missible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Berta Reitberger, the fiancée of Eugenio Marquez, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a non-immigrant temporary visitor for a period of three months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Berta Reitberger is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Eugenio Marquez and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, except that the provision of section 212(a)(9) of the said Act shall be inapplicable in her case: *Provided further*, That the exemption provided for in this Act shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within three months after the entry of the said Berta Reitberger, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within three months after the entry of the said Berta Reitberger, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Berta Reitberger as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

#### MRS. MATHILDE RINGOL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1453) for the relief of Mrs. Mathilde Ringol.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Mathilde Ringol may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided*, That, unless she is entitled to care under the Dependents' Medical Care Act, a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of that Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, beginning on line 7, strike out the proviso, and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided*, That, unless the beneficiary is entitled to care under the Dependents' Medical Care Act (70 Stat. 250), a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act: *Provided further*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Depart-

ment of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

#### SISTER MARY DAMION, ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1535) for the relief of Sister Mary Damion (Maria Saveria D'Amelio), Sister Maria Tarcisia (Maria Giovanna Fenuta), and Sister Mary Regina (Maria Lizzi).

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sister Mary Damion (Maria Saveria D'Amelio), Sister Maria Tarcisia (Maria Giovanna Fenuta), and Sister Mary Regina (Maria Lizzi), shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

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

#### DIMITRIOS KONDOLEON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1727) for the relief of Dimitrios Kondoleon (also known as James Kondolous).

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dimitrios Kondoleon, also known as James Kondolous) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

#### ELIZABETH LUCIE LEON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2589) for the relief of Elizabeth Lucie Leon (also known as Lucie Noel).

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Elizabeth Lucie Leon (also known as



Lucie Noel) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on January 2, 1951, upon payment of the required visa fee, and shall be permitted to file a petition for naturalization notwithstanding the provisions of section 316(a)(1) and (2) and section 316(b) of that 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.

#### MUKHTAR MOHAMMED

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3816) for the relief of Mukhtar Mohammed.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mukhtar Mohammed shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.*

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

#### JOSE SANTIAGO SAVEDRA CALZA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3817) for the relief of Jose Santiago Savedra Calza.

Mr. CONTE. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### STIRLEY LOUIS BERUTICH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4445) for the relief of Stirley Louis Berutich.

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

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a)(9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Stirley Louis Berutich may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: Provided, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.*

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "be" insert "issued a visa and."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the Private Calendar be dispensed with at this time.

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

There was no objection.

#### FEDERAL AID FOR PUBLIC AIRPORTS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, for many years, the familiar railroad station was as necessary to a city as its post office. Along the coasts and up the larger rivers the steamship landings were the terminals through which human beings and commerce flowed, coming and going.

Today hardly a month goes by that we do not see one of these railroad stations being boarded up like a building that has died. At the steamship piers we look in vain for the traffic of yesterday.

Then we hear the hum of activity over our heads, and looking up we see the planes in the sky, rising from and descending to some place beyond our vision miles away.

These are the public airports, the new terminals for long-distance transportation.

Bustling with activity and stretching out to accommodate the increasing use of their facilities and their services.

Much to our surprise we learn that the growing volume of private plane traffic leads all others in the use of civil airports.

A recent report of the Civil Aeronautics Administration covering the 196 civil airports in the United States at which FAA traffic control towers are located reveals the following record of operations:

|                          |      |
|--------------------------|------|
| Commercial airlines..... | 27.7 |
| Military.....            | 21.1 |
| General aviation.....    | 51.2 |

Even before we consider the needs of the great commercial air carriers, we must make allowance for the eye-opening requirements of general aviation.

Today business enterprises own and operate more than 26,000 aircraft, which now range from single-engine aircraft to DC-3's, turboprop Viscounts and F-27's, which will soon be supplemented by jet aircraft.

The general aviation fleet, including these business aircraft, exceeds 65,000 planes, and according to a recent Government forecast will grow to 89,000 by 1965 and to 107,000 by 1970.

This underscores the Federal Government's obligation to provide additional funds for airport development, because the maximum flow of airplane traffic is becoming essential to the economies of many communities.

To expect that the States and the localities should provide for this expansion in facilities is unrealistic. As the Federal Government takes the lion's share

of all available revenues, it must assume major responsibility for the development of public airports that are indispensable to interstate commerce and national defense.

The President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, in June 1955, recommended that the Federal-aid airport program be continued, stating that:

Furthermore, the device of Federal grants-in-aid facilitates central control of airport design, thus contributing to the safety of civil aviation. In addition, the National Government enjoys free landing rights for military aircraft on airports federally assisted. Occasionally this arrangement makes it unnecessary to build additional military airfields.

The President's rejection of a Federal-aid program last year, has set back our airport expansion program. As the Federal Airport Act is due to expire on June 30 of this year, and as airport commissions cannot proceed with expansion plans until they see what we do, it is urgent to provide means and encouragement for them without further delay.

More passengers now are transported in interstate and foreign air commerce than by railroads and transatlantic steamships.

Before this massive fact we cannot defer action.

The strain on present airport facilities is increasing steadily, and cannot be eased in any way other than by Federal assistance in the expansion of airports to accommodate passenger and air-freight volume with maximum safety.

Because H.R. 1011, "Amendments to Federal Airport Act," is adequate in meeting the requirements of public airports as we anticipate these requirements, I believe that it merits the approval of Congress.

Improved runway and taxi facilities must be provided for the new jet planes and the larger planes that are coming into use.

Only modern and improved airports can serve this need.

#### ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Mr. BOLAND. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, although St. Patrick's day falls just short of being included in the official spring season, it makes no difference: the day of the saint brings its own spring. There will be green in every Irish heart today south of the Ulster border, and in many a heart north of it. No color ever more fittingly symbolized the outward beauty of a land beautiful beyond most lands and lovely beyond compare to her sons and daughters. The term "Emerald Isle," endeared to the Irish through centuries, recalls a thousand sights and sounds woven into the warp and woof of the Irish background: the green valleys; the little shamrock which tradition tells us was employed by St. Patrick to expound the doctrine he had arrived to

preach; the very green of the northern seas even—all record and recall the glowing verdure of “the holy isle, the isle of the saints.”

Today, on both sides of the Atlantic there will be drums beating, bands playing, joyous groups marching in honor of the beloved patron Saint of Ireland—their one, incomparable Patrick, under whose benign auspices they have at last passed through centuries of poverty and suffering and through whose gracious intercession, they like to believe, they have at last obtained freedom, and dignity, and peace.

#### COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain preferential reports.

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

There was no objection.

#### AMENDING REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2 TO EXCLUDE REA

Mr. DENTON. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953, so that hereafter section 1 of the plan will no longer apply to the Rural Electrification Administration. The bill also specifies that the approval or denial of REA loans will be the sole responsibility of the REA Administrator, regardless of the provisions of any other law.

The bill provides for the transfer to the Administrator of the REA all functions which were transferred from the Administrator to the Secretary of Agriculture under Reorganization Plan No. 2 or any other reorganization plan or law.

Many will recall that legislation for this same purpose was introduced in the 85th Congress. Hearings were held, and although no formal action was taken, the hearings established the need for such legislation if the rural electrification program is to be administered as Congress intended it to be.

The making of loans is supposed to be the main duty of the REA Administrator. Loans are supposed to be made if they meet REA's standards of feasibility and if they come within the law. The making of loans should be entirely divorced from political considerations. However, we have seen that under Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953, the Secretary of Agriculture has been able to usurp the power of the REA Administrator and bring politics into an area that Congress intended to be entirely free from political influence and consideration. When the REA was set up, Congress specified that the REA Adminis-

trator would be appointed for a term of 10 years. He must be confirmed by the U.S. Senate. In throwing what should be a cloak of political immunity about him, Congress thought that he would not be tempted to let political philosophies influence his decisions on loan applications.

Using this philosophy as a yardstick, the REA program has been a great success. It has enabled the United States to bring the benefits of modern technology to agriculture and thereby develop our great agricultural economy. Today, more than 95 percent of our rural homes and institutions have been electrified, and no other Government program that has contributed so much to the public welfare can match the fine repayment record of the REA borrowers.

Under the present Secretary of Agriculture, the effectiveness of this great program has been greatly diminished. The REA Administrator's status has changed from that of an impartial and largely autonomous public servant to that of a hired hand of the Secretary of Agriculture. The power to judge an important loan application on its merits has been taken from him. Instead, he has been ordered to clear loans of more than \$500,000 with a political appointee of the Secretary of Agriculture who checks to see whether the loans fit the political philosophy of the Administration. Such a policy is a dangerous one no matter what party is in power.

I believe that it is in the public interest to restore the full loan-making authority of the REA Administrator. I am joined in this belief by thousands of members of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association and by many of my colleagues.

In Indiana we have firsthand knowledge of how the public interest has been set aside in this area. In 1956 the Indiana REA proposed to build a public powerplant at Petersburg, Ind., because the commercial utilities were charging an unreasonable rate for electricity that they purchased and also the State public service commission had ruled that wholesale power purchased by the co-ops from a commercial supplier to serve loads in excess of 250 kilowatts was to be charged for at a much higher rate than the energy the co-ops purchased to serve smaller loads.

In addition to the fact that this ruling would make it uneconomical for the REA to serve large industrial and commercial loads, it would have established a fatal precedent. If the commission could set 250 kilowatts as a demarcation point in a wholesale schedule, it could just as easily—and might—cut that down to 75 kilowatts or less.

Indiana rural electric cooperatives under a State law passed in 1935 have the exclusive right to service all loads within their territories. The following year, 1957, the PSC eliminated the discriminatory provision from the previous Commission's order. However, it left intact a 4.8 percent average increase in the cost of wholesale energy sold to the co-ops. The failure of the Commission to remove this rate increase has made the need for the 18 distribution cooperatives to gen-

erate and transmit their own power in Indiana more imperative. In May 1957, Hoosier Cooperative Energy applied to the REA for the \$42 million loan to construct a 198,000-kilowatt steam generating station on the White River near Petersburg, in the heart of Indiana's coalfields. The loan would also cover the cost of building 868 miles of 69,000 volt and 154,000 volt transmission lines to serve the substations of nine rural electric cooperatives in southern Indiana.

The estimated savings will exceed 17½ million in power costs over the 35-year life of the loan. More than 43,800 families will share in the savings through lower wholesale energy costs for their cooperatives. Soon after the announcement was made of this loan application, the Indiana Public Service Commission, armed with letters of protest from Indiana's commercial utilities, were sent to Washington by Gov. Harold W. Handley. At the time that the commissioners met with Secretary Benson, REA Administrator David Hamil expressed his irritation at such pressure and pointed out that the REA Administrator by Congress is given responsibility for REA loans and that the application would be reviewed and processed in exact accordance with the letter and spirit of the law. Subsequently, the controversy became hot enough to reach the White House, where a special meeting presided over by Sherman Adams was held.

As an outgrowth of this meeting, steps to restrict Hamil's authority and to injure the rural electric cooperatives were taken. Two administration bills were introduced in Congress to raise the REA interest rates and the Secretary of Agriculture ordered that all REA loan applications for more than \$500,000 must be reviewed by the Director of the Agricultural Credit Service prior to approval.

I am sure that similar abuses concerning the REA can be cited by some of my colleagues in support of remedial legislation, such as I have proposed.

Should my bill, or similar legislation be enacted into law, I am hopeful that the Indiana REA will be able to construct this public powerplant at Petersburg, Ind., and thereby provide cheaper power and bring about greater employment, both through this plant, and in the coalfields of Indiana, which will supply the coal to the plant. In addition, construction of this plant would bring other industries into the district, such as an aluminum plant, which was proposed at the time the Indiana REA applied for a loan to build the Petersburg plant.

#### WINNING ESSAY IN NATIONAL HISTORY CONTEST

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an essay.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include a timely and appropriate article for today—March 17, 1959—that consists of a very interesting essay that rated second

prizewinner in the national history contest recently conducted by the Ancient Order of Hibernians.

Jeremiah J. Riordan, Irish by birth and a citizen of the good old United States for ever so many years, one of the oldest but most reliable and outstanding members of division 11, Essex County, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Peabody, Mass., was the author of this beautiful composition, and of course the logical choice as one of the fortunate contestants winning second honors.

We, who have the honor of being members of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, are of course mighty proud of our fellowman, and today—the day that has been set aside to pay homage and tribute to our patron saint, St. Patrick—we extend to Mr. Riordan the “top of the mornin’” on a job well done.

MY PLAN TO END PARTITION IN IRELAND  
(By Jeremiah Riordan)

When I went to school in Ireland I attended the national school system of education, at that time under British rule. The teachers had to be very careful that any Irish history would not be imparted to the pupils. There was no word of the great struggle that was going on to free Ireland from bondage, no word of the Irish patriots who had sacrificed their lives in order to burst the galling chains that had kept their native land in slavery during the past 700 years, no word about John Mitchell's “Jail Journal,” where he told of his life in British prisons and in convict slavery in Australia and in Van Demons land because he loved Ireland. No word of Robert Emmett who sacrificed his young life because he tried to remove that chain which bound his people to a life of slavery. Those two patriots, together with Wolf Tone and scores of others who gave their lives that Ireland might be free were protestants, that England did not boast about, because they were Irish patriots who had given their lives for their native land. Neither were we told of O'Donovan Ross, one of the heroes of 1867 who, when in a British prison was made to partake of his prison fare while his hands were tied behind his back. We were told nothing of the heroes of old, Owen Rual O'Neill and Rory O'Moor, etc. We were never told of the Manchester martyrs or of “bloody Balfors” battering ram, when our homes were razed to the ground. No we were never told of anything that would help to preserve the spirit of Irish nationality in our young minds. They tried to bring us up as nice good, obedient English children by having included in our school books all about the Battle of the Baltic, and General Nelson with his blind eye. We were taught the history of the Battle of Waterloo, but not the story of the Battle of Fontenoy, where the English Army was routed by the Irish Brigade, who fought under the banner of the French Republic. But it was instilled in our minds that there were 32 counties in Ireland. Yes, our geography book told us Ireland was divided into four provinces, Ulster on the north, Munster on the south, Leinster on the east, and Connaught on the west. There were 9 counties in Ulster, 6 counties in Munster, 5 in Connaught, and 12 counties in Leinster and our geography book also said that the area of Ireland was 32,000 square miles.

That was Ireland from time immemorial. Thirty-two counties, men, women, and children living in peace, 4½ million of God-fearing people, until David Lloyd George, then Prime Minister of England, saw fit to draw a line of partition through Ulster, cutting off 6 counties from Ireland 37 years ago. Yes, that event occurred in the year 1921. In 1916, Padrig Pearse signed the

declaration of independence of the Irish Republic. He and his cosigners were quickly put to death. The Irish Republican Army kept up the fight and fought a guerrilla warfare, harassing the English Army until David Lloyd George in 1921 called for a truce partly because the sympathy of the renowned nations of the world were with the downtrodden and oppressed Ireland and partly because his army was receiving too many setbacks. Three lorry (trucks) loads of his men were wiped out one Sunday afternoon at Kilmichael, in West Cork by the West Cork Brigade, commanded by Tom Barry. After that disaster to David Lloyd George's forces, he, David Lloyd George, sent an ultimatum to the commander of the English forces in Ireland to surround Tom Barry and the West Cork Brigade (about 100 men) and capture them dead or alive. They were preparing to do so but before they were fully organized, Barry and his 100 men met them at Crossbarry, a village near Bandon, County Cork. The first truckload of English black and tans (auxiliary soldiers) was seen approaching, at 6 o'clock in the morning. Barry had his men placed in various advantageous positions and in less time than it takes to tell it, that contingent was wiped out and the truck set on fire. Guns and ammunition were used to replenish the dwindling supply of Barry's men. The next truckload came on and in due time was taken care of as before, and in that way up to 4 o'clock in the afternoon the fight went on until Barry and his men, tired and hungry, marched away through fields and hills and byroads to get billeted for the night in some friendly farmhouse and to forage or beg some food from some friendly neighbors as they were nearly 24 hours without food or drink as the Irish Republic Army had no canteen kitchen to feed the fighting men. “Such soldiers, such men,” were the words of Barry himself as he woke up during the night and looked upon his sleeping comrades lying exhausted in a bundle of straw spread on the floor of a laborer's cottage 20 miles away from Crossbarry. No wonder David Lloyd George called for a truce. It was agreed that Ireland should send three plenipotentiaries to London to meet with the Prime Minister and discuss toward a settlement of the Irish question. David Lloyd George with the cunning of his Welsh ancestry met the Irish delegation and cleverly maneuvered them, placed them in separated quarters, interviewed them one at a time and placed his proposition before them with the ultimatum that six counties be cut off from Ulster. “Accept this or face a terrible war” were his words on that first meeting. He never let them consult each other as to the proceedings but kept them apart under lock and key night after night and day after day told lies and used every stratagem he was aware of until he got one of them to sign under threat of a terrible war from the air, from the land and from the sea. After one had signed, the remainder followed suit. They came back to Ireland and shamefacedly presented their treaty. It was accepted by the majority of the Irish people because they were tired of fighting. Tired as fighting men, going for days without food. But the more patriotic, and the more enthusiastic refused to accept the terms of the treaty and a terrible and bloody civil war followed, where brother took up arms against brother and father fought in battle array against his son. In some parts of Ireland the civil war was more deadly than the war of the “black and tans,” all because of Lloyd George's gerrymandering. A great many people imagine the partition takes out Ulster from the rest of Ireland. But no, there are nine counties in Ulster. Lloyd George only wanted six for his scheme in gerrymandering. Just enough to keep a few orangemen

planters under the British Government, who live in an area which is roughly within a 30-mile radius of the city of Belfast.

Now as I said in the start of this narrative, my plan to end partition is this:

1. Those six counties behind the line of partition are in Ulster. Draw the line so as to include the nine counties of Ulster behind the “iron curtain.”

2. Let there be a plebiscite of the nine counties to show whether the whole of Ulster want to live under British rule or join in with the other 23 counties of Ireland under the rule of Dail Erin, the government of the Irish Republic.

3. As there is a sort of guerrilla warfare going on today between some remnants of the IRA and the northern government, lives have been lost on both sides and costly buildings have been damaged. It should be the business of the United Nations to secure peace. It should be considered a worldly affair, as well as Palestine, as well as the Suez Canal, as well as Algeria and Tunis and as well as Korea where the United States spent money of an untold amount and sacrificed many lives, some of them Irishmen by birth and some by extraction.

4. An appeal should be sent to our Senators and Congressmen to support Representative FOGARTY of Rhode Island in his effort to bring the question of the partition of Ireland to the attention of the U.S. Government.

5. An appeal should be sent to English societies right in the heart of Britain to prevail on their government to settle the partition by peaceful means. The average Englishman is a lover of liberty and is happy that the inhabitants of the 26 counties are now enjoying that liberty, which they gained at so great a sacrifice.

6. Finally in all our appeals to the United Nations, to the Senators and Congressmen of the United States, to any societies contacted, we should stress upon the fact that it is only fair that the following historic places should be restored to the Government of Ireland:

a. Armagh, primatial see and ecclesiastical center since the time of St. Patrick.

b. Downpatrick, the burial place of St. Patrick, St. Bridget, and St. Columbcille.

c. Belleek, where in 1258 Brien O'Neill was chosen King of Ireland.

d. Grey Abbey, where Rev. Mr. Porter, Presbyterian minister, was hanged for his part in the 1798 insurrection.

e. Dungannon, Thomas Clarke, signer of the declaration in 1916, was born in Dungannon.

While partition exists in Ireland, the Irish nation can never hope for national progress or national integrity in the true sense of the word. Partition has a demoralizing effect on the Irish people and is an eyesore which must necessarily be removed. Sectarian differences and the attendant evils of existing conditions in a divided Ireland, are of course the motives of the English and the boundary line of demarcation which breeds bigotry, intolerance and dissension since its very existence is repugnant to any red-blooded Irishman. It is only 37 years since the boundary line came into existence. Ulster, the land of the O'Neills and the O'Donnells, the land of Cuchalain and the Knights of the Red Branch, was never anything but Irish until English monarchs and despoilers deliberately sought to make settlement there of a gang of planters, alien in faith, in speech and in culture to the people of Ireland, and according to those same shoneens, such plantation constitutes legal ownership and entitles the descendants of the planters to carve the land upon which their forebears were but foreign parasites and set up a separate government opposed to the rest of the Irish people.

**A BILL TO EXPAND RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN FORESTRY**

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill which is designed to expand our present program of research in forestry and forest products, and for other purposes. This bill is declaratory of the present policy of the Congress to promote the efficient production, marketing, and utilization of the products of the forest. For the attainment of this policy, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to conduct and to stimulate research in the development, conservation, and management of forests and the production, marketing, and utilization of forest products in their broadest aspects.

To implement this congressional policy the Secretary of Agriculture by terms of this bill is authorized to cooperate and enter into contracts with colleges, schools, and universities and with other public and private organizations and individuals. Any contracts or agreements made pursuant to this authority shall contain requirements making the results of research and investigation available to the public through dedication, assignment to the Government, or such other means as the Secretary may determine. In entering into such contracts or in making cooperative arrangements the Secretary may arrange for the utilization of graduate students in the research performed under such contracts or agreements and shall take such measures as he deems appropriate to stimulate interest by graduate students in the development and application of all phases of forestry and forest products utilization research.

In carrying out the intent and spirit of this bill, the Secretary shall emphasize to the extent practicable special and early attention to the development of new uses and products for low-value timber, wood residues, and other products, in the improvement and more efficient production, harvesting, processing, marketing, and use of timber, lumber, and other wood products, and the development of new and improved scientific and technical methods and equipment for the development, conservation, and management of forests and for producing, marketing, and utilizing forest products. The emphasis on expanded forestry research programs is well placed. Forestry is not a short-time proposition. Where this Nation stands in timber supply at the end of the century depends largely on actions taken during the next two decades. Rapid acceleration of recent encouraging forestry trends is vital if the timber resources of the Nation are to be reasonably abundant 50 years hence. Because of the magnitude of potential demand, and the difficulty of extending more intensive forestry to the millions of small holdings, time is important. The potential of the land is

adequate. Our challenge is to make better use of it soon.

My study reveals that the greatest need for research in forestry not now being met is for basic or fundamental work. Progress in the solution of the many problems facing our forestry today depends on constantly increasing knowledge obtained by research and experience. I am happy to report that a very considerable amount of research, especially applied research, is now being done by the Federal and State Governments, and by private and industrial interests. However, because the pressures exerted on these organizations for immediate results having direct practical application in the management of forest properties are in the harvesting and utilization of the timber crop, they can be expected to do little research of a really basic nature. If this sorely needed basic research is done, it will have to be performed by educational institutions, especially private colleges and universities, and the more forward-looking private interests, through outright grants, fellowships, and particularly research assistantships.

It is reassuring to note that for the first time in many years, our forests are growing more wood than we are using. Annual wood growth is increasing at an accelerated rate. Our commercial forest area is expanding. The practice of good forestry on private forest lands—farm, industrial, and other—is spreading rapidly. Some of the most intensive forest management is on the lands of wood-using industries and other private owners.

These facts, bright as they are, do not necessarily mean we shall have more wood than we can use in the years ahead. Our population is growing; our consumption of wood is increasing. Industry and Government estimates indicate we will use wood in an increasing rate in the years to come. To keep forest growths ahead of our timber needs is our forestry job today. Many of us fail to realize the significant role our forests play in our economy from day to day. Like so many things, we have taken our great forest resources for granted. In my own State of Missouri, the forests have always played an important part in the economy of Missouri. The half of the population living in cities is not as acutely aware of their dependence on timber crops as are those living on farms and in small communities, but they nonetheless are affected by the condition and productivity of the forests and forest industries. A recent survey published by the U.S. Department of Commerce shows that 3 out of every 100 persons employed in the industries, trades, and businesses of Missouri were employed in industries directly dependent on timber for their raw material. Add to that figure the dependents of those so employed, and the relation of the forests to the State's welfare becomes apparent. These statistics when multiplied by 48 give us a better understanding of the importance of our forests to our overall economy.

Fundamental research is essential in determining the basic facts and principles upon which forest management and the utilization of forest products depend.

Research of this type is basically of general application and as such is a matter for public participation. Federal forest research has placed greater emphasis on forest inventory, forest protection, the economic aspects of forest management, and the utilization of forest products. This should be done through a reorientation program and not through increased appropriations. State and private agencies should be encouraged to expand their programs of forest research. Better coordination to avoid competition and duplication between Federal, State, and private agencies should be effected through the establishment of a national forest research advisory council representative of private, State, and Federal organizations interested in forest research. The results of research investigations and studies of forest management and utilization should be readily available and currently disseminated to all public and private forest agencies, and the forest industries and landowners. The bill which I have introduced today is a step in the right direction. To provide for the needs of the future we must plan and think in terms of the needs of the future. This can only be accomplished by a properly programmed plan for the future.

Starting almost from scratch at the beginning of this century, American forestry has made remarkable advances in the past 50 years. What men of vision half a century ago saw in the years ahead fell far short of what actually came to pass. They failed to fully foresee the astounding developments that have taken place in science, agriculture, and industry. They could not know that a half century would bring two world wars. All of these things made their impact on the forests and on the course of forestry. Forestry, then, should go steadily forward. Its potentialities for contributing to national prosperity, security, and progress are very great. Fifty years from now, as today, the strength of the Nation will lie in its people and in its resources.

A bill to authorize an increased program of research in forestry and forest products, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to further promote the efficient production, marketing, and utilization of products of the forest. For the attainment of this policy, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to conduct and to stimulate research into the development, conservation, and management of forests and the production, marketing, and utilization of forest products in their broadest aspects.*

SEC. 2. In carrying out this Act, the Secretary is authorized to cooperate and enter into contracts with colleges, schools, and universities and with other public and private organizations and individuals. In accordance with such regulations as he deems necessary, contracts and agreements made under the authority of this Act may be made for work to continue not more than four years from the date of any such contract; may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5); may provide for the making of advance, progress, or other payments without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the

Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and any appropriations obligated by such contract or agreement shall remain available as may be necessary for the payment of obligations under such contracts and agreements. Any contracts or agreements made pursuant to this authority shall contain requirements making the results of research and investigation available to the public through dedication, assignment to the Government, or such other means as the Secretary may determine.

Sec. 3. In entering into such contracts or in making cooperative arrangements hereunder, the Secretary may arrange for the utilization of graduate students in the research performed under such contracts or agreements and shall take such measures as he deems appropriate to stimulate interest by graduate students in the development and application of all phases of forestry and forest products utilization research.

Sec. 4. In carrying out this Act, the Secretary shall emphasize to the extent practicable special and early attention to the development of new uses and products for low-value timber, wood residues, and other products, and the improvement and more efficient production, harvesting, processing, marketing, and use of timber, lumber, and other wood products, and the development of new and improved scientific and technical methods and equipment for the development, conservation, and management of forests and for producing, marketing, and utilizing forest products.

Sec. 5. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. The authority provided in this Act shall be in addition to and not in substitution for existing authority now vested in the Secretary of Agriculture.

#### URBAN RENEWAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, today my subject is urban renewal, about which I have some basic criticism, particularly when Federal money is involved.

I want to make it plain I am for urban renewal. I do not know anyone who is against urban renewal, the improvement of homes and neighborhoods, the removal of blight, slum clearance, and the rest. Surely, everybody is for urban renewal. Most cities throughout the Nation have these problems, the aging of property. Many cities are now engaged in slum clearance and rehabilitation through local private and public initiative, without Federal aid. The lessons to be learned from these programs and those with Federal aid too, are the programs from which I draw my material today. We should benefit from our experiences. Whether we use Federal funds or not, there are lessons to be gained, and I shall pass on to you those I have learned. Dallas, for example, has just started a local program.

Since Congress acts as the city council for Washington, D.C., all of us are in effect city councilmen, studying and solving the problems of Washington.

Formerly, I was a realtor, land developer, and builder, so I am speaking on this subject from the inside, in a sense, because while I did not participate in Federal urban renewal I know something about real estate and this subject mat-

ter, and I have studied urban renewal almost as a hobby. So right or wrong, I am giving my conclusions from the viewpoint of intensive study, and I bring this material to you today in an attempt perhaps to make some constructive suggestions.

As a Congressman, I should say that when we take an oath to uphold the Constitution, we could use two yardsticks to evaluate legislation: First, Is this bill a function of the Federal Government, and second, Can we afford it?

Further I am even more interested in this matter of local projects with Federal money, because of an attack leveled against me and the 5th District of Texas. This occasion was the only other time I have imposed on you in 5 years with a special order, at that earlier time the arguments of the gentleman from California concerning Dallas' use of Federal funds were laid to rest. You will find that in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 104, part 1, page 1380.

I propose to talk about urban renewal in these five parts:

First. The Federal and State urban renewal laws.

Second. Eminent domain—of the right and use.

Third. The relocation problem—of people affected by urban renewal.

Fourth. Cost and time factors.

Fifth. A constructive plan—how to do it locally.

First, as to the law. I have a part of it here with me. I am sure some of you have seen the pamphlets put out on this, and they are here for your perusal.

The mechanics under the Federal law are:

First. The Federal Urban Renewal Administration, bypassing the appropriations process of Congress, lends money—currently at 3½ percent interest—to a local authority authorized to accept Federal aid to make preliminary studies—section 102d, Federal law.

Second. The URA similarly lends additional money for detailed planning of a project.

Third. The URA lends large sums, to acquire by condemnation under power of eminent domain, and otherwise, land and buildings now belonging to private citizens and use for their homes and businesses.

Fourth. The local authority generally demolishes and clears all the structures from the project area.

Fifth. The cleared land is then offered for sale, generally at tremendous loss, for reuse by other private citizens for sites for their businesses and homes.

Sixth. The loss—the difference between what the cleared land will bring when resold, and the cost of acquisition, demolition, preparation for reuse, plus all project overhead—is made up by the taxpayers. One-third of the loss is paid by taxpayers in their local taxes, as a so-called local grant-in-aid—section 104, Federal law. The other two-thirds is paid by taxpayers in their Federal taxes.

As to State law I shall only mention Texas as an example, because each State has its own implementing laws. The Texas Urban Renewal Law is an act which will enable Texas communities to

participate under the Federal Urban Renewal Law, and in our case it became effective in 1957.

Next, as to eminent domain—of the right and use. The private ownership of property is a basic right to be jealously guarded as we do our personal freedom. We are most aware of this when we are confronted by the power of eminent domain, by which law, property can be condemned and taken. Basic protection is given individuals by the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution which says:

No person shall be \* \* \* deprived of \* \* \* property \* \* \*, without due process of law—

And (2)—

nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

The Constitution thus assures protection of individuals and minorities from majority rule.

The Supreme Court upset this protection in 1954, in the case of Berman against Parker—in reinterpreting the traditional application of eminent domain.

In this case in a district court, the owner of a department store challenged the validity of the act which gives the local redevelopment authority the right to condemn property which is not substandard or slum property merely because the property is part of an overall redevelopment plan.

The Supreme Court then upheld this right to take property because in its concept of public welfare—now get this: Speaking of public welfare they said:

We do not sit to determine whether a particular housing project is or is not desirable. The concept of the public welfare is broad and inclusive. See *Day-Brite Lighting, Inc. v. Missouri*, 342 U.S. 421, 424. The values it represents are spiritual as well as physical, esthetic as well as monetary. It is within the power of the legislature to determine that the community should be beautiful as well as healthy, spacious as well as clean, well-balanced as well as carefully patrolled. In the present case, the Congress and its authorized agencies have made determinations that take into account a wide variety of values. It is not for us to reappraise them.

Mr. Speaker, I say losing your property under eminent domain because of someone else's judgment of a spiritual or esthetic value is unconstitutional and wrong. I say it is quite contrary to the fifth amendment.

Further this decision means that the courts, generally the final repositories of the people's rights against arbitrary action of the legislature, are not available to you when your property is taken and destroyed for redevelopment purposes. The remedy is in the legislature which may impose whatever restrictions on redevelopment authorities it may deem necessary. So the Supreme Court seems to switch the historic roles of the legislature and judiciary as we have criticized them in the past by their own language in ruling on this matter of eminent domain.

I am sure many of you would be interested in reading the entire Supreme Court's opinion, which I shall not take the time to read at this time.

The district court, whose decision the Supreme Court reversed, said this:

We are of the opinion that the Congress, in legislating for the District of Columbia, has no power to authorize the seizure by eminent domain of property for the sole purpose of redeveloping the area according to its, or its agents', judgment of what a well-developed, well-balanced neighborhood would be. This amounts to a claim on the part of the authorities for unreviewable power to seize and sell whole sections of the city.

That was the district court, whose decision was reversed by the Supreme Court. Here is the more complete decision:

Third, we have the problem of the area which is not a slum but which is out-of-date, called by the Government blighted or deteriorated.

We are of opinion that the Congress, in legislating for the District of Columbia, has no power to authorize the seizure by eminent domain of property for the sole purpose of redeveloping the area according to its, or its agents', judgment of what a well-developed, well-balanced neighborhood would be; lest this sentence be misconstrued out of context, we repeat our hypothetical assumption for the purposes of this first phase of section III of our opinion that no slum exists on the hypothetical property or in the area and that the seizure is not for a public use.

The Government says that it has determined that project area B in the case at bar is an appropriate area for redevelopment, that slums exist in that area, and that therefore it may seize the title to all the land in the area and, having replanned it, sell it to private persons for the building of row houses, apartment houses, commercial establishments, etc. In essence the claim is that if slums exist the Government may seize, redevelop, and sell all the property in any area it may select as appropriate, so long as the area includes the slum area. This amounts to a claim on the part of the authorities for unreviewable power to seize and sell whole sections of the city.

It covers about 15 square city blocks. It lies within a census tract in which slum conditions are said to exist, and it contains properties upon which slum conditions are said to exist. Its western boundary is an irregular line which runs around lots, encompasses some establishments along a street and excludes others on the same side of the same street, moves from east to west as it runs north. It excludes certain properties, and under it certain other properties would be sold back to the present owners or be retained by them. The key to the plan, apart from slum clearance, is the opinion of the Government authorities that residential neighborhoods should be "well-balanced" and that the area should contain housing for all income groups. \* \* \*

No acute housing shortage is to be met. In fact the plan provides for no more residents than presently occupy the area. No pressing economic condition, apart from the slums, is sought to be dealt with by this plan. No purpose of housing for the needy—low-rent housing—is the motivation. No rearrangement of streets is contemplated or provided. The streets throughout project area B are exactly the same as are the streets in all parts of the District of Columbia, lettered streets running east and west and numbered streets running north and south, in continuous lines across the entire District. The plan provides that certain streets shall be widened somewhat and that an expressway and a greenway shall be built. The only restrictions as to future use are the requirements as to the type of houses to be built (row, apartment, etc.) and as to the

percentage of rentals for the low-income group.

In sum the purpose of the plan, in addition to the elimination of slum conditions, is to create a pleasant neighborhood, in which people in well-balanced proportions as to income may live. The Government is to determine what conditions are pleasant, what constitutes the "most appropriate" pattern of land use, what is a good balance of income groups for a neighborhood, how many poor people, how many moderately well-to-do people, how many families of two, how many of four, etc., should be provided for in this neighborhood, and what the proper development of a community should be.

Of course the plan as pictured in the prospectus is attractive. In all probability it would enhance the beauty and the livability of the area. If undertaken by private persons the project would be most laudable. It would be difficult to think of a village, town or city in the United States which a group of artists, architects and builders could not improve vastly if they could tear down the whole community and rebuild the whole of it. But as yet the courts have not come to call such pleasant accomplishments a public purpose which validates Government seizure of private property. The claim of Government power for such purposes runs squarely into the right of the individual to own property and to use it as he pleases. Absent impingement upon rights of others, and absent public use of compelling public necessity for the property, the individual's right is superior to all rights of the Government and is impregnable to the efforts of Government to seize it. That the individual is in a low-income group or in a high-income group or falls in the middle of the groups is wholly immaterial. One man's land cannot be seized by the Government and sold to another man merely in order that the purchaser may build upon it a better house or a house which better meets the Government's idea of what is appropriate or well-designed.

We hold that Congress did not in the Redevelopment Act confer power to seize property beyond the reasonable necessities of slum clearance and prevention, the word "slum" meaning conditions injurious to the public health, safety, morals, and welfare.

This was the decision reversed by the Supreme Court in its redefinition of public welfare.

A congressional committee then commented about the inequities and injustices involved. Here is an excerpt from a report of the Subcommittee on Government Procurement, Disposal, and Loan Activities, to the Select Committee on Small Business, 84th Congress, 1st session, House report No. 1588, entitled "Washington Square Southeast Slum Clearance Project":

Despite our holding in this matter under the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, we cannot and do not approve the obvious inequities and injustices involved. Our sympathies lie with the small businessmen upon whom the greatest amount of inequities fall and with the tenants of dwellings who will be compelled to vacate what may be termed better-than-average homes.

Such changes in the law which would neither restrict local agencies in their development plans nor unreasonably harm those people who must feel the greatest impact of such projects must be submitted to and passed upon by the House Banking and Currency Committee which has jurisdiction over that legislation. That phase of such legislation is distinctly not within the jurisdiction of this committee. \* \* \*

It is the unanimous opinion of this committee that the Washington Square Southeast slum clearance project is valid under

title I of Public Law 171, 81st Congress. It is apparent, however, from the extensive hearing conducted by this committee that, although this project cannot be invalidated in this instance, certain changes must be made in the existing law to prevent the recurrence of such inequities to small-business concerns.

Obviously there were misgivings even then about the inequities of urban renewal and eminent domain.

Among the considerable thoughtful comments generated by the Supreme Court decision is this editorial by the Urban Land Institute:

#### HOW HIGH IS UP?—THE SCOPE OF LEGISLATIVE DETERMINATION

One of the most far-reaching legal decisions affecting the field of urban planning and development was rendered by the U.S. Supreme Court on November 22, when it unanimously upheld the constitutionality of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act in the case of *Berman v. Parker*.

The significance of the decision lies not only in its position on the case in question and redevelopment generally, but on the extent to which the Court went in broadening the concept of the police power and of eminent domain. In certain respects this decision is as important as was the *Euclid*, Ohio, decision in 1926, which established the constitutionality of zoning.

The case itself revolved around the right of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency to condemn a small department store in a duly established redevelopment project area for reuse by private enterprise, although the store itself was not slum housing but commercial, was not a health hazard, and, according to the plaintiffs, could not be taken merely to develop a better balanced, more attractive community.

Portions of the Court's opinion are worth quoting here at length for, as the writers see it, they go far beyond the question of redevelopment and cut across all of the powers of States and cities in such matters as zoning, subdivision regulation, and municipal esthetics.

#### SUPREME COURT SPEAKS

Said the Court about the police power: "An attempt to define its reach or trace its outer limits is fruitless, for each case must turn on its own facts. The definition is essentially the product of legislative determinations addressed to the purposes of government, purposes neither abstractly nor historically capable of complete definition. Subject to specific constitutional limitations, when the legislature has spoken, the public interest has been declared in terms well-nigh conclusive. In such cases the legislature, not the judiciary, is the main guardian of the public needs to be served by social legislation, whether it be Congress legislating concerning the District of Columbia or the States legislating concerning local affairs. This principle admits of no exception merely because the power of eminent domain is involved. The role of the judiciary in determining whether that power is being exercised for a public purpose is an extremely narrow one."

The scope of public welfare was also enlarged when the Court said:

"The values it represents are spiritual as well as physical, aesthetic as well as monetary. It is within the power of the legislature to determine that the community should be beautiful as well as healthy, spacious as well as clean, well-balanced as well as carefully patrolled. \* \* \* If those who govern the District of Columbia decide that the Nation's Capital should be beautiful as well as sanitary, there is nothing in the fifth amendment that stands in the way."

On the question of the public taking of land for private development as a public purpose, appears the statement that:

"Here one of the means chosen is the use of private enterprise for redevelopment of the area. Appellants argue that this makes the project a taking from one businessman for the benefit of another businessman. But the means of executing the project are for Congress and Congress alone to determine, once the public purpose has been established. The public end may be as well or better served through an agency of private enterprise than through a department of government. \* \* \* We cannot say that public ownership is the sole method of promoting the public purposes of community redevelopment projects. What we have said also disposes of any contention concerning the fact that certain property owners in the area may be permitted to repurchase their properties for redevelopment in harmony with the overall plan."

The Court also disposes of the right to take properties within a redevelopment area which are not slum or blighted by saying:

"Property may of course be taken for this redevelopment which, standing by itself, is innocuous and unoffending."

Two items, and two only, control the constitutionality of the police power and eminent domain according to the decision:

"(1) 'No person shall \* \* \* be deprived of \* \* \* property, without due process of law; (2) nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.'"

We believe the conclusions of the Court represent a distinct advance in outlining the scope of public authority which can be directed toward making and keeping our communities better places in which to live and work. But we cannot help wondering how far it is leading us away from the traditional American concepts of individual rights. Some exploration seems in order.

The Richmond News Leader had this to say on February 4, 1956:

#### A HARD LOOK AT REDEVELOPMENT

Delegate Delamater Davis, of Norfolk, is on exactly the right track when he urges that a thorough study be made of Virginia's laws dealing with the condemnation of private property.

"Private property is losing its importance," he said, and indeed it is. Before the deliberate onslaught of socialist forces that are more concerned with vague public benefits than with solid personal responsibilities, old guarantees of property ownership have lost their vitality.

Mr. Davis is especially concerned with the condemnation of private property for slum clearance purposes when the property is later sold to private owners for development. In brief, he is concerned with what the Federal Housing Act terms "urban redevelopment," and a great many persons share his concern. This mischievous program has made a mockery of the fifth amendment, and left all property ownership subject to the whims of the social planners.

The Founding Fathers nailed into the Constitution a flat provision that no person shall be deprived of his property without due process of law, and so there would be no misunderstanding of the phrase, or so they thought, they added this: "Nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation."

For more than 100 years, that language seemed sufficiently clear: Public use meant precisely that—something used by the public, and Government's awesome power of eminent domain was employed to acquire land for public streets and public buildings, for schoolhouses, parks, sewerlines and the like.

Where the power of eminent domain was exercised otherwise, it was by public service

corporations, whose rates are subject to public control.

But as in the case of the States and their public school systems, the Supreme Court in November 1954 found it could not let a mere Constitution stand in the path of what it viewed as social progress. The Court could not wait for the States to amend the Constitution. It amended the fifth amendment itself, to make it read, in effect:

"Provided, however, That 'public use' shall be construed to mean whatever a legislative body conceives to be 'public benefit.'"

With that decision, involving an urban redevelopment project in the District of Columbia, private property rights went down the drain. "The concept of public welfare is broad and inclusive," said Mr. Justice Douglas blandly. He cast a cool eye at the little department store involved in the litigation, and agreed that it violated no laws of public health or public safety. But "if those who govern the District of Columbia decide that the Nation's capital should be beautiful as well as sanitary, there is nothing in the fifth amendment that stands in the way." So they ran the bulldozers through Frank's Department Store at 712 Fourth Street SW.

The object in the Washington case, as the Court itself summarized it, was to take one businessman's property and sell it to another businessman. The land was not to be used by the public; it was to be sold for commercial redevelopment. But Frank's Department Store, by the Court's condemnation, was not "well-balanced."

This same travesty upon the Constitution is in prospect in the Carver redevelopment project here in Richmond; it is involved in an even larger redevelopment scheme in Norfolk. Whole blocks of generally blighted property are to be swept bare by the bulldozer state. And if in the middle of it all there stands a clean and decent home, well-kept, proudly maintained, and the owner does not want to sell? Then to hell with the owner, and seize his house anyway. Who says a man's home is his castle? There is nothing in the fifth amendment that stands in the way.

If the study proposed by Mr. Davis can suggest ways and means for preserving plain constitutional rights here in Virginia, it will be a most worthwhile investigation. Our own Virginia Constitution declares that citizens of this sovereign State "cannot be deprived of, or damaged in, their property for public uses without their own consent." It is high time that we recurred to this fundamental principle of a free society, and restored individual rights to the high pedestal they once occupied.

Very significant are the decisions of the Supreme Courts of Florida and Georgia, both of which declared "eminent domain" in urban renewal to be unconstitutional according to their respective State constitutions. Here are these decisions, in part:

#### MEMORANDUM ON FLORIDA SUPREME COURT CASE ON THE USE OF POWER OF EMINENT DOMAIN FOR REDEVELOPMENT

The court ruled that the power of eminent domain to take private real estate and resell or lease it to private business was unconstitutional under the Florida Constitution. The notes on the case follow:

"ADAMS v. HOUSING AUTHORITY OF CITY OF DAYTONA BEACH ET AL.—SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA EN BANC.—AUGUST 12, 1952—REHEARING DENIED OCTOBER 21, 1952

"Taxpayer's suit against city and city's housing authority to restrain defendants from acquiring by purchase or eminent domain certain real estate for redevelopment and resale or lease to private enterprises, and to adjudicate the constitutionality of a statute authorizing such procedure. The

Circuit Court, Volusia County, H. B. Frederick, J., granted decree for defendants and plaintiff appealed. The Supreme Court, Mathews, J., held that acquisition of real estate for such disposition was not for public use or purpose, and that the statute authorizing such procedure was unconstitutional.

"Reversed with directions.

"Terrell, J., dissented.

"1. Eminent domain: Power of eminent domain, authorizing sovereign to take property for public use or purpose when just compensation is made therefor, is clearly distinct from police power, whereunder Government may destroy or regulate use of property in order to promote health, morals and safety of a community, without making compensation for the impairment of use of property or decrease in value resulting therefrom.

"2. Eminent domain: A city has sufficient police power, under general laws relating to cities and towns, to remove or abate a blighted area without resorting to power of eminent domain. \* \* \*

"3. Eminent domain: Under power of eminent domain, city could condemn houses which are unsafe, unsanitary, or breeding grounds for disease, and leave the real estate for owners to redevelop or use within limits of a zoning ordinance.

"4. Eminent domain \* \* \* municipal corporations: Where plan of city housing authority called for sale or lease of redeveloped land to private individuals, associations, or corporations, for private commercial and industrial purposes, acquisition of title to blighted residential area to be so redeveloped was not primarily for public use or purpose, and housing authority was precluded from acquiring title by eminent domain or purchase.

"5. Eminent domain: The question of whether constitutional provisions against taking of private property for private use have been violated is ultimately for the courts.

"6. Eminent domain: Incidental benefits accruing to the public from the establishment of some private enterprise are not sufficient to make establishment of such enterprise a public purpose justifying employment of power of eminent domain.

"7. Eminent domain: When the taking of private property is for a public use or purpose, courts will not review the determination of the necessity for such taking, in the absence of fraud, bad faith, or gross abuse of discretion.

"8. Constitutional law \* \* \* eminent domain \* \* \* municipal corporations: Statute empowering city housing authority to acquire by purchase or eminent domain realty in blighted areas and make it available under certain conditions for redevelopment by private enterprise or by public agencies, denied right of citizen to acquire, possess and protect property, authorized taking of private property for private use, authorized expenditure of public funds for private purpose and authorized appropriations of public funds for private gain and profit, in violation of Florida Constitution."

Further quotations and data from the decision itself follow:

"On its face it is a 'redevelopment' plan and a mere inspection of the plan shows it to be a real estate promotion."

The plan prohibits residential use in the project area. Seventy residential structures containing 75 dwelling units and 5 nonresidential structures were to be acquired. It was asserted that "the majority of the structures are in such a dilapidated condition that they are dangerous to the occupants and not worth the consideration of being rehabilitated."

Property was to be used for industrial railroad siding, retail uses, parking areas, wholesale and restricted industry including warehousing, furniture and sheet metal shops,

bottling works, cold storage and laundry plants.

All occupants in the area were Negroes. The housing authority stated that 52 of the families were eligible for public housing and that new public housing under construction would be available for all those in the lower income bracket that wanted to apply.

"It is inconceivable that any one would seriously contend that the acquisition of real estate for the declared purposes set forth in the proposed Redevelopment Plan is for a public use or purpose. No one has ever heard of any corporation, association or individual going into any of the above mentioned businesses except for profit or gain. If the municipalities can be vested with any such power or authority, they can take over the entire field of private enterprise without limit so long as they can find a blighted area containing sufficient real estate. \* \* \*

"Incidental benefits accruing to the public from the establishment of some private enterprise is not sufficient to make the establishment of such enterprise a public purpose. In the Article on Eminent Domain, 18 Am. Jur., Sec. 45, p. 675, the author states: \* \* \* 'Every legitimate business, to a greater or less extent, indirectly benefits the public by benefitting the people who constitute the State, but that fact does not make such enterprises public businesses.'"

(NOTE.—References have been deleted. Source: Southern Reporter, November 6, 1952 (60 So. 2d 663).)

And the Georgia decision, an excerpt:

Insofar as the redevelopment plan here in question is concerned, it affirmatively appears that there is now ample housing for the people to be displaced and not one dwelling house will be erected. It follows, the object here sought is not to provide more housing for people of low income or for anyone else, and is not to relieve a housing shortage of any kind. The object is to clear away slum or blighted areas and then to have the property redeveloped by private individuals for private purposes in such manner as the city and housing authority determine to be best.

The power of eminent domain is to be exercised to accomplish this result. The

property is to be sold to people who could have no interest in acquiring the property other than as a means to make money. If the property of one individual can be taken from another for this purpose, where does the power of eminent domain stop?

Article 14, section 2, paragraph 1 of the Constitution of Georgia Code section annotated, 2-2501, provides: "The exercise of the right of eminent domain shall never be abridged, nor so construed as to prevent the General Assembly from taking property and franchises, and subjecting them to public use." It follows, the exercise of the power of eminent domain provided and sought to be applied here, if sustained must be for a 'public use.' The property here in question is admittedly to be used to provide industrial sites for private use and private gain. "Public use" means just what it says and means that the power of eminent domain can never be exercised to acquire property to be used by private individuals solely for private use and private gain.

While Georgia modified its constitution later, the basic reasoning of the Georgia's Supreme Court decision was not altogether set aside.

Another example which illustrates the inequities of eminent domain's use is found in the Washington renewal agency where they took property from one private business, as I understand this case, a warehouse I believe it was belonging to Standard Oil, and transferred it to another private businessman, an auto parts dealer. Although constitutionally private property cannot be taken for public use without just compensation, here a private business was taken from a private businessman and transferred to another private businessman. The major damage, therefore, is the taking of private property for private use, which is unconstitutional, as I see it, no matter how you slice it.

Relocation housing is the next subject and is a part of urban renewal; the housing of those displaced by slum clearance. Relocation housing is a basic require-

ment of the urban renewal law. The seven part workable plan requested by the HHFA as a prerequisite for Federal aid embraces these objectives:

First. Adequate local housing, health, and safety codes and ordinances, effectively enforced.

Second. A comprehensive plan for community development.

Third. Analysis of blighted neighborhoods to determine treatment needed.

Fourth. Effective administrative organization to carry out the improvement program.

Fifth. Ability to meet financial requirements.

Sixth. Rehousing families displaced by urban renewal and other governmental activities.

Seventh. Citizen participation and support for local renewal objectives.

Part 6 clearly is an integral part of urban renewal.

There are two basic types of housing available: First, private construction through FHA insured mortgages; second, public housing, existing or new units, constructed with Federal money. The FHA help—section 220—is specifically designed for help whenever urban renewal is involved or whenever any Government action results in displacing families.

Public housing, the other alternative, may be used to relocate families either in existing or in new housing units. The housing law of 1949 established urban renewal as title I and public housing as title III. In practice the two are closely linked as the congressional hearings show, almost by definition.

In fact, there is a remarkable connection between urban renewal and more new public housing units. The following list shows some urban renewal projects by location and date and the new public housing units which were contracted for shortly thereafter:

Public housing units under annual contributions contracts, in process but not completed, in selected cities with slum clearance and urban renewal programs under title I of the Housing Act of 1949 as amended by title III of the Housing Act of 1954

| City                  | Slum clearance project approval dates | Capital grants reservations | Number of public housing units | Dates annual contributions contracts signed | City                | Slum clearance project approval dates | Capital grants reservations | Number of public housing units | Dates annual contributions contracts signed |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|---|---------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|---|
| Putnam, Conn.         | February 1956                         | \$1,687,912                 | 124                            | July 1956                                   | Auburn, Ala.        | December 1954                         | \$27,255                    | 50                             | June 1955                                   |
| Lawrence, Mass.       | March 1956                            | 1,718,691                   | 137                            | January 1958                                | Birmingham, Ala.    | March 1956                            | 3,158,941                   | 1,250                          | July 1956                                   |
| Somerville, Mass.     | March 1954                            | 1,023,164                   | 42                             | April 1955                                  | Cullman, Ala.       | March 1955                            | 175,179                     | 60                             | Do.   |
| Portsmouth, N.H.      | January 1955                          | 995,299                     | 124                            | July 1956                                   | Decatur, Ala.       | February 1957                         | 278,113                     | 200                            | June 1957                                   |
| North Tarrytown, N.Y. | April 1955                            | 433,033                     | 130                            | June 1955                                   | Demopolis, Ala.     | January 1956                          | 121,810                     | 100                            | May 1956                                    |
| Syracuse, N.Y.        | May 1956                              | 395,233                     | 318                            | July 1956                                   | Elba, Ala.          | June 1955                             | 141,729                     | 34                             | July 1956                                   |
| Wilmington, Del.      | March 1954                            | 2,000,719                   | 400                            | June 1955                                   | Huntsville, Ala.    | July 1956                             | 1,149,158                   | 539                            | June 1957                                   |
| Asbury Park, N.J.     | June 1957                             | 446,000                     | 113                            | November 1957                               | Sheffield, Ala.     | October 1956                          | 197,554                     | 150                            | Do.   |
| Edison, N.J.          | January 1956                          | 710,000                     | 60                             | July 1956                                   | Augusta, Ga.        | November 1955                         | 1,115,291                   | 525                            | July 1956                                   |
| Hoboken, N.J.         | February 1956                         | 2,085,959                   | 416                            | September 1957                              | Bainbridge, Ga.     | August 1955                           | 248,372                     | 36                             | Do.   |
| Jersey City, N.J.     | do.                                   | 9,789,268                   | 712                            | June 1956                                   | Cartersville, Ga.   | September 1956                        | 228,000                     | 60                             | March 1958                                  |
| Morristown, N.J.      | July 1954                             | 799,372                     | 56                             | June 1955                                   | Columbus, Ga.       | August 1955                           | 1,781,023                   | 242                            | June 1956                                   |
| New Brunswick, N.J.   | do.                                   | 1,039,498                   | 246                            | Do.   | Douglas, Ga.        | November 1955                         | 1,056,640                   | 50                             | July 1956                                   |
| Passaic, N.J.         | March 1955                            | 888,866                     | 204                            | July 1956                                   | Lawrenceville, Ga.  | August 1956                           | 53,600                      | 40                             | May 1957                                    |
| Paterson, N.J.        | March 1956                            | 2,461,149                   | 500                            | Do.   | Savannah, Ga.       | October 1955                          | 4,752,000                   | 337                            | July 1956                                   |
| Princeton, N.J.       | August 1955                           | 520,000                     | 50                             | Do.   | Waynesboro, Ga.     | July 1955                             | 113,218                     | 50                             | Do.   |
| Beaver Falls, Pa.     | July 1956                             | 359,646                     | 44                             | Do.   | Paris, Ky.          | December 1955                         | 128,903                     | 26                             | Do.   |
| Darby, Pa.            | November 1955                         | 385,895                     | 36                             | July 1956                                   | Dyersburg, Tenn.    | December 1955                         | 14,914                      | 155                            | January 1958                                |
| Harrisburg, Pa.       | May 1956                              | 2,656,024                   | 660                            | Do.   | Franklin, Tenn.     | April 1956                            | 260,000                     | 78                             | July 1956                                   |
| McKeesport, Pa.       | December 1954                         | 1,236,105                   | 300                            | Do.   | Gallatin, Tenn.     | May 1956                              | 221,815                     | 60                             | June 1956                                   |
| Sharon, Pa.           | May 1957                              | 490,865                     | 50                             | November 1957                               | Johnson City, Tenn. | January 1955                          | 724,377                     | 100                            | July 1956                                   |
| Danville, Va.         | March 1955                            | 3,621,516                   | 124                            | June 1956                                   | Lebanon, Tenn.      | December 1955                         | 525,733                     | 120                            | February 1958                               |
| Richmond, Va.         | March 1956                            | 1,657,668                   | 894                            | May 1956                                    | Manchester, Tenn.   | January 1956                          | 52,950                      | 40                             | July 1956                                   |
| South Norfolk, Va.    | July 1954                             | 841,457                     | 100                            | July 1956                                   |                     |                                       |                             |                                |   |

Source: "HHFA Urban Renewal Project Directory," June 30, 1957, HHFA Public Housing Administration, "Development Progress Directory," Mar. 31, 1958.

That this may be more than coincidental is documented by the Chattanooga case. The mayor was given assurance from insurance, banking, and real estate leaders that private enter-

prise stood ready to supply the necessary housing. Yet the field man of the HHFA stated that they first must file an application for 1,000 public housing units before they could qualify for urban re-

newal funds. See page 1002 congressional hearings, House Appropriations Committee, Housing bill 1958. This has been variously called the "entering wedge" of the "shoehorn," the "black-



jack," or "the trap" whereby urban renewal is used as the entree for public housing.

Well, we do not want public housing as an urban renewal blackjack operation. Other Members have done a fine job on this floor, including the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] in times past telling us about some of the dangers of public housing. So have many other Members on both sides of the aisle who have discussed the problems. These are the lessons learned from over a half million units. It is no longer a future speculation.

The inherent weaknesses in public housing are threefold as I see it; they are sociological, economic, and political. I have some documentation which I will mention. Here, for example, is a quotation from Judge Francis J. McCabe of Rhode Island who says:

[From the Providence (R.I.) Journal, Mar. 20, 1954]

**DELINQUENTS MAKE SLUMS, AND NOT THE REVERSE, JUDGE MCCABE DECLARES**

"Slums don't make delinquency. Delinquent people make slums," Judge Francis J. McCabe, of the Rhode Island Juvenile Court said yesterday.

Public housing projects don't wipe out juvenile and adult delinquency by eliminating slums, he said. Delinquents are more plentiful in the projects, he said, because they move into the projects from scattered areas and thereby become more concentrated.

Judge McCabe said housing projects were all right for temporary homes, but for permanent dwellings, they are "undignified monstrosities" and look like prison "cell tiers."

Here are some of the findings of a Senate committee:

**JUVENILE DELINQUENCY—INTERIM REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, U.S. SENATE, 83D CONGRESS, 2D SESSION**

Juvenile delinquency in public housing areas: The public housing areas of Boston were also described as centers of much juvenile delinquency. There are at present 38 housing projects within the city, varying from small 5-house developments with 10 families to a project housing 1,149 families and having a population of 4,500 residents. There are under construction in Boston four other housing developments and one in the planning stage. When the entire program is completed at the end of 1954 it is expected that the population of the 15,000 units will approximate 60,000 people.

A recent breakdown of the operation of the Boston Housing Authority showed that public housing served 12,110 families with a population of over 50,000 persons. A little over one-half of that population, 26,000, were under 21 years of age. In 1,197 of these families there was no father in the home.

Vandalism in housing projects is costing the housing authority \$40,000 per year, of which \$35,000 represents glass breakage alone.

The housing project areas have been the site of many juvenile gangs and gang activities, as well as crimes committed by juveniles. One of the most vicious of these crimes occurred in the Heath Street housing project in October 1953. A juvenile of 16 years of age stabbed to death another boy 17 years of age. This housing project is in the Roxbury section and has been the scene of much juvenile gang activity. Many members of the juvenile gangs have been known to carry knives, zip guns, and other weapons and to stage drinking parties at which numbers of them become intoxicated.

Another comment comes from the Newark Star-Ledger of August 29, 1956:

**CITY HOUSING SPAWNS GANGS**

(By John McDowell)

The gentleman shall remain anonymous. His job is selling—and collecting. His route covers a little city of nearly 1,000 families in a Newark public housing project. And publicity, of the delinquency variety, is something he can do without.

But the story he told one day led to one of the most shocking phases of the Star-Ledger's grassroots study of the juvenile delinquency problem in Newark.

"I started out one evening to do some collecting in the project," the routeman recalled.

"I got in an elevator and two teen-age girls got in at the same time; they couldn't have been more than 15 or 16. We started up, and one of the girls casually extended me an invitation—for a price; and her companion chimed in with her bid.

"We've got an apartment we can go to—there's nothing to worry about," one of the girls told me," the routeman said.

"I tried to laugh it off—and I got out at the first stop and got out of the project. I don't want any part of that kind of trouble."

It was a difficult story to believe. But, in ensuing days, 10 different families living in various units of the development, made similar reports to the Star-Ledger.

Several persons reported that older women in the development were recruiting teen-age girls for prostitution, and making their apartments available to them.

One of the tenants reported that the manager of the development had evicted one of the women who had made little effort to conceal her illicit operations.

The Star-Ledger reported its findings to the management of the project.

The manager admitted the city's housing projects have prostitution problems, but said he had heard no reports of young girls being involved.

"Our trouble has always been mainly with women in the project, not girls," he said "We keep a close watch for such activities, and if we find evidence of prostitution we evict the person involved."

The manager admitted it was disturbing to have such a report come from families in different buildings within the project.

"If teen-age girls are being recruited by older women, it certainly is a serious matter," he said. "But, to date, we have received no such complaints in this office, and we can't take action unless we have something definitely to go on. If tenants bring these reports to us, and give us leads on the parties involved, you can be assured action will be taken."

The Star-Ledger also transmitted the reports of a teen-age vice ring to a Newark police official. The reaction was the same.

"If these people will turn over definite leads to us, a thorough investigation will be made," the police official said. "We can't go into a housing project without something definite to work on."

Although this was the only recurring report received by the Star-Ledger of organized teen-age vice in city housing projects, one of the most frequent complaints voiced by tenants concerned youthful promiscuity.

"Too many parents in this project let their kids run wild, and at all hours of the night," one housewife said.

"I've been married 10 years, but some of the things I've seen going on between the older boys and girls in this project—and the language they use—makes me blush."

Another young housewife, with two small children, said:

"Some of the teenagers here don't seem to have any sense of morality. They carry on right in broad daylight—in the halls, in the elevators, on the roof, and even in the

courtyards. And at night, you never know what you're going to see. They act just like animals."

It is difficult to assess the validity of such reports without living in a project and being close to conditions day after day for an extended period of time.

The Star-Ledger spent several days and a number of night-time hours in various Newark housing projects during its delinquency study. Except for instances of rowdiness and outbursts of youthful gutter profanity, the developments during the day seemed as orderly as could be expected in small cities of several thousand persons.

During the night hours, however, the Star-Ledger observed in several projects increasing activity by teenagers. Few adults were out after dark, and almost no women. But, as late as midnight, groups of teenagers—boys and girls—were in the courtyards and lingering in the halls.

There was a buildup of rowdiness and noise, and heavy petting sessions seemed to be a popular pastime. At one project, police—apparently summoned by a disgruntled tenant—arrived to break up a group of teenagers who had been singing and shouting in a courtyard long after the curfew hour.

The youths vanished into the buildings with the arrival of police, but after the officers left, they reassembled and the uproar was renewed.

Housing Authority officials insist there is no serious delinquency problem in the city's projects. But the repeated complaints voiced to the Star-Ledger by tenants—plus the off-the-record concern expressed by staff members of several projects—indicate otherwise.

And a shakeup by the Housing Authority this summer of managers of various projects seemingly would indicate that all is not serene behind the scenes.

Several of the projects have definite gang problems—particularly the Reverend Hayes Homes in the heart of the Mohawks' territory.

"It's so bad here, with these kids running wild, that a decent person is afraid to go in the halls at night," a mother in the Hayes Homes said.

"You can't send your child to the store on an errand," another mother said. "The gang is always robbing children, and if you say anything you get nothing but abuse and threats."

The Otto Kretchmer Homes on Dayton Street is another teen-age trouble spot.

A major gang war was narrowly averted at that project in July.

The trouble started over two teen-age girls living in the project. The girls got in a fight over boy friends—and the boy friend of the girl who lost the fight decided to avenge her defeat.

The following afternoon he brought his gang—two carloads of teen-agers armed with knives, chains, broken bottles and clubs—into the project. Teen-agers living in the project, unprepared for the invasion, took to cover. But a challenge for a war was issued, and accepted.

Police, however, were alerted and were waiting the next day when a force of some 50 outside teen-agers, armed for battle, arrived on the scene.

And a shakedown of the Kretchmer Homes showed the project teen-agers were fully prepared. A large-sized arsenal of spiked clubs, knives, pipes and chains was uncovered. And, on the rooftops of project buildings, police found stockpiles of paper sack bombs filled with gravel, milk bottles and bricks.

"Eight teen-agers were arrested in that incident," the project manager told the Star-Ledger. "But, as far as we have been able to learn, juvenile court has taken no action against them."

Since that time, incidentally, two regular police officers have been assigned to patrol the Kretchmer Homes at night and there

have been no further breakouts of gang violence.

Even in the projects where there are no major gang problems, tenants time after time reported to the Star-Ledger that teenage defiance, vandalism, rowdiness, violence, and drinking are increasing.

In project after project, the Star-Ledger found signs of vandalism. Many halls and stairways were darkened—light bulbs smashed by youths; broken windows, mutilated mailboxes and emergency firehoses missing.

Even housing authority officials admit the firehose problem is serious. Brass fittings are repeatedly stolen, and in other cases the hoses have been used to flood hallways.

In some instances, tenants reported that teen-agers threaten them with violence when they take their complaints to police.

One angry husband reported: "Night after night, a gang assembled outside our building and raised hell for hours, shouting, fighting, cursing, singing. I'd ask them to go away and they'd just get worse. Finally, I called the police one night. The police came, and the kids disappeared. But when the police left, the kids came out again, swinging car chains and shouting for me to come down and fight them."

A housewife said: "I was down in the courtyard one afternoon and a gang of boys began spitting at me and calling me vile names. I told my husband about it, and he went out to talk to them. They pulled knives and threatened him."

A mother said: "This is a terrible place to bring up children. You can't leave them out to play alone—and they see so many bad things, you wonder how they can grow up decently."

A father said: "A night watchman in this project reported a boy to police. The boy was arrested for car theft, and a few nights later a gang of teen-agers beat up the watchman."

A housing project employee said: "The situation is getting worse all the time. It's about time somebody did something to bring these kids under control. When you see them carry on, with no sense of responsibility and only contempt for authority, you can't help wondering what kind of parents they're going to make for our next generation."

In addition to the sociological problems that it entailed in public housing, let me go on to the economic significance and talk to you very quickly about four aspects of the Federal public housing subsidies. All of this should strike home to those of you who are vitally interested in fiscal responsibility, balanced budget, and the prevention of inflation.

There are one known and three hidden subsidies taxpayers pay on Federal public housing:

A. The known one: Outright Federal subsidy annual contributions to pay somebody else's rent. The difference between total cost and the rent paid by tenants, a large amount.

B. The three hidden ones:

First. Local tax losses due to exemption from school, personal, real property, and other local taxes—estimated by Public Housing Administration at one-half of the Federal subsidy.

Second. Federal income taxes lost on Federal public housing tax-exempt bonds held by wealthy investors.

Third. The Federal administrative cost of the Public Housing Administration. No telling how much this is.

As to the tax-exempt bonds every annual contribution (subsidy) contract commits you—the taxpayers—to pay

subsidies for 40 years. The local public housing bonds which are issued to finance these projects are the only Government obligations which are both federally tax-exempt and federally guaranteed as to principal and interest.

Here is what the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board told a U.S. Senate committee:

One important new factor in the market which is very disturbing to us at the Federal Reserve is the tax-exempt bonds which are being issued to finance public housing. Not only do such issues absorb some of the funds that would otherwise supply a market for Government bonds or for mortgages generated by new private construction, but they afford an opportunity for wealthy individuals and corporations to reduce legally their income tax payments in a period when it is essential that tax revenues be as large as possible.

Both Democrats and Republicans in Congress threw up their hands in horror at a similar financing proposal for highway construction. Incredible, but true.

Next, the political aspects: Again I am hurrying on. Here I have a statement from Mr. Kimbrew, housing manager of the Edison Court in Miami, who said to all tenants of Edison Court, "Tomorrow is voting day. Either we win or lose some public housing in Miami. If you appreciate what public housing did for you, then go to the polls tomorrow, Tuesday the 27th, and vote 'Yes.'"

This was sent to everybody who lived in the project. He said, "Every tenant is expected to vote 'Yes' tomorrow." He is very forthright.

#### SPECIAL BULLETIN

EDISON COURTS MANAGEMENT OFFICE,

June 26, 1950.

To all tenants of Edison Courts:

Tomorrow, June 27 is voting day. Tomorrow we either win or lose more public housing in Miami. If you appreciate what public housing did for you (and is still doing) when you needed housing so badly, then go to the polls tomorrow, Tuesday, the 27th, and vote "Yes."

Every tenant in this project will be expected to vote "Yes" tomorrow. The polls are open from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m., located in Edison High School Auditorium, Northwest 2d Avenue and 61st Street.

If you need transportation contact our office.

V. M. KIMBREW,  
Housing Manager.

POLITICAL DANGERS AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR CORRUPTION INHERENT IN PUBLIC HOUSING

Here is a statement by Langdon W. Post, former chairman of the New York City Housing Authority, later regional director for the San Francisco region of the Federal Public Housing Authority, and nationally known proponent of public housing:

Another danger signal flashes from the political implications and opportunities inherent in a vast public housing program. It is obvious that housing is now in politics, and must of necessity be so if we are to house decently the poor of our cities. Until 1938, there was no money to be made in public housing and little political preferment to be gained by its espousal. Now the picture is different; a large housing program benefits not only the slum dwellers but business in general. If the average businessman sometimes shows a lack of intelligence and foresight, he always has his sense of opportunism developed to a high degree.

In a housing program there are land to be bought, houses to be built, and tenants to be selected. Each step holds great possibilities for the politician and the businessman. The real estate operator has land to sell. The banks have bad mortgages which they are anxious to have rescued. The architect has plans for sale. There are building contracts to be awarded. The inhabitants of the slums are tumbling over themselves to get into the developments, which means that there will not only be the usual jobs for those in control to give out, but apartments as well.

This last plum is a new brand of political fruit which has enormous possibilities for exploitation. Imagine the golden opportunities latent in a \$500 million housing program in New York City. Commissions, profits, fees, jobs, and finally, apartments for at least 200,000 voters. It is a bonanza beyond the wildest dreams of the most optimistic politician.

The fear of possible political exploitation is almost the only justified one which I have heard the opponents of public housing express. I confess that it has made me hesitate at times, and my 4-year experience with the New York City Housing Authority, in which time we built apartments for about 5,000 voters, has not served to allay my fears.

This is from a gentleman who believes in public housing.

Another one: "Public Housing in Politics." This is an article by Mr. Abrams, of New York. Here is what he said:

BILL TO SEIZE CONTROL OF CITY HOUSING PROJECTS ATTACKED

(By Charles Abrams)

The bill to make State Housing Commissioner Herman T. Stichman censor of the city's housing projects is the latest of many attempts to seize control of the \$700 million N.Y.C. Housing Authority. The bill, drawn in Stichman's office, would compel housing authorities to submit every project to Stichman's scrutiny. This would include both Federal and city-aided undertakings in which the State has played no part.

The bill, introduced by two Queens legislators, is partly the offshoot of the ugly fight to keep public housing out of Queens, where a few key members of the Washington anti-public housing lobby have joined a clique of troublemakers in fanning up race hatred among Queens homeowners. The owners have been told that the public housing projects lower realty values and that selection of some Negroes in the projects would lead to a Negro inundation of the whole borough. Though the claims have been proven false wherever mixed public housing has been set up, the myth persists and the sinister propaganda machine rolls mercilessly on.

Stichman's aim seems to be entirely political. GOP control of the housing authority's operations would be a political coup. The N.Y.C. Housing Authority looms as the big plum in the political orchard and the politician who dominates the housing authority controls the city's political destiny.

Within a few years the families in housing projects will be nearly 10 percent of the city's total, and the investment of the authority will exceed \$2 billion with all this means in construction contracts, patronage and other rewards for the worthy.

Selection of sites enables carving out blocks where hostile voters are numerous and then retenanting the projects with those who vote right, while tenant relocation on vacant areas could change a whole neighborhood's political complexion overnight.

Under proper procedures the city's independent planning commission is supposed to lay down a general plan indicating sites for housing.

But this is not what has been happening. Opposition by Queens Borough President Burke has forced the authority to avoid Queens and select occupied sites in slums with all it means in hardship to the occupants that are displaced.

Recently a small committee headed by Robert Moses was appointed to pick sites suitable to all the powers that be. Planning Chairman Robert F. Wagner, Jr., was belatedly made a member.

Amid the scramble for control of site selection, now comes the Republican housing commissioner demanding that he and he alone be made housing arbiter. This would put control of the forthcoming billion dollar federally aided as well as the \$300 million city-aided projects in Stichman's hands and make him czar of every housing authority in the State.

Under his fantastic proposal, five agencies representing all three levels of government would have to approve every plan and every change in plan with all that it means in slowing up progress and retdape. Stichman's delays in the past have caused projects to be held up for months, and administrative costs on his State-aided undertakings have been said to be more than three times that of city-aided and twice that of federally aided undertakings.

Both the planning commission and the housing authorities of the State were set up with safeguards against political meddling. But efforts by politicians to move into housing have begun.

The Stichman bill would now collapse its independence with a simple blow. The bill should not only be defeated, it should highlight the fact that the people of the city will be ever vigilant in opposing any effort by any political clique, whatever its earmarkings, to make the underprivileged the plaything of politicians.

This gentleman who has been for public housing does see the danger politically, and says so.

That is enough on public housing from the standpoint of economic, sociological, and political dangers, although there is much, much more. Now, who has turned down public housing.

I have here a list of cities. I would like to go over them in detail, but I will pick out a few very quickly: Shreveport, La.; Rockford, Ill.; Natchez, Miss.; High Point, N.C.; and there are others here, South Haven, Mich. These people have considered public housing and voted it down for sound reasons.

Shreveport, La., property owners decided on local effort for slum clearance and housing:

[From the Shreveport (La.) Times, Aug. 14, 1957]

**PUBLIC HOUSING IN BOTTOMS VOTED DOWN—  
DEFEATED BY 315 BALLOTS**

Public housing in the Bottoms was rejected by Shreveport voters by a narrow margin yesterday.

The vote was 9,948 in favor and 9,633 against, according to unofficial, but complete returns.

Mayor James C. Gardner, in conceding defeat of the city-sponsored low-rent housing project for Negroes, said he would accept the mandate of the people.

"We did the best that we could, but got beat," Gardner said.

"The people of Shreveport," he said, "have indicated that they do not desire slum clearance in the Bottoms. We accept that decision and will be guided accordingly in our actions."

One result of the defeat, Gardner said earlier, will be repayment of \$42,500 in ad-

vance planning money to the Public Housing Administration.

**OPPONENTS**

Major opponents of the Federal housing project were the Shreveport Property Owners Association and the junior chamber of commerce.

Floyd R. Hodges, president of the SPOA, said, "The people of Shreveport are to be congratulated on having set an example for the entire country in rejecting Federal control and retaining the fundamental principles of home rule."

Robert Stacy, Jr., president of the Jaycees, said in New York last night the Jaycees will "ask Shreveporters to unite in efforts to rid our city of all its slum areas wherever they exist, through the action of local citizens and enforcement of our local health, sanitation, and housing laws, and we renew our support of such citywide slum clearance."

N. B. Carstarphen, Caddo Parish Democratic executive committee chairman, said yesterday's election was one of the most trouble free ever conducted here.

"We had only one small complaint," said Carstarphen. "Even with the comparatively heavy turnout, we had no delays at the polls."

Although only 315 votes spelled defeat for the project, it was rejected in 33 precincts in the city, leaving only 10, including 2 Negro precincts, voting for it.

The Negro precincts were overwhelmingly in favor of the project, voting 644 to 44 in one and 434 to 24 in the other. The Negro total was 1,078 to 68.

The South Highlands section, with four boxes, was the only one to vote in favor of the project. Including precincts 21, 22, 25, and 26, the total vote there was 1,164 in favor and 1,129 against.

Queensborough fairgrounds, Cedar Grove, and Broadmoor all tallied against the proposal. The biggest gap of the three was in Queensborough fairgrounds where six boxes voted it down 1,433 to 1,049 against.

The six boxes in Broadmoor downed the measure by a narrow margin—only 20 votes—with 1,687 against and 1,667 for. Cedar Grove registered 549 votes against the project and 401 for it.

**NEGRO BOXES**

The precincts in which the measure carried were the two Negro boxes, 39 and 40; the courthouse, precinct 5; Broadmoor Junior High, precinct 12; Arthur Circle School, precinct 11; No. 9 fire station, precinct 23; Nelson's Garage, precinct 26; Municipal Auditorium, precinct 29; Allendale School, precinct 30; and Caddo Heights School, precinct 36.

Cost of the proposed project which would have eliminated 20 acres of the 60 acres of slums in the Bottoms was placed at \$3,767-665 by the PHA.

The property owners in the Bottoms signed pledges that they would correct slum conditions in the area within 1 year from the date the housing project was abandoned.

The city council is scheduled to mark the official death knell of the 250-unit public housing project at 10 a.m. Thursday in a special session when official returns will be tabulated.

Defeat of the project came as a surprise in many quarters. But some observers noted the heavy campaigning in the latter days of the battle by both sides, particularly the property owners association.

City officials were none too confident early yesterday when it became apparent many voters had become confused over contradictory statements being issued by both sides.

One of the most effective weapons used by the SPOA in influencing defeat of the project was the cry poponents were planning to build \$15,000 apartments for residents in the Bottoms.

And here is another one from one of the aldermen of Natchez, Miss. They want no part of a "direct dole."

[From the Natchez (Miss.) Democrat, Feb. 13, 1957]

**ALDERMEN KILL HOUSING PROJECT 8-TO-4  
VOTE—STREET PAVING AND JAIL IMPROVEMENT BONDS SOLD—WOULD ABOLISH HOUSING COMMISSION**

The mayor and board of aldermen last night killed the proposal to construct a 200-unit public housing project in Natchez, voting eight to four against adopting any of the resolutions submitted by the Natchez Public Housing Authority which would have authorized the project.

The aldermen later in the meeting voted unanimously to instruct the city attorney to draft a resolution rescinding the previous action of the aldermen in authorizing the creating of the Natchez Housing Authority.

The action killing the public housing project proposed for Natchez followed the introduction of three resolutions by Clyde Mullins, secretary for the housing authority. These resolutions provided for application for authorization for 200 units; for application for a temporary loan of \$40,000 and for adopting of an amended cooperation agreement."

The amended cooperation agreement as proposed by the housing authority provided for a minimum of 200 housing units; location of the project on slum sites and removal of substantially an equal number of slum or substandard houses as there would be new units; and changes in zoning in the city in instances where the city governing authorities deem it advisable and necessary.

Before a vote was called on the resolutions, Mayor Watkins opened the matter for remarks from persons in the audience who were favorable or unfavorable to the housing project.

Several spoke against the housing project and several for. Among those speaking for the project were members of the Natchez Better Business League who were in attendance.

At the close of the discussion each resolution was offered on motion of Alderman W. R. Chisum and seconded by Alderman Leroy Cobb.

The vote on each of the resolutions showed Aldermen Chisum, Cobb, William Freeze, and Ollie Hall voting for the resolutions and Alderman Randall Ferguson, William H. Parker, A. V. Davis, Jr., Hayden Kaiser, Tom Radigan, Robert Montgomery, Joe Sam Moritz, and O. C. Montgomery voting against.

Alderman Parker stated that he did not approve the Public Housing Act as passed and did not believe that it would be for the greatest benefit to the people of Natchez. He suggested that necessary action to clear slums be taken on a local level.

Alderman Davis pointed out that he was opposed to the project as a direct dole and not being for the best interests of Natchez and its citizens.

Alderman Radigan declared that with 1337 vacant houses and apartments in Natchez there was no need for an additional 200.

Alderman Bob Montgomery stated that he felt that such a project as the public housing would destroy the private initiative and incentive of citizens to make and earn a living and run their own homes and thus was opposed to it.

Alderman Hall said he favored the project because he felt that it was for the best interests of the city to do so.

Alderman O. C. Montgomery stated that he felt that the city of Natchez was big enough to straighten out its own slum problems without having to go to Washington to get it done.

Alderman Ferguson, members of the special investigating committee on housing, stated that he felt that now that the housing project was rejected that the city should come

forward with some sound and substantial program for clearing slums in the city.

He further stated that the Natchez Housing Authority had done an outstanding job and deserved the commendation and thanks of the mayor and board of aldermen.

He offered a motion urging the mayor to address a letter to all members of the housing authority expressing the appreciation of the aldermen for their untiring work and efforts.

High Point, N.C., thinks public housing will do more harm than good, and that it is not sound to line up at the Federal feed trough.

[From the High Point (N.C.) Enterprise, Feb. 16, 1950]

#### FEDERAL HOUSING

Does High Point need any new grocery stores, drugstores, or clothing stores? Should medical and dental care be made available to all High Point citizens at whatever they are able to pay for it? How many High Pointers would like to see a new bank or two enter the local field? Do we need a new newspaper or a new radio station? A new hotel? New and diversified industries? Almost every High Pointer would answer "Yes" to one or more of those questions.

But that does not mean that the average High Pointer wants the Federal Government to come into town to operate tax-free stores, banks, medical centers, newspapers, radio stations, hotel, and industries.

The admission of the need does not mean that we want the need met through socialism.

We are in complete agreement with the High Point Housing Authority that High Point needs more residential units to replace substandard units. We also understand the feeling that as long as others are getting help—if anything that fosters socialism can be so termed—High Point might just as well line up at the trough. But that is a feeling, not a sound deduction.

Socialism is socialism—whether it is extreme socialism as goes by the name of communism in Russia, Fabian socialism such as the Labor Party brought to England, or gradual and well-disguised socialism which is being put over in the United States under the labels "New Deal" and "Fair Deal."

And socialism, which never has helped for long to solve the problems of the little man who helps put it over, is the greatest danger of democratic capitalism, out of which grew America's unequal standard of living.

There are strong arguments for the proposal that High Point seek Federal money with which to build 200 low-rent housing units. J. D. Cox, D. A. Dowdy, Dr. C. S. Grayson, S. D. Clapp, Charles F. Carroll, and Bunn Hackney are able men who have given generously of their time and talents to the housing authority. There is not a man in the group who has any affection for socialism. We doubt that there is a man in the group who would suggest Federal housing in preference to privately financed housing. Probably their position is that a Federal project is the quickest way to meet the needs most everyone will admit.

But quick cure nostrums are of very doubtful value, as none know better than Dr. Grayson and Druggist Dowdy. We wonder if either have analyzed the Federal medicine, being dispensed by Truman and company, with regard to its ultimate effect upon the body politic.

Maybe they have, maybe they have good arguments for Federal housing that we don't know. Likewise, maybe the opponents of the present-day trend of the Federal Government have arguments which the members of the housing authority have not considered carefully.

As we understand it, the formal application for Federal housing aid must be ap-

proved by the city council. Would it not, therefore, be a good idea for the council to arrange a referendum on the subject before the application is actually filed? And for public discussions to be had. We feel certain that High Point's two radio stations and weekly newspaper, like this paper, would be glad to see that the full facts and best arguments on both sides were presented to the public. And we doubt that the cost would amount to anything as the referendum could be held in connection with the May primaries.

There may be better reasons for the Federal Government to enter into the housing business than there are for the Federal Government to compete on a tax-free basis with those who run stores, practice law or medicine, and manufacture furniture and hosiery. But so far we have never heard them.

Quick cures are usually the products of quacks with a flare for promotion. It is our belief that Federal housing is just exactly that—and in the long run will do a hundred times more harm than good. Maybe we are in the minority. Maybe the trend toward socialism has taken complete hold of the majority. Maybe the democratic capitalism upon which this country was built is doomed. Political developments of the next decade will give the answer. But in the meantime, why not find out how the people of High Point like this immediate proposal?

Rockford, Ill., rejected Federal housing saying, "We won't take the Federal money just because it's there—somebody else can have the money and the headaches."

[From the Rockford (Ill.) Morning Star, Jan. 4, 1950]

#### CITY REJECTS U.S. HOUSING PLAN, 14 TO 4—400-UNIT PROPOSAL NOW IS DEAD

Rockford City Council voted 14 to 4 Tuesday night against joining the Winnebago Housing Authority in seeking Federal funds for construction of 400 low-rent housing units in the city.

Pressure from the Rockford Real Estate Board and the Rockford Chamber of Commerce was credited by Al O. Hougan, housing authority secretary, for the defeat. "This kills it," he said. Without city cooperation, the authority cannot ask for the Federal aid.

Rockford is one of the few cities in the country to reject participation in the 810,000-dwelling-unit program authorized by the 1949 Federal Housing Act. A number of Illinois communities already have obtained funds for preliminary planning under the act.

#### SOUGHT FEDERAL FUNDS

The housing committee report on which the council voted was submitted by Alderman Milton Lundstrom, housing committee chairman. It called for cooperation with the housing authority in seeking preliminary funds for conducting a survey of housing needs in the city and planning for the housing project. The city later would be asked to enter into a more detailed cooperative agreement.

Voting against the report were Aldermen C. Henry Bodin, Thomas H. McDonnell, Charles E. Garlock, Jr., William J. Burns, Fred G. Camlin, Clyde F. Weingartner, John Cason, Peter P. Cicero, Harold E. Peterson, Benjamin Schleicher, Gustaf A. Johnson, Clarence J. McCue, Alga Reece and Thorsten Thorstenson.

Voting for the report were Aldermen Eric J. Anderson, Lundstrom, Francis A. Bartel and Oscar E. Hallberg. Alderman Marion Haste was absent.

#### CITES NEED HERE

In support of the report, Lundstrom declared that the low-rent housing should be constructed for the aged and blind. "I sin-

cerely believe that we can use more low-income group housing," he said.

Alderman Cason stated that no location for the proposed project had been announced and that he would not vote for it until this was done. At a housing committee meeting recently held to discuss the proposal, Cason declared that he was against locating it in his ward.

"They want our acquiescence for construction of more nontaxable property in the city," Alderman Clyde Weingartner said. He argued that public housing costs more to construct than does privately financed housing.

Aldermen Peterson and McDonnell argued that persons who now advocate enlisting Federal aid for low-rent housing had previously fought against city cooperation for the construction of at least 446 privately financed units in the past.

"What is the Federal Government going to do with the other housing projects it already has in Rockford?" Alderman Johnson asked. Only the Blackhawk Court project, which is controlled by the local housing authority, is a low-rent project. Higher rents are charged for the approximately 600-home units in other governmental housing projects in and around the city.

An attempt by Lundstrom to have Hougan explain the city's obligation in approving the initial step and to answer the question whether the city could back out after a housing survey was made were ignored by the council.

[From the Rockford (Ill.) Morning Star, Dec. 29, 1949]

#### HOUSING HANDOUT

There is no good purpose in our spending city money and asking the Federal Government to spend Federal money for subsidy housing if there is no pressing demand for such Federal housing. Here is one field in which this city should not bid for money merely because money is being passed around; for the end result of putting that gift money into subsidized housing may not be good for the town. The less in-lieu-of-taxes shelter that we have here, and the more fair-payment-of-taxes housing that we have, the better for everybody.

It has been proposed that we bid for 400 Federal housing units to be erected within the city limits of Rockford. If our bid were heeded, we would have 400 more units on which no property tax is paid, but on which a maximum payment of 10 percent of gross rental would be paid in lieu of taxes. This in-lieu payment does not pretend to match up what the ordinary citizen, owning or buying his home, has to pay in taxes. So the ordinary citizen has to pay for services which are laid down for a privileged group of renters who get less-than-cost rents.

There are two questions to ask: Is this subsidy housing needed? Is it wanted?

Alderman Weingartner quotes the county housing director as saying that there are only 22 eligible applicants for this type of housing now on record. And there are 100 families living in subsidized quarters at less-than-cost rent which are not entitled to live there because their earnings are too high. Well, applications ought to provide some kind of yardstick as to whether there is need of subsidy housing.

Is this type of Federal housing wanted? The application list throws some light on this question. For if it seemed desirable to get less-than-cost shelter through the generosity of the Federal Government, one would assume that the line of applicants would be several blocks long. But we find, instead, that independent-minded home-seekers are striving for the independence of their own homes. The hunger for one's own roof is so great that they go out and build their own homes on the edge of town; they don't want to live under Federal mentorship.

And don't tell any of these people who build their own homes that they are creating substandard housing, unless you want a fight on your hands. These householders are in the finest American tradition.

Well, if we don't need and we don't want, the only excuse that can be given for bidding for housing-subsidy money is that somebody else is going to get it if we don't. Somebody else will get the headaches, too.

South Haven, Mich., commented on the great expense of public housing to the local community in tax loss and the cost of free city services for the public housing units:

[From the Monroe (Mich.) Evening News, Apr. 6, 1950]

#### NOT COST A CENT

In our opinion the city commission rescued the city from a welfare involvement of great expense and dubious entanglements last Monday night. The vote was emphatic—6 to 1—in rejecting a proposed contract with the Federal housing bureau which would have launched the project.

One of the interesting aspects of the commission's brush with this project has been the persistency of Federal agents in trying to sell it to the community. The effort was so intense and of such character as to invite sober thought on the part of citizens as to what Washington is up to these days.

We have heard much in the past as to the good and bad of dollar matching funds set up by Federal enterprises. The Federal Treasury being farther away from the scrutiny of the taxpayer than his local or State treasury it has been easier for enterprisers with both good and bad schemes to work at that end.

Now apparently out of Washington we have certain dollar matching schemes with something new added, namely a sales force employed from tax funds to actually promote the sale of certain projects to communities.

What was shocking and amazing in the hearing of the project before the city commission Monday night was the case of one of three Federal men who attended the meeting and remained on their feet throughout the hearing to talk for the project whenever occasion offered. This one Federal man went so far as to tell the commission and the audience just before the commission voted that if the community would accept and go ahead with the project it would "not cost the community a cent."

In the contract which he was asking the commission to pass was a requirement that the community hold the project tax free for 40 years. Printed Federal literature explaining such a project says: "It is expected that the contributions made by communities through full tax exemption less in lieu payments will average about 50 percent of the actual Federal contributions over the life of the project."

In the contract which he was asking the commission to pass were requirements binding the city to certain other things the costs of which obviously are not computable, including a provision that for every new dwelling unit established under the project the city must acquire, tear down, or close, or secure the compulsory improvements of, an existing dwelling.

If we wanted to be as glib and as loose as the Federal salesman we might promote a project along his line without Federal money. Just ask the city commission to issue notice to the people that the next 130 homes built in Monroe will be held tax free for 40 years; that all utilities and improvements will be brought to selected lots free; that no assessments of any kind will be made against the property for 40 years.

Then wait to see how long it would take to get 130 new homes; how quickly workers now

hesitant about home building would jump to it; how readily loan agencies or individuals would advance money to build tax free homes; how happily thrifty people would quick get up not only a tax free house for themselves but an extra one for rent.

However, we couldn't say as the Federal salesman did, that such tax exemption wouldn't cost the city a cent.

[From the South Haven (Mich.) Daily Tribune, May 1, 1950]

#### SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO PHA DIRECTOR TO SPEAK

James H. Inglis, special assistant to the Director of the Public Housing Administration, will speak in Central Auditorium, Tuesday at 7:30 p.m. He will speak on public housing.

The meeting is sponsored by the Central Labor Union and is brought to South Haven in the interest of better understanding of the public housing project now under consideration by the people of this community.

The program will consist of a talk by Inglis, a short movie entitled "The City," comments by architects currently engaged in building public housing projects and a question and answer period.

The public is invited. Admission is free.

And so on it goes with these and other cities.

There are still other dangers inherent in public housing that have been pointed out by other Members. The Comptroller of New York pointed out that New York was losing \$30 million tax revenues per year because of tax-free public housing in the following article on the cost of public housing.

[From Barron's Weekly, June 18, 1958]

#### CASTLES IN THE AIR—THE COST OF PUBLIC HOUSING FAR EXCEEDS ITS VALUE

In an eloquent inaugural address nearly 20 years ago, the late Franklin D. Roosevelt was moved to declaim: "I see one-third of the Nation ill-housed, ill-clad, and ill-nourished." Since that time, for one reason and another, the United States has come a long way. Today, as even the most rabid Fair Dealer probably would concede, hunger stalks the land no more. In fact, to judge by the huge and mounting surpluses of farm products, as well as the sudden burgeoning of firms such as Slim Zelle and Slenderella, plenty has become the weightier problem. As to clothing, the plaid cummerbund and the flat hat admittedly leave considerable room for argument. Yet on other than sartorial grounds, it scarcely can be claimed that this country now is anything but handsomely garbed.

With respect to housing, however, the depression-born shibboleth somehow still has power to sway the minds of men. For every year, as regularly as the budding of the cherry blossoms, Congress with fine bipartisanship passes legislation designed to improve and increase the domestic stock of shelter. On the whole, through a generous use of Federal mortgage guarantees and similar devices, such laws have aimed at encouraging private housing and home finance. While some quarters—this publication not least—frequently have criticized the means employed, few would quarrel with the ends. But Washington has not stopped there. Instead, for two decades it also has supported a program of so-called public housing, under which the Government has thrust itself directly into the business of providing homes for its citizens. During the heyday of F.D.R., perhaps, some excuse might have been found for a scheme of this kind. Today it represents merely an old-fashioned experiment in socialism, which, in terms of neither economic nor human values, is worth its growing cost to the community.

Public housing on a large scale, though popular in Europe since the turn of the century, gained scant ground in the United States until 1937. In that year Congress approved an act "for the eradication of slums, for the provision of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for families of low income, and for the reduction of unemployment and stimulation of business activity, to create a U.S. Housing Authority and for other purposes." USHA (now the Public Housing Administration) was empowered, first, to aid in financing the construction of low-rent projects. It also was given the right to make annual subsidy payments to their operators, the local public housing authorities. On this basic plan, amended several times thereafter, the program has grown to its present enormous size. Since 1937 some 415,000 units, quartering over 1,500,000 people, have been completed and another 20,000 are being built. To date, furthermore, the full faith and credit of the United States has been placed behind several billions of public housing obligations. In addition, subsidy payments by the Treasury to such projects (which are also exempt from municipal taxation) now are running to \$100 million per year.

By any yardstick, these are substantial sums. Under the terms of legislation now pending on Capitol Hill, moreover, they are slated to grow considerably. The House Banking Committee, for example, last week authorized 50,000 new public housing units during each of the next 3 years, as well as an additional 10,000 for the exclusive use of elderly people. Meanwhile, the Senate, traditionally more openhanded in such matters, already has passed a bill which, in part, calls for 150,000 units per year (including 15,000 for the oldsters). The administration, to be sure, which has recommended a more limited measure, has attacked both bills. However, curiously enough, official fire has been directed solely at the size of the public housing program, rather than at its practices or principles.

Yet it is precisely in these areas that the issue should be joined. For a growing mass of evidence suggests that public housing, on several counts, ought to be condemned. To begin with, despite the original purpose of the law, it has provided anything but low-cost shelter. Public projects frequently have proved not a whit cheaper to build or operate than their private counterparts. What's more, those whose rent has been subsidized are not, as might be supposed, at the bottom of the economic ladder. Instead, the privileged tenants actually fall within an income bracket, under \$4,000, which contains no fewer than 14 million taxpayers, with a combined annual tax bill of over \$2 billion. Nor does public housing necessarily clear slums. The fact is that for the most part, and at the present time, by the way, it has been possible, by building on vacant land, to push one program and ignore the other.

Public housing, it thus appears, has become a fraud on the Nation's taxpayers. To this longstanding charge can be added a new one, it also constitutes a growing financial menace to the very communities which it is supposed to benefit. This ironic circumstance was underscored the other day by the comptroller of the city of New York, which can boast more subsidized dwellings than any other U.S. metropolis. The perturbed official pointed out that owing to the tax-exempt status of such property, the city at present is losing more than \$30 million per year in badly needed revenues. Furthermore, when projects now on the drawing board or under construction are completed, the drain will grow still worse. Accordingly, the comptroller urged the city fathers, before launching any new projects of this kind, to look long and carefully to the state of the municipal purse.

Such sound advice should be heeded no less in Washington than in New York. For

the truth is that Federal aid in this realm has gone far beyond the bounds of prudence and good husbandry. The need for shelter, as some lawmakers are wont to observe, may be virtually limitless; the resources of the U.S. Treasury, to say nothing of city hall, most certainly are not. Clearly, then, those who are drawing up ambitious and costly blueprints for subsidized housing should review their handiwork. Castles in the air, even if publicly owned, make a poor place in which to live.

Another indication of the mishandling and mismanagement of the program is to be seen in the number of executive directors of public housing authorities now in prison: Houston, Galveston, Los Angeles, Contra Costa County, Calif.

May I point out to you the fact that the Communist constitution, article 6, states that the "bulk of dwelling houses are state property." Now, that is the Communist constitution which, of course, we have followed to the degree that we have public housing. That is what that article of their constitution states.

Public housing obviously is the Government in business. I am one who believes that the less Government participation in business that we have the better off we are.

What about the cost to the taxpayer of urban renewal? It is almost beyond the imagination to comprehend. Not only are old buildings all over the country becoming older, but brandnew buildings sometimes have built-in weaknesses that are going to make them unsafe before too great a time. Inspection, repair, and rehabilitation are always needed. The cost is so fantastic I do not believe we can possibly conceive it. If we are going to take care of people effectively through Federal programs such as these the cost will be prohibitive.

With all levels of government demanding heavier and heavier collection and expenditure of taxpayers' money to meet greater and greater public requirements, obviously the urban renewal cost is going to be beyond what we can afford at this time. The Treasury right now is not broke, it is a quarter of a trillion dollars less than nothing. It is a tricky job in fiscal management just to pay current operating expenses of government. Only the borrowing power of Government makes possible the continuation of the deadly overspending spree. Federal bills are to be paid from future revenue, gambling on the continued high income of taxpayers. Simultaneously Congress adds to the Federal spending to help the financially drained taxpayers from whom the money is taken. Any sign of local financial trouble is the signal for more Federal spending with little thought that the aid distributed must first be taken from the same people in taxes. So the burden increases.

With the defenses of the Nation demanding so much of our public outlay it is unconscionable to spend money in this way. The cost of urban renewal at this time approaches \$3.5 billion and it will cost many billions more. The administrative expenses are running yearly somewhere around \$6 million. The total cost of the outstanding tax exempt bonds is fantastic. I have the figures here as of March 1957, which

shows that the cost on \$2.2 billion in bonds in that 40-year period will amount to \$7.7 billion. It goes up terrifically because of the rate of interest over a period of 40 years. We have added much since 1957, too.

The Federal grant contribution to urban renewal is two-thirds of the write-down or loss; that is, the difference between the resale or reuse price and the expenses of acquisition, demolition, and clearing. This is being picked up by the taxpayers, one-third as locally and two-thirds as Federal taxpayers.

Heavy Federal taxation makes it difficult for the local communities to raise money for their purposes. So the grants in aid become more attractive to localities. Grants mean more taxation for the individual. The Federal tax load is thus heavier; therefore, the locality has trouble raising money locally. So localities and States go to Uncle Sam for grants and around, around we go.

This is just a start so far as the heavy local expenses are concerned. In addition to the cost of renewing these properties, you have other local costs, since the local authorities provide garbage disposal, schools, streets, pavements, utilities, police protection, and other facilities, all for free. Earlier I mentioned the New York City local tax loss of \$30 million annually and so it is proportionately in other cities.

If I said nothing else to make you realize how prohibitive the cost is, let me mention this. A gentleman in the other body sponsoring one of these bills at the present time has pointed out as cited in the Congressional Digest that of 1,233 cities only 223 are getting urban renewal. We are spending money hand over fist, but what would it cost to take care of the other 900 cities?

The fiscal danger can be shown by the fact that if communities sought all the Federal money available under existing law, there wouldn't be enough to go around, not with printing presses running ceaselessly. The competitive inducement to States and communities to seek and bid for this money postpones realistic appraisal of the facts, and heightens the potential danger of complete socialism.

The write-down or shrinkage of value which occasions the Federal loan and grant is subject to serious question in itself. Why the excessive drop in value when raw land, strategically located, is cleared and ready for use. Generally, the availability for a higher use should enhance the land values sufficiently to offset the cost. At the least, an appreciable write-down suggests some question of judgment on the part of the urban renewal authority's setting a reuse value not in conformity with the highest and best use of the land. Misuse of land is always reflected in lower value.

Another financial danger is the windfall, the heavy profit which might be made by individuals in the private development after purchase of the land. Profit in free enterprise is one thing but profit off the taxpayer is another. Existing cases show the inequities already occurring. Would it not be possible under this law to buy up older areas,

as older downtown sections, sell them under eminent domain valuations with the possibility of tidy profit, then buy them back from the urban renewal authority at a written down price, to redevelop and make a handsome profit? Yes, it would.

The time factor of Federal urban renewal is another drawback. Even if we overlook the unconstitutional, financial, and Government administration aspects, there would be the same old story of redtape and delay. In Washington it took 7 years to get an urban renewal project under way. Admittedly, this may be longer than some but the pattern is there.

There is a way to do this job and do it locally. The proof can be found in a number of other cities that are doing urban renewal work right now without Federal aid. I can talk knowledgeably because Dallas was the first city to do so in our Little Mexico project. This rehabilitation is a matter of local pride that goes with the idea of "Let's clean up, paint up our own neighborhood." This can be done all over the country.

Here is an interesting little booklet, called "Blueprint for Neighborhood Conservation," put out by one National Association of Real Estate Boards, Realtors. It could be called the Tale of Seven Cities, perhaps. These cities have done the job of urban renewal without Federal aid. And I want to read you the honor roll of these cities because lessons can be learned from all of them. They are New Orleans, Los Angeles, Charlotte, N.C., Chicago, Cincinnati, Newark, and Kansas City.

Take Charlotte, N.C., for example. As of today 12,000 residences have been rehabilitated—10,000 bathrooms were added. Two thousand buildings could not be saved and were demolished, at the owner's expense. Meanwhile the city did its part by paving 65 miles of streets, adding street lights and providing playgrounds, parks, and other needed improvements. Two thousand families were relocated in privately owned homes, rehabilitated or new. Two thousand new private housing units were built—all of this without Federal aid. Note also the financial impact with increased revenue to the city. There are expenses but urban renewal also generates revenue.

The New Orleans story is much the same, so is the Los Angeles story and the others—each without Federal aid. In fact, the cases where there was no Federal aid involved suggest that the other areas getting Federal aid could have done it on their own.

The case of Memphis, Tenn., is another example of the local people—bankers, insurance men, builders, realtors, and citizens doing the job—without Federal aid, and without eminent domain. The power of eminent domain, the taking of private property, does not necessarily have to be used in urban renewal, where owners are given a chance to participate. True, they must be told to clean up, sell, or have the city clean it up at the owners' expense. The result is greatly increased property value so the owner can hardly object. Even in cases where property does not conform to the zoning requirements, the

owner can be given a chance to abate the nonconformance through remodeling or removal of the building, still retaining the land ownership. The property is not taken away without his having a chance to participate.

The comprehensive program for neighborhood conservation is a blueprint for every city and no Federal money for urban renewal needed. Here it is:

#### COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM

First. Establish realistic city ordinances specifying health, safety and sanitary standards for housing. Rehabilitate the substandard housing, at the expense of the property owners, through firm enforcement of these ordinances.

Second. Demolish those slum structures which are unfit for rehabilitation, at the expense of property owners, again through firm enforcement of city ordinances.

Third. Establish systematic public improvements to schools, streets, parks, sewers and to such municipal services as refuse collection, traffic and other facilities.

Fourth. Establish more livable, attractive and convenient neighborhood environment by replanning, rezoning and replatting cleared and long vacant sites and by closing or widening streets.

Fifth. Acquire and remove structures and uses of land which might delay, obstruct or hinder carrying out the program.

Sixth. Attract investment in new construction, as well as in rehabilitation and modernization, by the application of specific Federal income tax incentives.

Seventh. Elicit the cooperation of local financing institutions to secure credit facilities for property owners participation in the conservation program. Most banks and lending institutions can offer loans or monthly payment plans or credit may be secured under the FHA section 220 mortgage insurance program and the FHA title I program for insurance of home repair loans.

Eighth. Improve credit facilities for your city through Federal insurance of municipal neighborhood conservation bonds on the basis of an insurance premium, so that these bonds will be readily marketable at favorable interest rates.

In Gadsden, Ala., it is my understanding that no right of eminent domain was used in redeveloping a run-down area. Neither did this city have a proper housing code or proper enforcement—compared to Dallas. City teams talked to owners about rehabilitation. When the owners refused to clean up the slum-like property, the city teams went directly to the property tenants. Each tenant was asked if he wanted a new home in a nearby residential development to be built with FHA financing under section 221. When most tenants signed up the realtors, builders, mortgage men and bankers went to work. A lovely new development was completed. The tenants moved into the new homes. The old shacks were left vacant. The owners then agreed to cooperate.

In all these cases there is no politics as such as far as whether it was Republican or Democrat. These people de-

ecided they would do the job locally, and they did the job. There is the same story in each of them. The locality provided the streets and the utilities, and they expected the owners of the property to tear down or improve their properties, and out of all this there was considerable enhanced value of property. And, a week ago, I can tell you with some pride, the city of Dallas, after studying this a year, finally put their weight behind a 600-acre development without any Federal money, and I hope they stand fast to their guns.

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

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman has made a great contribution here today. It has been quite apparent that he has been rushing over a prepared statement to the Members of the House, but much of the material, he says, is available. I am hoping that the gentleman, when he extends his remarks, will see that these matters which he has made reference to are included. I think the matter he is referring to is of great value, and it would save many of us a great deal of research trying to pick up these things if you put them in the RECORD. I hope the gentleman will include much of the material which he has passed over.

Mr. ALGER. I thank the gentleman and his expression of interest in it will be reason enough, and I will put more of this material in than I had planned.

Let me simply point out that this urban renewal is a local problem. There is a local solution to it. There is no end to the Federal solution. Take New York. They pay 20 percent in taxes that they cannot possibly get back. So, we see New York and other States fighting competitively to try to get back as much as possible of the Federal money. Now, we cannot compete with each other in this way for the taxpayer's dollars. I realize some have expressed an ideological difference to what I contend, but I point out some of these things in the hope that such contenders will slow down a little bit.

The need for private enterprise and local initiative has been rediscovered by the residents of Gary, Ind., who have offered for sale Duneland Village, a complete public housing development of 165 units. Upon the sale of public housing these advantages would accrue: First, revenue from the sale would be realized; second, stop further Federal subsidy using the taxpayers' money; third, the property would start to pay its full share of local taxes; fourth, the morale of occupants would be greatly boosted, no longer ashamed over others helping to pay the rent; fifth, and no political worry over being evicted if their salary is increased.

Section 406 of the Housing Act of 1954 permits a resolution or ordinance by the city council or a referendum by the citizens to call for the liquidation of a project. The city would then negotiate with the Federal Government and the project will be sold by the public housing authority to the highest bidder after public advertisement. The bonds supporting the

project would be repaid and any receipts above the indebtedness would be paid to the city and Federal Treasuries.

Urban renewal is a local problem, concerning local property and local property owners. The local citizens, as property owners and taxpayers, also foot the bill in every instance. "That government is best that is closest to the people" is no empty axiom. Our mayor and city council backed by local judgment can better solve our local problem than the distant Federal Government. Further, Federal aid weakens local government, costs more to do the same job, and violates the individual and States rights guaranteed by the Constitution.

I believe the acceptance of Federal money for purely local projects to be wrong. So I oppose this use of Federal money.

As I see it, the truth is, the job will be done locally. It is just a question of recognizing responsibility and properly labeling what must be done, and then doing it. This will require responsible property owners—and responsibility accompanies ownership—it will require a courageous mayor and city council; it will require an understanding and willing citizenry.

Now we have housing bills before us. Let us compare the Democrat and administration bills. Here are portions of the Senate report:

#### MINORITY VIEWS—A BUDGET-BUSTING BILL

This is a budget-busting bill. The spending authorizations it grants will increase the deficit in the current fiscal year and will result in increased budget expenditures in every year for the next 45 years. The total new authorized budget expenditure impact of the bill is \$5.8 billion. This contrasts with new authorized budget expenditures of \$1.66 billion in the housing bills proposed by the administration. The following tabulation gives a breakdown of the amounts in the two alternate proposals:

#### Authorized budget expenditures [In millions]

| Program                            | This bill  | Administration bills |
|------------------------------------|------------|----------------------|
| Public housing grants.....         | \$ 3,700.0 | 0                    |
| Urban renewal grants.....          | 1,500.0    | \$ 1,450             |
| College housing loans.....         | 400.0      | 200                  |
| Elderly housing loans.....         | 100.0      | 0                    |
| Cooperative housing mortgages..... | 75.0       | 0                    |
| Hospital grants.....               | 15.0       | 0                    |
| Urban planning grants.....         | 10.0       | 10                   |
| Farm housing research grants.....  | .1         | 0                    |
| Total.....                         | 5,800.1    | 1,660                |

<sup>1</sup> Estimated contract amounts under 40-year annual contribution contracts with credit given for reducing contract amounts by excess receipts at fiscal 1958 rate. Gross contract amounts, \$4,484,000,000.

<sup>2</sup> 3-year program.

<sup>3</sup> 6-year program. Excludes \$100,000,000 Presidential contingent reserve.

Of the \$5.8 billion of new authorized budget expenditures in the committee bill, only \$575 million would be on a recoverable basis, i.e., in the form of loans and mortgage purchases. In other words, in the committee bill over \$5.2 billion is in the form of outright grants. Under the administration proposals \$200 million would be in form of loans and \$1.46 billion in the form of grants.

Look at the comparative costs. While I may disagree with urban renewal in the Republican bill, yet of the two, if I am for a balanced budget, there is only one answer.

This year, fiscal 1959, the result of the last Congress' spending, is now running a \$13 billion deficit. Yet look at the increased expenditure sponsored by the Democrat leadership of both House and Senate.

[In millions]

| Program                                    | Authorized budget expenditures        |                        |
|--|---------------------------------------|------------------------|
|  | Bill last year upon which House voted | Present committee bill |
| Public housing.....                        | <sup>1</sup> \$195.0                  | <sup>2</sup> \$3,700.0 |
| Urban renewal.....                         | <sup>2</sup> 400.0                    | <sup>4</sup> 1,500.0   |
| College housing.....                       | 300.0                                 | 400.0                  |
| College classrooms.....                    | 125.0                                 | 0                      |
| Elderly housing.....                       | 50.0                                  | 100.0                  |
| Federal National Mortgage Association..... | <sup>3</sup> 0                        | 75.0                   |
| Hospital construction.....                 | 15.0                                  | 15.0                   |
| Urban planning.....                        | 0                                     | 10.0                   |
| Farm housing research.....                 | .3                                    | .1                     |
| VA direct loans.....                       | 100.0                                 | *0                     |
| <b>Total.....</b>                          | <b>1,185.3</b>                        | <b>5,800.1</b>         |

<sup>1</sup> Estimated contract amounts under 40-year annual contribution contracts with credit given for reducing contract amounts by excess receipts at fiscal 1958 rate. Gross contract amounts, \$236,000,000.  
<sup>2</sup> Estimated contract amounts under 40-year annual contribution contracts with credit given for reducing contract amounts by excess receipts at fiscal 1958 rate. Gross contract amounts, \$4,480,000,000.  
<sup>3</sup> 1-year program.  
<sup>4</sup> 3-year program.  
<sup>\*</sup> \$250,000,000 authorization contingent upon direction of the President not included in this tabulation.  
<sup>\*</sup> Separate bill has already passed the House, this Congress, providing \$300,000,000 for these loans.

The difference between the two bills in the urban renewal authorization is set forth in clear-cut fashion. In the bill last year a 1-year \$400 million authorization was provided—total, \$400 million. In the bill this year a 3-year authorization at the rate of \$500 million per year is provided—total, \$1.5 billion. This difference between the two bills is readily apparent.

In the case of the tricky language of the public housing authorizations, dollar budget impacts are not given and indeed even the number of new units authorized is completely masked. Translated in terms of effect, what the public housing authorization in the bill last year did was to authorize new contracts for 10,000 additional public housing units. What the public housing authorization in the bill this year does is to authorize new contracts for an estimated 190,000 additional public housing units. Common sense, of course, dictates that if one bill provides for 19 times more units than the other bill there will be a 19 times difference in capital costs assuming the same average cost per unit. Since the capital costs of the units are financed over a 40-year period and the payment of principal and interest on such financing is covered by Federal annual assistance contracts, it is obvious there are vast differences in the total amount of authorized budget expenditures between the two bills. The respective amounts involved for public housing are estimated and set forth in the preceding table.

At a time of grave national defense situation there is no excuse for such increased spending for welfare programs, even if such programs were good ones. The comparison of the housing bills shows which political party is trying to cut down and return to a balanced budget and maintain a sound dollar. Any other course now is dangerous and irresponsible.

The demands in the Democrat housing bill for 70,000 additional public housing units in the next 2 years is "wel-

fare statism pure and simple." In this day of record home construction and with 585,000 public housing units already occupied or authorized, what emergency demands that we impose this additional load on the taxpayers who are trying to finance an arms race and at the same time pay for their own homes.

Impelled by the genuinely humanitarian instincts common to all Americans you might ask if these units are not necessary to shelter the poor and needy who are unable to afford any minimal housing if privately financed. Well, after searching through these bills you may well ask the same question all over again, for nothing in these proposals solves the problem of these people. Instead, we are now asked to do away altogether with congressional restraints aimed at reserving public housing for our neediest citizens. Now we're being asked to march willy-nilly into the welfare statist's dream world of publicly financed quarters of the middle income group.

There are a couple of other things about the current Democrat housing bill. The bill that is to be considered before this House very shortly offers a 5-year retroactive community windfall for reimbursement of earlier expenditures. For 5 years previous the community cost in urban renewal can be secured. We do not have enough money to do that, but money apparently to some, is not so consequential. Also it is proposed that the income-rent ratio should be changed, which further complicates the situation. At present people living in public housing can live there only so long as they are below the maximum pay, and if they exceed this they have to move. In the bill before us, the people can stay in public housing even though their pay goes up and exceeds the allowable. This is toward public housing for the middle income. All in all, the people who need the housing the most in many cases are not getting it.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by saying this:

First. To those who believe in constitutional government, in eminent domain—that private property can be taken for public use for just compensation—let me point out that now private property can be taken through eminent domain for private use property, your home, your place of business, thought by generations of Americans to be constitutionally protected against Government seizure, except for a necessary public use, no longer enjoys any such immunity.

Second. To Supreme Court critics let me point out that this Supreme Court has redefined eminent domain so that private property can be taken for spiritual and esthetic reasons as a redevelopment board may decree, or for reasons of well-balanced planning.

Third. To those interested in small business, let me point out that the two-thirds shrinkage value Federal expenditure holds the greatest possibility for windfall profit at John Doe taxpayer's expense that big businessmen have ever been extended. The small businessman cannot so benefit. He just pays.

Fourth. To those who favor constitutional appropriation of public moneys let

me point out that urban renewal sets up procedures for direct Federal expenditures bypassing Congress.

And, fifth. To those who criticize public housing for whatever reasons, let me point out that public housing is, by definition, part and parcel of the relocation problem, so decreed by the Urban Renewal Administration.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I am glad to yield.  
 Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask one question. Is the gentleman interested in providing cheap, adequate healthy housing for our people?

Mr. ALGER. Yes; most assuredly.  
 Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. And the gentleman is interested that the people have proper housing?

Mr. ALGER. Absolutely.  
 Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. As I understand it, the gentleman's argument is that the Federal Government method of trying to attain that goal is not the most efficacious; that a better method exists by going through local communities and private enterprise?

Mr. ALGER. That is correct. And I have figures here to show the cost of public housing is considerably more than that of private housing, and I would be glad to include that for the benefit of those who are interested.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The reason I made those remarks is that those who are great advocates of public housing programs at the Federal level always try to win the argument before they even start by saying that if you are not for public housing therefore you are not interested in providing cheap, adequate healthy housing for our people.

Listening to the gentleman's remarks I was tempted to ask that question, because I know the gentleman well and I know of his deep interest in the welfare of the people of his own community and the people of our Nation. I know the business he has been in, and I know of his interest in trying to get more cheap, adequate housing for our people.

That is not the issue. I hope that many of the public housing advocates will read the material that the gentleman has been presenting to us. Incidentally, I want to join the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] in requesting that the gentleman put in the RECORD all of this data to which he has referred, for this reason. For years now we have had the public housing question before the Congress. Our committees, I regret to say—in this instance the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House and the similar committee in the other body, to whom public housing matters are referred—have not made an objective appraisal of this program.

Listening to what the gentleman presented, there was more meat, more material for coming to some conclusion on this matter than in all the hearings that I have read on public housing put out by the Committees on Banking and Currency of the two Houses in recent years. Therefore I trust the gentleman will put in all of the material he has.



And finally, I would like to say this:

I want to commend the gentleman for making a very thorough study. It obviously has taken him many hours and many days. It is this kind of study that is of benefit to the entire House regardless of what one's views may be on this subject. The material the gentleman has presented to us has been objectively thought out. He has his own conclusions, of course, but this objective information should be of value to all of us in trying to reach a sane conclusion on this problem of, How do we get more cheap, adequate, healthy housing for our people? I commend the gentleman and in behalf of the entire Congress I thank him from the bottom of my heart for doing this work.

Mr. ALGER. I thank the gentleman for those very kind remarks. I have worked on this a year. I would be the first to admit that any of us could be wrong, and if wrong am consistently wrong, yet I have studied this thing backward and forward and I am interested in least expensive way of getting the houses built. For that reason I will put in the RECORD at this time a study made by the Library of Congress for a number of Congressmen 2 years ago, which some of you may have, entitled "Adverse effects of the expanding activities of the National Government on the private economy and the Federal system, the case for free enterprise and local self-government." I will put in this comparative study, a very interesting one, right under our nose here in Washington, between some buildings built on Alabama Avenue, Southeast, and some privately built properties on Minnesota Avenue, Southeast, as to their cost, Federal versus private, as to their condition, architect's fees, and other things. I shall include this additional material.

#### THE COST OF PUBLIC HOUSING PER HOUSING UNIT

Under the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, the cost of building and equipping dwelling units cannot exceed \$1,750 per room, excluding the cost of land and non-dwelling facilities. An extra \$750 per room is allowed in some of the higher-cost areas.

The Housing Act of 1956 permits an extra \$500 per room for dwellings designed for elderly families.

Thus, the full cost for standard dwelling unit rooms can be as high as \$2,500 each; dwellings for elderly families may cost as much as \$3,000 per room, if built in a high-cost area. The size of the units varies within each project. The average is two bedrooms, but a few have as many as four or five bedrooms.

A publication of the Foundation for Economic Education, Inc., makes the following statement with regard to the hidden costs involved in building public housing.

"Not all of the high cost of low-rent Government housing is revealed by a direct comparison of construction costs for public versus private housing projects. The public housing calls for continuing subsidy, not only by way of Federally collected tax funds, but also by way of the added burden of local taxes on property owners of the community in which the partially tax-exempt housing project is located.

"Some citizens of Los Angeles recently took the trouble to look into the total costs which might be involved in a proposed 10,000-unit public housing program in their

community. The cost of construction was to have been \$11,000 per unit. Their conclusion was that the taxpayers would be much better off \* \* \* to build 10,000 houses costing \$11,000 each and give them away than to build and subsidize the 10,000-unit public housing program."<sup>1</sup>

Members of the real estate and building materials industries contend that public

housing is not only costly in terms of the cost to the taxpayer of the subsidy, but that the original construction costs are higher than they would be if the projects were privately sponsored. To support this contention, the National Association of Real Estate Boards makes the following comparison of private and public housing costs based upon projects located in Washington, D.C.:

|                              | Frederick Douglass (Government)      | Greenway (private)           |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Location                     | 200 Alabama Ave. SE.                 | Minnesota Ave. and A St. SE. |
| Year constructed             | 1941                                 | 1941.                        |
| Per room cost                | \$1,120                              | \$849.                       |
| Number of units built        | 313                                  | 796.                         |
| Architect's fees             | \$61,000                             | \$10,000.                    |
| Type of construction         | Concrete block and frame             | Fireproof high-grade brick.  |
| Type of heating              | Coal-burning stove in living room    | Central heat: coal.          |
| Period to be paid out        | 60 years                             | 25 years.                    |
| Rent for 2-bedroom apartment | \$40.50                              | \$60 per month.              |
| Federal subsidy              | Yes                                  | No.                          |
| Local tax exemption          | Yes                                  | No.                          |
| Tenant pays for utilities    | About \$5 per month average for coal | Nothing.                     |
| Condition in 1948            | Deteriorating rapidly                | Excellent.                   |

How does the cost compare with private housing? At hearings before the House and Senate Committees on the District of Columbia, held in 1944, testimony was presented by the National Capital Housing Authority as to the costs of building some of the projects under its jurisdiction. Representatives of the Federation of Citizens Associations of the District of Columbia; the Washington Taxpayers' Association, the Home Builders Association and others presented cost data in rebuttal which indicated that the National Capital Housing Authority costs were from 26 to 41 percent higher than construction costs on similar projects erected by private builders. Some of the comparative costs follow:

#### PUBLIC

Fort Dupont Dwellings located on Ridge Road near Minnesota Avenue SE., were built in 1940 by the Alley Dwelling Authority and cost \$4,724 per unit, including land.

Frederick Douglass Dwellings for colored occupancy were completed in 1941 by the Alley Dwelling Authority. They are of permanent frame construction with part masonry, have individual space-heating units, no tile baths, or basements and cost \$4,511 per unit, including land.

Parkside Dwellings for colored occupancy located on Kenilworth Avenue NE., were built by the National Capital Housing Authority and completed in 1943. They have individual space heating units, no tile baths or basements and cost \$5,376 per unit, including land.

Bennings Road Houses were built by the National Capital Housing Authority. These are demountable war houses completed in 1943 with individual space heating unit, no basements or tile baths and cost \$5,072 per unit. This is construction cost only.<sup>2</sup>

#### PRIVATE

Greenway, Minnesota Avenue and East Capitol Street SE., completed by Cafritz Construction Co. in 1941. It has tile baths and hallways, Strand steel and concrete floors, washing machines and laundry room in each building, recreation rooms, playgrounds, etc. It cost \$2,778 per unit, including land.

Suburban Gardens for colored, Deanwood NE., was completed by A. Lloyd Goode Construction Co. in 1942. It has tile baths and central heating plant and cost \$3,949 per unit, including land, etc.

Four family flats built by Davey & Murphy in 1943 in the 3200 block of East Capitol

Street. They have tile baths, weather-stripped windows and basements, and cost \$3,335 per unit, including land, etc.

Homes on East Pine Drive, Md., built by Standard Properties and sold in 1943. Four-room houses sold for \$3,775; four and a half rooms \$4,300 and \$4,350 on lots that cost \$550 each. They cost from \$813 to \$963 a room and if two rooms are finished in the attic, the cost would drop to about \$609 per room. These figures include the builder's profit.<sup>3</sup>

The Christopher Columbus Homes, New Jersey's largest low-rent housing project was completed in July 1955, at a cost of \$20,800,000. This project includes a health clinic, library, hobby shops, and an auditorium with a motion picture projection room. It serves 1,556 families through 96 one-bedroom apartments, 960 two-bedroom apartments, 384 three-bedroom apartments, 96 with four bedrooms, and 20 five-bedroom units. The average cost per unit in this project was \$13,367.60.<sup>4</sup>

The June 25, 1954, St. Louis Post-Dispatch reported on the building of the Joseph Darst public housing project in St. Louis. It reported that developmental costs would be \$9,353,772, with a cost of \$14,173 per dwelling unit.

According to a May 1950 report of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, Greenhills projects completed in Cincinnati, Ohio, in the early part of 1938, consisted of 676 urban units and 60 rural units. The average cost per dwelling unit was \$16,030. The overall cost including shopping facilities, administration building, etc., was \$11,800,000. According to the BLS reports, the average construction costs of all dwelling units started in 1939, was \$3,783.<sup>5</sup>

In 1948, in a statement before the House Committee on Banking and Currency, Thomas S. Holden, president of the F. W. Dodge Corp., made the following comments: "Experience shows that the one effective means of steadily reducing production costs

<sup>1</sup> National Association of Real Estate Boards. Realtors' Washington Committee. Socialized public housing background and history. Washington, 1950, p. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Hearings before the House Subcommittee on the Judiciary of the Committee on the District of Columbia on several bills dealing with the elimination of alley dwellings. (78th Cong., 2d sess., 1944.)

<sup>3</sup> Newark Sunday News, July 31, 1955, sec. IV, p. S 10.

<sup>4</sup> This is based upon the total of 406 dwelling units started in 1938, at a total construction cost of \$1,583.9 million, as taken from data compiled by U.S. Bureau of the Census in "Historical Statistics of the United States 1789-1945."

<sup>1</sup> Poirot, Paul L. Public housing. The Foundation for Economic Education, Inc., Irvington-on-Hudson, New York. 1954, page 26.

<sup>2</sup> These are no longer in existence.

is the operation of free competitive enterprise. The only cost factor in housing with which the Government can deal directly and effectively is financing cost. This it has done by creating and operating the financing services of the Federal Home Loan Bank System and the Federal Housing Administration. Government can also render appropriate research and information services of signal assistance to private enterprise in cost reduction.

"When it comes to direct intervention in housing production, Government can inflate costs, can conceal costs, can pass excessive costs on to the taxpayers; it cannot reduce costs.

"According to a recent report of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, the average construction of new privately financed nonfarm dwelling units started in the United States in the first 9 months of 1948 was \$7,640, whereas the average publicly financed unit cost was \$9,350. The difference may reflect generally higher standards in the publicly financed units.

"Cost limits imposed in this bill—Housing Act of 1949—for subsidized housing units could permit expenditures as high as \$9,500 for a 3½ unit, including land costs. Currently, the Housing and Home Finance Agency is spearheading a drive for production by private homebuilders of economy houses, to be sold with lots at \$6,000 to \$8,000.

"Published figures on costs of public housing projects never include the overhead administrative costs of the Public Housing Administration in Washington, of its many regional and field offices, or of the local public housing authorities. Such administrative costs are very high. Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, has estimated that the average overhead cost of administering Federal grants-in-aid is 15 percent. Many programs cost more."<sup>7</sup>

The Public Housing Administration reported average development costs of \$10,475 per unit on 1949 act projects as of June 30, 1953, an average per unit cost of \$10,648 as of the end of 1954; and a national average total development cost of \$11,083 as of June 30, 1955. The ninth annual report of the Housing and Home Finance Agency stated that the total development cost for the average unit of 4.9 rooms during 1955 was \$10,615.

Some units can cost as much as \$15,000 per unit. Under the Housing Act of 1956, at a maximum per room cost of \$1,750, only a 7½-room unit would cost as high as \$15,750, not including the cost of the land. This seven and one-half-room unit would represent a kitchen, bathroom, living room, and five bedrooms. Very few units this size are found in the projects, but in a high-cost area a 6-room unit could conceivably cost \$15,000 (e.g., top per room costs of \$2,500 times 6 rooms equals \$15,000). Since eligibility is based upon family units and family size, public housing projects contain several three- and four-bedroom units (six- and seven-room units).

The National Association of Homebuilders believes that all units cost at least \$15,000 each based upon the following calculations under the Housing Act of 1949.

1. Room costs as high as \$2,500 each are permitted. This would be \$15,000 for a 6-room unit, not including land, etc.

2. Thus the unit cost, with land and non-dwelling facilities, might run as high as \$16,000 to \$17,000.

3. The law does not specify that the maximum Federal contribution shall be \$31.69 [debt service] per unit per month. This is an HHFA estimate. Actually, this is an average calculated by dividing the total authorized Federal subsidy (\$12,320,000,000) by the total number of units authorized (810,-

000). [1949 act.] This equals \$15,210 subsidy per unit over 40 years. Divided by 12 months this equals \$31.69. But—

4. Section 10 (b) and (c) of the public housing law provide [that] the legal maximum for Federal contributions on an annual basis of 4½ percent of the development cost (including land and everything). Thus, 4½ percent of \$16,500 (as an example of a cost permitted under the law), is \$742.50 Federal subsidy per year, or \$61.87 per month per unit. For 29 years this would be \$21,532, or for 40 years it would be \$29,700.

5. Furthermore, the PHA need not authorize the full 810,000 units if they find the costs are such that higher subsidies are needed. There is nothing to compel PHA to so build that the average of \$15,210 subsidy or any other amount will be maintained. The \$12 billion plus can be spread over fewer units if needed. (They can always go back to Congress for more money—and will.)<sup>8</sup>

The dollars-and-cents costs of the Government's operations in housing can never be measured precisely, but the data shown above indicate that the Government cannot operate as efficiently as private industry.

Mr. LINDSAY. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LINDSAY. I should like to compliment and congratulate the gentleman from Texas on the large amount of research and the intelligent and careful analysis he has made, from one point of view, of the problem of urban renewal. I, in many ways, disagree with the gentleman from Texas; nevertheless, I still compliment him on the valuable piece of work he has done and the contribution he has made to the study of this subject, which to me is as important as any subject presently before the Congress.

Let me just pose one problem, which I am sure the gentleman will recognize faces many of us who come from urban centers. My district is in Manhattan. I can assure the gentleman that over the past 16 or so years the State of New York has had responsible government. I am happy to say it is now back in Republican hands after a short interlude. The State of New York has strained itself to the utmost on the matter of housing for our citizens in crowded urban centers. I am also glad the gentleman pointed out that the contribution taxwise made by the State of New York is substantial and significant—that is to say, the taxes which New York has contributed to Uncle Sam and which have not been turned back to the citizens of New York in equal measure, are substantial.

One of the biggest problems we have is the flight to the suburbs of our young families, our young talent, and our best brains. In fact, we are close to becoming bankrupt in Manhattan of young people with children. They leave because they cannot afford decent housing in which to live. The responsibility for community affairs that ought to be assumed by young people with energy and time, who are leaders in their various localities within the city, is not being assumed because of the forced flight to the suburbs. Consequently these responsibilities are being seriously neglected.

<sup>8</sup>National Association of Home Builders, American home ownership versus public housing. Washington, The Association, [1951] p. 22.

It is the belief of many that unless something is done to reverse and stop this trend you will see a great center such as Manhattan slowly becoming so bankrupt of talent that it will become nothing more than a business-office community, which to my way of thinking is a slow way to destroy a city. A city needs flesh and blood as well as paving and stonework.

Now it would have been impossible in Manhattan and the city of New York to have done anything to ease this situation—and it would now be far worse—had it not been for Federal urban renewal. Again I point out that the State of New York has more than contributed its share of taxes to Uncle Sam and has also strained itself to do whatever possible by way of local housing subsidies to ease the housing problem in its urban centers. But, without a Federal urban renewal program, I submit, cities such as New York and particularly communities such as Manhattan will be in the most dire straits. The number of title I projects, for example, that are now located in the island of Manhattan has saved any number of young families that otherwise would have been driven out to the suburbs.

Mr. ALGER. I am sure we appreciate that. I know we share the gentleman's problem which is one that is facing all of us that we must solve. I cannot help but reflect that the problem you present in reference to the brains and ability from New York is probably what has taken away the very brain power that was needed to do urban renewal locally. I might further observe that the comptroller general in New York observed very unhappily that the present tax losses yearly are over \$30 million from tax-free properties now going into just public housing. So this is adding a burden on you. We are not going to resolve this problem, I am sure, in these few brief moments on this St. Patrick's Day, but certainly I want the gentleman to know I am just as interested as he is in urban renewal. I started out by saying I am for it all the way. But, I must take issue with the gentleman, if I may do so respectfully, by saying we of Dallas have found in our way, while we are not so big a city as New York, of course, that we can do urban renewal locally with local initiative and local brain power and local money and not with Federal money that brings with it more problems than Federal aid solves.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

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

Mr. ALGER. I yield.

Mr. IRWIN. I would like to come to the defense of my friend over here because he is one of the intelligent people who has stayed in New York and he is a brave fellow, doing a grand job. He does very well for his party and I am one who is benefiting by those people who are being driven out. There are fine and intelligent people coming out to Fairfield County in Connecticut. I believe, too, that this is one of the metropolitan areas of the United States that are in trouble. They need the kind of

<sup>7</sup>House Committee on Banking and Currency. Hearings on Housing Act of 1949, p. 458. (81st Cong., 1st sess.)

help that the housing bill provides. It is essential, I think, that we who come from metropolitan areas not only recognize it but feel it is a problem that grows day by day and the whole Nation has to address itself to it. These different regional interests, of course, have to resolve this and we have to ask patience of each other. We in the northeastern part of the country saw the mandatory restrictions on oil go through the other day. It is not something that is good for us and I personally object to it, but there is nothing we can do about it.

Mr. ALGER. I will say to the gentleman that urban renewal is a problem which is not peculiar to any one area or to any one city. The very reason I took the floor today is the fact that I am identifying my city and our problems with the cities and problems of our other colleagues who have kindred problems, and there will be a solution for each of them, I think, which applies to the other even with our differences. All I have tried to point out is that the long round trip of money from the locality up to the Federal Government and back to the locality, with the consequent loss and shrinkage en route and the loss of initiative and the local get-up-and-go, is not the way to solve this problem, as I see it, based on these facts. These cities all over the country who have weighed the use of Federal money and not getting Federal money have decided that the lessons and the experiences of those who have used Federal money is reason enough for them not to ask Federal aid, because even though they do not get that money back, and they are paying for it, they would rather not have the money than to have the problems that go with it.

I simply want to comment further to the gentleman that I have been appalled the few number of years I have been in Congress over the fact that when we see a need in Congress, and all of us are sincerely dedicated to providing for a need after we recognize it, that we immediately rush in to say the answer is in the Federal Government. I simply say the answer is inside each man and as men collect in groups at the government level closest to the people, we can solve many of the welfare problems. Certainly in our home areas where we know our problems we can solve their problem better than a distant Federal Government taking our money in taxes.

Can we get more money from the Federal Government? Absolutely not. The money is coming from us. The money the Government gives us is from our own pockets. Uncle Sam has nothing. In order to give us money back, he has to take it from us. How in the name of heaven can anyone offer you more money when it is your own money? How is it possible to think that you can get more money from the other man? You cannot get back relatively more than you have to give to the other man. You cannot win, as I see it.

Mr. IRWIN. But you cannot win that game. I do think that this is true of every element, that we would be better off if we had an open economy on oil, but

because of the reasons you present, a company has bowed to other forces.

Mr. ALGER. Some of us, even from the oil areas try to solve these problems on a basis of fact. Today I just waded through a bunch of factual material that made a lot of sense to me. It is not Republican. It is not Democratic. It is plain old American tradition. It is not regional. It is not Texas. I quoted from all over the country, from California to New York and from Michigan to Florida. Urban renewal is a pressing problem which I think we in Congress have an opportunity to try to solve. It is not through the dishing out of money which we do not have when we are operating at a deficit that we will solve our problems. I would say that when the budget is unbalanced it is no time to pour out more money. I would even be against certain good programs during deficit periods.

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

Mr. ALGER. I yield.

Mr. MOORHEAD. My city is the city of Pittsburgh and it has been in the forefront of urban renewal. As a matter of fact, we had 10 urban redevelopment projects either completed or now in progress. Out of those 10, 6 were done completely with local funds. No Federal aid whatsoever. However, the local community, all the political leaders and city leaders now say they cannot carry on these projects which are so essential to the continued expansion and economic welfare of the city unless we have Federal contributions.

Mr. ALGER. Why is that? Is it lack of money?

Mr. MOORHEAD. It is lack of money.

Mr. ALGER. Uncle Sam does not have the money. He is broke. The money has got to come from you. That is my point.

Mr. MOORHEAD. If we can revise the entire tax structure, it is possible we could do it on the local basis.

Mr. ALGER. I would like to compliment the gentleman on his statement of what Pittsburgh has done on its own. I point out the money is not available federally. Perhaps you are hurrying along too fast, expanding urban renewal too fast because of your expecting to get the money from the distant wealthy Uncle Sam. Whereas, if you still had the problem locally without Federal aid you would plan more carefully, possibly more slowly—I am only speculating that local people know best what they can do with their own means, but if some outside source is offering the promise of money, you may hurry along if you are bidding for that money and there is only a limited amount of it, overlooking your own better judgment.

Mr. MOORHEAD. The gentleman must remember the community puts up half of the money. Even that hits the big cities.

Mr. ALGER. Yes, but what holds the local community back more is the loss of tax revenue. Take Pittsburgh, for example. Does the gentleman know what the tax revenue loss will be because of the urban renewal and housing that goes

with it that is now tax exempt? This is income loss to Pittsburgh.

Mr. MOORHEAD. The first redevelopment project we undertook, after the land was cleared and the new buildings were put up, the taxing bodies received \$800,000 more from those buildings than they did from the blighted areas.

Mr. ALGER. This is true, no doubt, since the property was enhanced, but does the gentleman know how much the city has to pay out for such matters as the paving of streets, sewerage, water, garbage collection, police protection, schools, and all those other things the people get free in public housing?

Mr. MOORHEAD. I do not know what the figures are.

Mr. ALGER. This will surprise the gentleman when he learns these figures. You get started on these problems, find the cost is more than was expected, and find you have to get more from Washington.

Mr. MOORHEAD. We do find in Pittsburgh and we are convinced that urban renewal is the only way we can get our city cleaned up, but we do find that when we clear out slum areas that approximately one-half of the people living there have income levels so low that they cannot be housed in private housing.

Mr. ALGER. I would contest that with the gentleman. I believe we have figures that show that it can be done cheaper under private enterprise with FHA insurance under titles 221 and 222 than it can be done with public housing. I will just have to contest that with the gentleman. I think he has failed to grasp some of the logic I have tried to set out as to the economic burden that we are passing on to the future. There are two questions that present themselves: First, how much of this is the role of the Federal Government; and, second, how much can we afford?

I say in all sincerity that I am sure the city of Pittsburgh will find when all factors are taken into consideration that public housing turns out to be more costly than private housing.

Mr. MOORHEAD. I want to commend the gentleman from Texas on his excellent analysis and study of the problem. He has made a contribution which I consider to be most important in this matter of urban renewal.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I want to commend the gentleman from Texas for bringing this problem to the forefront of the minds of Members of the House. His presentation of the subject has been very illuminating. I certainly agree with the gentleman when it comes to this one very important point, and that is that the Federal Government is not a well without a bottom as far as money is concerned. Perhaps as far as money is concerned it is, but as far as the purchasing power of money is concerned it certainly is not such a well. People seem to feel that when they need money all they have to do is to ask Washington for it, that the Federal Government has money, and you can get part of it. This is true only

when we speak of dollars and cents, but too many people fail to realize that every time the Federal Government puts out more dollars than it takes in it involves a cheapening of the dollar, it involves inflation which shrinks purchasing power, which must be used every time the Federal Government gets into something. It takes the purchasing power out of the hip pockets of every citizen of your district and my district without those people realizing it until the money is gone, until the dollar which they put into social security, the dollar they put into savings, the dollar they put into bonds is worth less than half what it was when they put it in.

To me this is a thing which all of us must remember when we consider urban renewal and the other programs. They are wonderful programs, but every time we go in debt to finance these programs we shrink the value of the dollar.

One question the gentleman has asked since I have been on the floor is, "Can we afford it?" This is a question I think should become a great deal more popular in the House and the Senate: Can we afford it, not in dollars, but can we afford it in the purchasing power of money? That is the question we must ask ourselves often.

Mr. ALGER. I thank the gentleman, and I heartily agree.

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

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

Mr. BECKER. I want to commend the gentleman from Texas and also join with him in his exposition of this problem. I think he has done a splendid job.

I was extremely interested in the colloquy between the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. MOORHEAD]. At one point of the gentleman's remarks the gentleman from Texas asked the gentleman from Pennsylvania why they were slowing down in their work. The gentleman from Pennsylvania said it was due to lack of money so they were going to Washington.

There are only two ways to get money, one is for the Government to print more money, and the second is to get it from taxes. Consequently, if you get it from revenue coming to the Federal Government, then it has got to come from the people in the form of taxes and when it is derived from taxes it comes from the pockets of the people. In my State of New York we realize that at the present time out of every dollar taken from us in the way of taxes all we get back is 25 cents for projects in our State. Certainly New York State needs as much as any other State.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain data.

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

There was no objection.

#### A NEW LOOK AT OUR DEBT MANAGEMENT POLICIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EDMONDSON). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the debate up to this time has ranged very interestingly over the national budget, national expenditures and the problem of inflation. I would like to address myself to a problem which is essentially enmeshed with all those matters.

We are facing a crisis in the management of our public debt. It will not do to ignore the problem. On the contrary, Congress, as the guardian of the national credit, has the duty to discuss and debate the question of debt management. For only from discussion and debate can come sounder policies—policies which can safeguard the full faith and credit of the United States.

It is imperative that we inquire into the impasse to which we have been brought—the excessive increase in interest cost which does not seem justified by the present scale of business activity, the plunge in the capital values of outstanding Treasury bonds, and the increasing inability to attract funds except with very short-dated securities. Even if we found that paying still higher rates of interest would enable us to sell more long-term bonds, we should have to consider the effect of such action both on the already lagging pace of the recovery, and on the Federal budget. The interest cost for fiscal 1960 is now estimated to be \$8 billion. This is the largest single nondefense item in the budget. It represents an increase of 20 percent over the fiscal 1959 budget item. An average rise of as little as one-half of 1 percent in a total debt of \$285 billion would result in boosting interest charges by an additional \$1.5 billion.

#### THE DEBT-MANAGEMENT CRISIS

What is the nature of the crisis in debt management?

Last June the Treasury issued a 2½-percent, 6-year bond, to refund a maturing issue. Subscriptions outran all anticipations, and more than \$7 billion of the securities were issued. Within a few days after the date of issue, it became apparent that a large part of the purchases were of a speculative nature. The market became so disorderly that the Treasury bought back some \$600 million of the issue. The Federal Reserve stepped in to buy another \$1.2 billion before near-panic conditions could be corrected. Between this episode and the relatively small January issue, only short-term securities could be marketed. It appears now that the situation is even worse—the Treasury is having trouble refunding debt, not with long-term debt, but even with attractively priced, short-term securities.

This past month, in February, \$15 billion in short-term debt came due. In exchange, the holders were offered a choice of either a 3½-percent, 1-year certificate, or a 4-percent, 3-year note, priced at par. These rates were higher than the going market rate of interest for outstanding securities of comparable maturity. Instead of snapping up the

Treasury's generous offer, however, owners of \$2.1 billion of the \$9.2 billion held outside the Federal Reserve System demanded cash rather than the exchange. Therefore, the Treasury had to make another trip to the market to obtain \$1.5 billion in 7-month bills.

This, in short, is the debt-management crisis. The outlook is grave. A large volume of refunding must still be handled this year, in addition to the weekly rollover of about \$2 billion in Treasury bills. According to the weekly rollover of about \$2 billion in Treasury bills. According to the Treasury's statement to the Joint Economic Committee on February 5, the entire deficit for the fiscal year 1959 has been financed, but funds will have to be found for a heavy temporary deficit in the July-December portion of fiscal 1960. The major refunding remaining amounts to \$4.5 billion in May, \$13.5 billion in August, and \$9 billion in November.

The present debt management practices of our Government collide squarely with three fundamental principles: First, that the debt to the maximum extent should be held by real savers, not by the commercial banks; second, that it should not be excessively in short-term obligation; and third, that debt management should be coordinated with the Government's monetary and fiscal policies.

The reason for the first principle is that a large bank-held national debt stockpiles an inflationary credit potential that may prove impervious to restrictive monetary policies if and when they become necessary.

The reason for the second principle is that an excessive proportion of short-term obligations keeps the Treasury in the nervous position of having to resort to the money market almost constantly.

The reason for the third principle is that the Employment Act of 1946 requires all policies, including debt management, to take into account the national goals of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

#### THE ADMINISTRATION RECOGNIZES THESE GOALS, BUT VIOLATES THEM

Let it not be said, Mr. Speaker, that the administration is pursuing its wrong course in ignorance of its wrongness. The goals of debt management which it set up itself when it took office were diametrically opposed to the course now pursued.

On February 2, 1953, the President said in his state of the Union message:

It is clear that too great a part of the national debt becomes due in too short a time. The Department of the Treasury will undertake, indeed, has undertaken, at suitable times a program of extending part of the debt over longer periods and gradually placing greater amounts in the hands of longer term investors.

In answer to criticism for paying too high an interest rate on bonds issued in April 1953, Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey said:

The new issue of 30-year 3¼ percent bonds is one step in a program of extending part of the debt over longer periods and gradually placing greater amounts in the hands of longer term investors announced by Presi-

dent Eisenhower in his state of the Union message.

The concentration of short-term debt in the banks by the previous administration was one of the causes of inflation in the cost of living which has cost the American people billions of dollars. A gradual placing of more securities in the hands of non-bank investors is a necessary step for economic stability.

Former Under Secretary of the Treasury Burgess stated the philosophy of the administration's debt management program to the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, meeting in Washington, D.C., on May 12, 1953:

When the Treasury meets a deficit by borrowing from the banks, it is inflationary—creates more money—tends to raise the cost of living.

Bank borrowing may be cheap in terms of interest cost to the Treasury. But it is exceedingly expensive for the country as a whole, as all Americans who have been hurt by inflationary prices in the past decade should know.

The reasons are simple but deserve spelling out.

When the Treasury sells short-term securities to banks the money supply is increased by the amount of the borrowing. There is more money—but there is no increase in the things people can buy for their own use. Borrowing outside of banks, on the other hand, reaches genuine savings. Money which might have gone into other investment outlets goes instead into governments. The Treasury competes for available loan funds rather than creating new money.

This avoids inflation—it keeps the price of food, clothing, and shelter from going up.

These simple principles constitute the bases for the program of the Treasury Department for financing the public debt. It was the violation of these principles by the previous administration which was one of the major causes of inflation in the cost of living, which cut the buying power of the dollar in half since just before World War II.

#### THE INCREASE IN COMMERCIAL BANK HOLDINGS

The administration was extremely critical of the share of the Federal debt held by the commercial banks when it came into office. Its declared objective was to place more of the debt among the nonbanking purchasers and, particularly, among individuals and the savings institutions.

The record is one of confessed failure. Mr. Charles J. Gable, Jr., of the Treasury Department, conceded to the Joint Economic Committee on February 5.

First. From December 1952 to December 1958 none of the savings of individuals, on a net basis, either directly or indirectly through savings institutions, went into purchases of Federal debt.

Second. In these 6 years the major savings institutions reduced their holdings of Government securities from \$27.5 billion to \$26 billion at a time when the assets of these institutions grew by approximately \$100 billion.

Moreover, the commercial banks now hold a somewhat larger proportion of the total debt, outside of the Government trust accounts and the Federal Reserve System, than they did at the end of 1952. If there is a continuation of the present trend, there is every reason to believe that as the share of individuals and the savings institutions continues to decline, the amount financed through the commercial banks will increase. This was

stated by Secretary of the Treasury Anderson in a speech to the American Bankers Association convention in Chicago on September 23, 1958:

A matter of considerably greater concern is the sharp drop in the Government security holdings of nonbank financial institutions. \* \* \*

When the great institutional holders of the Nation's savings do not buy Treasury securities, the Treasury must turn to the commercial banks.

From Mr. Gable's testimony and a study of Treasury economics, a number of very disturbing conclusions can be drawn about debt management during 1958:

First. In 1958 the Treasury had to raise \$19 billion in new money—\$8 billion to finance the deficit, and \$11 billion to pay off former investors who demanded cash for maturing and redeemable securities. Refinancing, therefore, constituted a much bigger burden than the deficit itself.

Second. Individuals and institutional savers—insurance companies, mutual savings banks, savings and loan associations, and pension funds—not only did not increase their holdings of Federal debt, but reduced them by almost \$2 billion during the year.

Third. The entire Federal deficit of \$8 billion was actually financed by the commercial banks. Their holdings of U.S. Government securities increased exactly \$8 billion—from \$58 billion in December 1957, to \$66 billion at the end of December 1958.

Fourth. These bank holdings might well have been even larger were it not for increased purchases by the Federal Reserve System of \$2 billion, and increased purchases in the last 6 months of 1958 of bills and other short-dated maturities by nonfinancial corporations.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I will be very glad to.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I am happy that the gentleman is discussing this very important subject. I think you properly pointed out three basic principles. What you are, in fact, saying is that in spite of adherence and a desire to attain these three basic principles, our situation is such that the economics do not permit it, and the proof lies just in the figures that the gentleman has stated, that instead of increasing holding in E-bonds, for example, in the hands of private investors other than the Federal Reserve System, in spite of all the efforts made to sell those, we have not been able to do it.

Mr. REUSS. That is precisely what I am saying. I thank the gentleman for clarifying it, and I hope the gentleman, in his deep interest in the subject, will be able to stay for a few minutes despite the fact that it is St. Patrick's Day. Later on I am going to address myself, in what I hope will be a constructive spirit, to some of the things that I believe we ought to be thinking about if we are to get out of this dilemma. At this point, however, all I am saying is that the Treasury recognizes, as do responsible people everywhere, that one most excellent practice of debt management is to

stay to the greatest possible extent away from the commercial banks. But unfortunately we are not able to do that now.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The gentleman, I am sure, is trying to keep it on that plane. As I listened to the gentleman, he said that the observance of these principles has been more in the breach.

Mr. REUSS. The gentleman has agreed with me.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No. What I meant was whether that was the result of the failure to do everything the Treasury could to follow the principle but that other factors outside of the power of government had entered in, and I am willing to discuss that later. I just did not want the gentleman to beg the question.

Mr. REUSS. We will come to this later, but meanwhile I am delighted that so far the gentleman is with me in the points I have made, which are, first, that it is good common sense and good political economy to keep the national debt to the largest possible extent out of the hands of the commercial banks because of the obviously inflationary potential; secondly, that the Treasury, in pouring increased amounts of national debt into the hands of the commercial banks, has, quite properly, a bad conscience about it; it knows it is not doing what it would like to do. And, thirdly, that it behooves the gentleman from Missouri, myself, and all others to address themselves to this problem and see how we can help the Government dig itself out of the hole.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. And see what the economic factors underlying the situation are, yes.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and I hope that he will be able to stay.

I move on then to the second principle of sound debt management which I referred to, and that is the goal of increasing the average maturity of debt. There, again, the obvious point of wanting a longer maturity is so that the Treasury does not have to resort to the money market every few months, or, sometimes, every few days.

#### THE DECLINE IN THE DEBT'S LENGTH

What has happened since 1953 to the goal of increasing the average maturity of the debt?

In December 1951, the average length of the marketable, interest-bearing debt was 6 years and 7 months. The relatively short-term financing for the Korean war reduced this average to 5 years and 8 months by the end of 1952. This was the heritage which the administration deplored and vowed to change. The sad truth of the matter is that the average length has now declined to only 4 years and 9 months. Moreover, there is every indication that this figure will continue to decline.

During the last months of 1954 and early 1955, the Treasury was able to issue enough long-term securities to raise the average length temporarily to 6 years and 1 month. From March 1955 to January 1958, however, there was a steady reduction in this figure to a low of 4 years and 7 months.

In 1958, 72 percent of the financing and refinancing was in the form of

short-term debt—under 4 years to maturity. The under 1-year debt now averages about \$78 to \$80 billion out of a total marketable debt of about \$179 billion. This compares with an under 1-year maturity figure of \$58 billion out of a total marketable debt of \$149 billion at the end of December 1952.

Moreover, Mr. Gable of the Treasury warned the Joint Economic Committee in his testimony on February 5 that, if no effort is made in the coming year to exchange maturing issues with debt having maturities longer than a year, the under 1-year debt will climb to \$84 billion by the end of the year. If this practice were continued in 1960, 1961, and 1962—and there were no increases in the total debt—the under 1-year category would comprise 75 percent of the marketable debt outstanding by the end of 1962.

Let us look, then, at the third canon of sound debt management, that to the maximum possible extent it should be enmeshed with other economic policies, monetary policy, fiscal policy, the policies which our Government uses to achieve the triune aims of the Employment Act of 1946.

#### THE INCONSISTENCIES BETWEEN DEBT MANAGEMENT AND OTHER ADMINISTRATION POLICIES

The administration also believed that debt management policy could and should complement monetary and fiscal policies. Thus, it stated in November 1954, to the Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization of the Joint Economic Committee:

Monetary policy during the late months of 1953 and during 1954 has stressed active ease in the money market. The Treasury, therefore, has refrained in the past year and a half from issuing long-term securities. It has purposely done its financing so as not to compete for or reduce the long-term money available for private capital investment or for State and local highway, school, and other construction projects. This policy has contributed appreciably to maintaining a high level of economic activity during the last year or so. (Joint Economic Committee, Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization, replies by the Treasury Department to questions on monetary policy and debt management, November 1954, p. 2.)

But this 1954 statement of principle has quite consistently been honored in the breach.

In the boom of 1955-57, long-term Government financing should have been in order so as to discourage too much resort to long-term financing for inflationary business expansion. But except for a \$2.7 billion issue early in 1955, the Treasury was unable to do any long-term financing during the entire 2-year period.

Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve expressed his dissatisfaction to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee in these words:

I think we should have had more support from a larger budget surplus and from other restraining factors in the economy, including the management of the public debt. (U.S. Senate, hearing before Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency on Federal Reserve monetary policies, Feb. 19, 1958, p. 9.)

In the 1957-58 recession, a coordinated debt management policy would have

called for emphasis on short-term securities. Yet from October 1957 to February 1958, the Treasury sold \$8 billion of long-term securities, ranging in maturity from 6 to 32 years.

Currently the administration is very vocally pursuing a policy of monetary restriction. Yet the Treasury once again is out of step with the rest of the team. Last month's financing showed a renewed reliance on short-term Federal debt.

At the hearings of the Joint Economic Committee on February 5, Secretary Anderson was asked whether the Treasury would join in the President's anti-inflation program by issuing long-term securities. He replied:

I can answer that by saying we will issue long-term securities whenever we think we can market them at a reasonable price. Now, there is a classical theory that you put out long-term securities in times of prosperity and that you put out short-term securities in times of recession. My own experience has been that no classical theory is ever wholly operative and that you put out long-term securities when you can. This is a problem that we are concerned about, as to whether or not part of the debt can be extended.

Now, Mr. Speaker, many of us, including the majority of the Joint Economic Committee, think that the administration is wrong in its current tight money policy at a time of almost 5 million unemployed, and with one-quarter of our resources unused. So it may be suggested that we should not object too much to a debt management policy which rides off in the opposite direction from the administration's current monetary policy. But there is little to praise in a debt management policy which by the criteria of its own makers is dead wrong. Moreover, the kind of credit ease which is needed now is by a relaxation of one or more of the traditional Federal Reserve tools—rediscount rate, reserve requirements, or open market policy. To achieve credit ease by creating a large short-term debt, and by selling it largely to the commercial banks, is to ease credit in the worst possible way—one that makes the economy more unresponsive than ever to a restrictive monetary policy that might be necessary in the future.

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. I want to congratulate the gentleman on a very excellent statement and, may I say, a scholarly treatment of this difficult and complicated subject. I wonder if the gentleman has figures which highlight the average cost which annually is being borne by the American taxpayer in interest payments on the national debt as the result of the hard money policy which has been fostered by the administration.

Mr. REUSS. Yes. I think in order to keep this colloquy unloaded, I should simply give the differences in the figures and we will leave it to our later discussion to develop the causes. But the fact is that in 1946, with a national debt of \$269 billion, the carrying charges were \$4.7 billion. Today, with a national debt

of somewhat more, but not very much more, \$285 billion, the carrying charges are estimated in this year's budget to be \$8 billion, or almost twice the carrying charges on a comparable debt some years ago.

You can take the figures throughout the years and make a somewhat similar comparison. For instance, in this year's budget the greatest single increase by far over last year's budget is in the carrying charges on the national debt. I believe it is something in excess of 20 percent over the carrying charges last year. This is not to assign blame for it. It is simply to report the fact that the carrying charges on a national debt of a fairly comparable size have unconscionably risen.

Mr. WRIGHT. It was not my intention, let me say at this point, to hurry the gentleman into a premature discussion of a phase of the matter that he hopes to undertake, prior to the time when he wishes to discuss it. I think I may say in passing that there are other things which could be discussed in connection with that particular phase of this overall subject matter. I presume the gentleman is coming to that matter in time.

Mr. REUSS. Yes, I do intend to come to it. At that point, incidentally, and quite apart from the point the gentleman is making now, I intended to refer to the very penetrating speech the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] made on this floor several weeks ago on this matter of debt management.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. May I make the observation that I thought the gentleman would point out that in 1951 there was a great change.

Mr. REUSS. Yes; I intend to come to that and discuss it rather fully.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I am glad to have the gentleman do that, but I think in fairness we could let the gentleman from Texas know the real reason why the carrying charges on the debt have changed was that there was a pegged market before 1951, and after 1951 a change was brought about. It was a matter of politics, and it was a Democratic administration. The change was made because that was not working out, and they shifted and brought about an Open Market Committee, and therefore brought out the real cost of the Federal rate of interest. I think when the gentleman compares the interest rate he should point out that we were paying for it in an entirely different way than what is actually put down in interest rates.

Mr. REUSS. I think both the gentleman from Texas and I were trying to be fair. For that reason, when I gave the comparison I said, let the figures speak for themselves. I will come in a moment to this question of what happened in 1951. Let me say that I think what happened in 1951 is one of the things we have to take a good, cold, clear look at right now. I know that I speak for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] as well as for myself when I say that this

clear look has to be taken without regard to party considerations. Throughout my discussions this afternoon, I am going to let the chips fall where they may. If they bruise Democrats as well as Republicans, so be it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is why I wanted to bring that point out. In weighing this, you just cannot weigh the figures, you have to weigh the economic impact and why the methods that were pursued before 1951 were changed in 1951.

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman has referred to the increased cost of carrying the debt. I wonder if the gentleman would care to comment on the policy of lending money to various groups at less cost in interest than the Treasury is now paying for money that they are borrowing. I have particularly in mind the fact that the REA borrows money at 2 percent and the Government is now paying considerably more than that. Would the gentleman consider that as wise debt management, which he is now discussing?

Mr. REUSS. I will try to answer the gentleman very briefly. I think I should confine my discussion to the question of debt management this afternoon and not to get into side discussions, however interesting, of our various national expenditures policies. In foreign aid, for instance, we give aid by grants. We give aid by hard currency, and world bank loans. We give aid by a kind of relaxed loan. With our various domestic groups there are many, many subsidies, some outright by grant, and some by economic interest loans, and some by a loan at less than the going rate of interest. I think what we have to consider here is that our total national expenditure, by grant or loan or whatever, has to be determined on its merits. All I am concerned with this afternoon is the question, having created a national debt now on the order of \$285 billion, how we most sensibly can manage it.

Mr. BOW. If I may ask the gentleman one brief question, and I do not intend to get into an argument with the gentleman about this, but it seems to me for proper debt management we would do well if we were to establish the policy we had in many instances of making loans at the cost of the money to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. REUSS. Well, yes, of course, debt management would be easier if we had no national expenditures, and if we dissolved the Army and the Navy and the Air Force and we had no expenses. Then we presumably could use more tax revenues to pay off the national debt. But, I think the question we should concentrate on is the question of how, given a national debt such as the whopper that we have, do we make the best of it?

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

Mr. REUSS. I will yield briefly to the gentleman from Ohio; then I must go on, because I want to cover some further points, and then I will surely yield quite freely.

Mr. HAYS. I just wanted to point out in relation to the REA that before the days of the high interest boys, we were still charging the REA 2 percent and making a profit on it because the Federal Government was borrowing money at less than 2 percent and we did make a sizable and substantial profit on REA loans until the high interest rate people took over downtown.

WHAT IS THE REASON FOR THE TREASURY'S TROUBLES?

Mr. REUSS. So our debt management policies disregard each of the three principles that have been considered as worthy guides. And the end of our troubles is not in sight.

Let us now inquire into possible causes of the Treasury's predicament. Why don't long-term investors seem to want to buy Treasury securities?

ARE THE TREASURY'S TROUBLES CAUSED BY INVESTORS' FEAR OF INFLATION?

The notion that the fear of inflation is preventing people from buying fixed income securities—including Treasury bonds—is often expressed. Thus, for example, Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve stated to the Joint Economic Committee on February 6:

Investors cannot be induced to purchase fixed income securities if they fear a steady erosion of the purchasing power of the dollar.

The administration's own unceasing contention that the dangers of monetary inflation are an imminent threat has done much to rouse fears of inflation among the public generally. It has without doubt been an important factor in shifting much private investment toward equities. But fear of inflation during 1956-57 did not prevent purchases of nearly \$23 billion in mortgage debt and of \$18 billion in corporate long-term debt. Corporations raised three times as much money through bond issues as through issues of both common and preferred stock.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. An element in all of those loans was the prepayment condition. A mortgage is for 6 or 7 years. The prepayment makes a great deal of difference in the type of investment.

Mr. REUSS. The fact is the investors were not so panicked by inflation but they did come in and buy corporate bonds and municipal bonds and residential and industrial mortgages, with or without prepayment clauses, and apparently without much fear of inflation.

The great bulk of the small- and medium-income savers of the country continue to put their savings into savings accounts, insurance policies, or pension and retirement funds—not into the purchase of equities, as is implied by Mr. Martin's statement. A continuous increase in consumer prices during 1956 and 1957 did not prevent individuals from increasing their savings and loan deposits by \$10 billion, mutual savings bank deposits by \$3.5 billion, and life insurance company reserves by \$8.5 billion.

Furthermore, most of the funds taken in by the various savings institutions

cannot by law be invested in other than fixed-income securities. Their lack of preference for Government bonds must be explained in some other way—it cannot be said that this group is speculating in the stock market. They have simply shifted on a massive scale to investment in other types of debt. Life insurance companies, for example, have reduced their investments in governments by more than \$3 billion from the end of 1952 to today, but have increased their holdings of corporate bonds by more than \$13.5 billion, and of mortgages by \$15 billion. Savings and loan associations bought \$2 billion more U.S. Government obligations of all types, but increased investments in mortgages by more than \$26 billion.

The volume of municipal bonds outstanding has increased from \$16 billion in 1945 to \$60 billion today.

So it is at best dubious how far the fear of inflation has frightened investors away from Treasury issues.

ARE THE TREASURY'S TROUBLES DUE TO A NEED TO MARKET A VASTLY INCREASED NATIONAL DEBT?

It is axiomatic that the larger the debt which must be financed, the greater the management burden upon the Treasury. At the end of 1957, the Federal debt totaled \$275 billion, and the recession deficit added \$8 billion more, creating a debt of \$283 billion by the end of 1958. Is this increase in debt the fundamental cause of the Treasury's difficulties? Had the deficit not occurred, would there be no debt management problem?

An examination of the 5 years preceding 1958 shows otherwise. From 1952 to 1957, the debt rose from \$267.4 billion to \$275 billion, an increase of \$7.6 billion, but the principal nonbank savers—the savings institutions and individuals—increased their debt holdings by only half a billion dollars. Commercial banks and nonfinancial corporations reduced their holdings by \$7.7 billion, as a result of their greatly increased investments in business expansion. While the State and local governments added to their net purchases of Federal debt by about \$6 billion, this was not enough to offset the reductions by other classes of purchasers.

How then was the debt increase financed?

It was not a miracle of debt management, but the rapid, automatic growth in the Government trust funds which absorbed the additions to the debt and obscured the latent crisis. These funds, created by the accumulations of social security and unemployment compensation taxes over and above the amounts paid out, made available over \$9 billion—enough to take care of the debt increase and to permit net redemptions of debt held outside the Government accounts by \$1.7 billion.

With the huge assistance of the trust fund resources, and, therefore, with a smaller debt in 1957 than in 1952 to finance in the market, the Treasury has consistently since 1952 encountered the same kind of difficulties that it meets today. The existence of budget surpluses in both 1956 and 1957 made no difference. No long-term bonds could

be sold, and the bulk of the financing was in maturities of less than 2 years. And these were not held in high esteem, as pointed out by Moody's Bond Survey in a recent issue:

The majority of marketable Treasuries (other than bills) offered between the fall of 1955 and September, 1957, were selling below their issue prices as soon as their issue dates. This behavior occurred despite the existence of budgetary balances in both fiscal 1956 and 1957.

The point I make is simply this: that every problem of debt management now confronting us would still have confronted us had the national debt remained at an absolutely level rate in the last 5 years. So we must seek elsewhere for the basic cause of our difficulties.

If neither inflationary fears, nor recent deficits, seem to be the primary cause of the Treasury's inability to attract investors, what is the cause? There remains for examination the fluctuations in the price of Governments as a possible explanation.

From the advent of a large national debt during World War II until 1951, the Federal Reserve supported the Government bond market at close to par. During all this time, while the national debt rose from a 1936-40 average of \$43 billion, to \$269 billion in June 1946, and \$255 billion in June 1951, the national debt was manageable.

Prior to 1951 the national debt, since it became a large national debt during the days of World War II, had been, as the economists say, a manageable national debt; that is to say, the interest charged was tolerable. The figures I gave in response to the question by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] were that they were on the order of \$4.7 billion a year for the national debt in 1946, compared to around \$8 billion today for a national debt that in terms of dollars is not much more than it was in 1946.

The percentages, up until 1951, held in short-term obligations and held by commercial banks, while they were not completely satisfactory, were much more satisfactory than the similar percentages today. Then in 1951 came the Treasury-Federal Reserve accord, under which the Federal Reserve no longer concerned itself with supporting bonds and Government securities, except in instances where conditions became disorderly.

The extent of the fluctuations since 1951 can be gaged by just a couple of examples:

A 2½-percent bond, issued at par in November 1945 and subject to first call in December 1967, is today worth only \$853.75, a loss of \$146.25. A 3¼-percent bond issued in May 1953 and subject to first call in June 1978, is today worth \$890.63, a loss of \$109.37. A 3-percent bond, issued in February 1955, due in February 1995, is now priced at \$855.75, a loss of \$144.25. The 2½-percent 6-year bond issued last June is now worth \$926.88, a decline in value of \$73.12 in less than 8 months.

This trend in capital values is, of course, not limited to the most recent period. A 2½-percent 7-year bond issued

in February 1954, sold at a low of \$936.25, on July 22, 1957. The 3¼-percent bond mentioned above sold at \$923.75 on October 18, 1957, while the 3-percent 40-year bond was worth only \$868.75 on June 21, 1957.

These wide fluctuations were not supposed to happen under the theory of the proponents of present debt management policies. It was asserted that investors would be reluctant to take capital losses in Government securities that were down in price; and this resistance to selling would minimize the downward trend. But the facts have not supported this theory. Both the commercial banks and savings institutions reduced their holdings of Government debt on a substantial scale during 1955-57, because profitable alternative investment opportunities abounded. Insurance companies in this period reduced their Government holdings almost \$2.5 billion, and the commercial banks \$3 billion, despite widespread capital losses.

It seems highly probable that these excessive fluctuations have helped to scare investors away from Government securities in recent years. During the period prior to the accord, when Government securities were supported, fluctuations were minimal, and enough investors preferred Government securities to corporate bonds and mortgages, municipal bonds, and common stocks. The national debt was manageable. But since 1951, fixed-income investors have seemed to prefer other securities. Municipals, though they fluctuate, are tax-exempt. Corporate bonds and mortgages, though they fluctuate too, yield a higher interest rate.

#### CAN HIGHER INTEREST RATES MAKE DEBT MANAGEMENT EASIER?

If the fluctuations in the price of Governments have tended to turn investors away from them, why not make Governments more attractive by hiking the interest rate? Unfortunately, for the Government to do this is to chase its own nose. The Government, of course, can set higher interest rates on its own issues, both directly and by control of interest rates through general monetary policy. But these tend to be immediately reflected in higher interest rates on corporate bonds and mortgages. So investors' resistance to Governments remains uncured.

Indeed, a policy of successive hikes in interest rates on Government securities is likely not merely to leave Governments in the same relatively unattractive position as compared with corporate bonds and mortgages. Because of investors' sensitivity, it may actually heighten the disfavor accorded Government securities. This is so because investors know the ability of the Treasury to write its own ticket on interest rates, something other borrowers cannot do. If the Treasury, therefore, seems to be embarked upon a course of steadily increasing the interest rate on Government bonds, investors decide to forego a current issue and to wait for something better. After the announcement of the disappointing refunding operation last month, a bond house which specializes in

the handling of Government securities commented:

Actually, the Treasury was fortunate to be able to name rates no higher than 3¾ percent and 4 percent \* \* \* the market's action [in selling outstanding maturities after the January financing] told the Treasury rather pointedly that if it offered a 5- to 12-year bond—it would have to pay through the nose, a 4¼-percent coupon would have been required without real assurance that any worthwhile amount of bonds would be taken on those terms. (Market letter of Aubrey G. Lanston & Co., Inc., Feb. 2, 1959.)

Interest rates for Government securities are now bumping the 40-year-old 4¼ percent statutory ceiling on over-5-year Government issues. President Eisenhower, at a recent press conference, said that he would ask Congress to raise the 4¼ percent interest ceiling if it became necessary. But it becomes increasingly clear that Congress should consider the entire debt-management problem, of which the interest-rate ceiling is merely a part.

#### DEBT-MANAGEMENT POLICIES NOT WORKING

From what I have said, it is clear that our debt-management policies are not working. Instead of reducing the interest cost of the national debt, we have almost doubled it in recent years. Instead of lengthening the average maturity of the debt, we have shortened it. Instead of achieving a well-spaced regularity of chosen types of financing, we are in the market at frequent, irregular, and unexpected intervals. Instead of refinancing the debt increasingly with nonbanking, long-term savers as recovery proceeds, we continue to reissue bills to the commercial banks.

Then, complaining of the "inflationary tinder" lying around, the administration raises the rediscount rate, which not only impedes recovery from the recession, but aggravates the debt-management problem itself.

It is high time that our best thought be given to debt management. The administration should be doing it. But Congress, as the guardian of the currency, should do its share. Fortunately, the Joint Economic Committee has just embarked on a year-long study of economic growth and stability. As we have seen, every economic objective of the Federal Government—maximum employment, production, and purchasing power—is deeply affected by debt management. The Joint Economic Committee study can perform a great public service by focusing attention on some basic questions:

#### SOME QUESTIONS THAT NEED ASKING

First. Are our financial institutions—savings banks, pension funds, insurance companies, savings and loan associations—so constituted as to provide the best possible market for Government securities?

Second. To what extent do fears of inflation hurt the Federal securities market, and how can we set these fears to rest if they exist?

Third. How do Federal tax policies affect debt management?

Fourth. What can Congress do, by fiscal policy, to set up an orderly system of debt retirement? While we have seen



that the Treasury would have its debt problems even had there been no deficits in recent years, we surely need a long-term program of debt retirement. On this question, the recent floor speech of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] has offered some provocative guidelines.

Fifth. Has the 1951 accord been harmfully misapplied? It was conceived in a period of full employment and demand inflation. Its sponsors sincerely believed that uncritical support of the Government bond market at par would create reserves that could add to inflation. Although this is quite true, the accord could still be inapplicable to the situation today, when open market purchases of the debt by the Federal Reserve would serve the dual purpose of easing credit conditions and helping in debt management.

We should not return to a rigid system of supporting U.S. securities at par. But what is wrong with redefining the accord so that the Federal Reserve would be encouraged to support governments as much as it could without creating inflationary credit conditions?

In other words, when monetary ease is indicated, let the Federal Reserve support the market for governments; and before ceasing its support, let it first exhaust such other anti-inflationary monetary weapons as raising reserve requirements. Would not such a redefined accord, with its promise of some stability of capital values for Government securities, tend to give them that little bit of extra attractiveness needed to interest investors?

Above all, Mr. Speaker, our objective must be to restore the confidence of our investors in Government securities. We believe in the future of our country. It should be within our abilities to encourage our citizens to invest in that future.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of sympathy for the remarks the gentleman has made and I would like to express sympathy for the plight of the present and preceding administrations. We had an economic stabilization program that was put together during the war years, which was largely dismantled following the war, and monetary policy was the only power left to the administration in its effort to in some way or other keep the economy in balance and defeat inflation. I am pleased to have the gentleman suggest that in the study, which I am sure he will be instrumental in making, they will reexamine other alternatives. It strikes me that we should ask the Treasury to reconsider the level of the interest rate at which it operates and ask the Federal Reserve to reconsider, as I think we should, the role which it will play in making for an orderly market for Federal securities. We should then also consider, and I would like the gentleman's reaction to these suggestions, what powers we will give the Treasury and, more particularly, the Federal Reserve to compensate for the restriction on the power of debt management. I have in mind not only raising the reserve re-

quirements, as has been suggested, but giving the Federal Reserve power and asking that they use that power for selective use of credit. It occurs to me that the high interest rate discourages investment in industry and encourages the consumer use of credit and frankly feeds inflation without increasing our productivity. Therefore, I would like to raise the question whether this study should not also reexamine these two points and possibly reexamine whether we might not maintain, even in peacetime, some kind of standby wage and price controls to permit publicity to be applied to them.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for his thoughtful contribution, and I thoroughly agree with him that we have been putting an unfair load on monetary policy in this country. We have been sending a boy to do a man's work, and the job has proved too great for it. And, the incidental by-products, the harmful effects on small business, on the farmer, on State and local governments, have been very pronounced. I would certainly agree with the gentleman that the Joint Economic Committee study should look into such adjuncts to monetary policy as control over consumer credit. I should think, too, that we ought to take a good hard look at whether the Federal Reserve's powers should not be extended over the so-called financial intermediaries. It is one of the ironies that the Federal Reserve actually controls, by its monetary mechanism, just a small part of the credit-creating mechanism of our society. I think, too, that we ought to take a look at the credit-creating agencies of the Federal Government, the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal Housing Administration, the Veterans' Administration, and many other credit-creating agencies of the Federal Government. And finally, there certainly needs to be a hard look taken at the question of administered prices, sometimes associated with wage increases, which in certain pace-setting industries, such as steel and automobiles, have done things to our price system which old Adam Smith never envisioned. And, I am glad to see that the Council of Economic Advisers have just in the last few weeks come to the conclusion that some of us have been reaching for a long time: that what we are faced with was not the classic demand inflation of too many dollars chasing too few goods, but was another sort of an animal, and that the sooner we focus an informed critical public opinion on these matters, the better.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Did I understand his inquiry would also extend to a redefinition of the accord, perhaps as a matter of law? I have in mind the testimony I have taken just informally from bankers in my own district that the upsetting of the bond market a few years ago, or the action of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve, in looking the other way because of the rapid change in interest rate, has profoundly shaken the country, and that a searching review would reduce the accord to a resolution which the Congress might approve in broad principle.

Mr. REUSS. Yes; I certainly think if the Treasury bond market has halitosis, that we ought to discover the cause of it, and I hope we do it. And, as I say, let the chips fall where they may.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I want to commend the gentleman from Colorado for his contribution and suggestions for this study. I think they are good. There is one thing that is an overtone to what the gentleman from Colorado is saying, and I will put it in my own words, which he perhaps would not care for as much. It seems very important that we review and learn by experience why the Federal Reserve accord of 1951 came about.

Mr. REUSS. As I said, if I may interrupt the gentleman, the motivation for the 1951 accord was laudable. While I was not around here then, from where I sat I thought it was a good thing. I thought that the unreasoning policy of supporting the bond market at par was carrying things too far. However, what I have been suggesting is that maybe we have gone too far in the other extreme, and that somehow or other we have to add a little sweetener to the Federal bond market. I have been suggesting that maybe that sweetener is not to jack up the interest rates even more—they are too high now; maybe the solution is not to make them tax exempt—we have enough problems with tax exemptions now; but to see whether a little genial support at times, when it is consistent with sound monetary, credit, and fiscal policies, would not be just the sweetener needed. I am sure that the gentleman, while we are not coming to conclusions today, would not disagree with the need for such an inquiry.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No, I agree. I like the way the gentleman now puts it. But the part that I am driving at is this. When people, like the gentleman from Texas, come up and compare, as the gentleman himself did in his preliminary remarks, the interest rates that we were paying during this period when we had these rigid supports at par, with the situation when we shifted over into the 1951 accord, completely ignoring the economic damage that the previous system was doing, that brought about this 1951 accord—

Mr. REUSS. If I may interrupt the gentleman, we do not completely ignore it. I have said three or four times that it served a useful purpose then. The question is whether we need pay this price now for adherence to what may be an outworn dogma.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The gentleman and I are agreed on that, I will say. But the point that I am trying to make is this. But this loose talk continues—I regard it as loose talk—of comparing the interest charges and payments of the era when we were supporting the bond market at par, and we did have a low interest rate, with the higher interest rate we have today, and throwing in these other factors which the gentleman does throw in, but which too often in the speeches on the floor of the House and around the country are ignored—that is all I am dwelling on right now. I

do commend the gentleman for approaching the subject in this fashion, and the only reason I am emphasizing the need for the study, why we did go to the 1951 accord, is to discount that kind of what I regard as loose talk.

I do myself think that we should be reviewing this 1951 accord to see whether in it we might find some area for alleviating the problem.

The second point I should like to make is to reemphasize what I said in the beginning. I think the Treasury Department does adhere to these basic rules of how we should handle our Federal debt. The trouble is not that they do not want to do it. The trouble is that we are facing up more to economic reality. One good thing about the 1951 accord is that at least we are getting some economic factors out into the open, so that we may see that there is something wrong here which will lead us possibly to studies such as the gentleman suggests, and to the real solutions that underlie our economic structure, where I think the real solutions do lie, because the real solutions are not in monetary policy. Monetary policy can only assist, I think the gentleman will agree.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a comment?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am sometimes fond of quoting a stanza from a poem by James Russell Lowell, which goes:

New occasions teach new duties;  
Time makes ancient good uncouth;  
They must upward still, and onward,  
Who would keep abreast of Truth.

I am pleased to note that the Joint Economic Committee is now trying to get abreast of truth.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman for bringing this very important subject to the floor of the House. I should like to ask the gentleman one or two questions. The first one is this. Suppose we took the gentleman's suggestion and the Federal Reserve once again started, sporadically at least, supporting the price of Government bonds. Presumably the price of those bonds generally would go up. What effect would this have on the economy?

I recognize the effect it would have on the present state of mind of the bankers. Probably it would reduce the intake of aspirin and Alka Seltzer, and such things as that which has resulted from the price of these bonds going down. But what effect would it have on the economy?

Mr. REUSS. Let me say to the gentleman first that I have not proposed this as a settled conclusion. I propose it as something which I hope will be the subject of thoughtful inquiry.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I understand that.

Mr. REUSS. Further, I am delighted when measures I suggest offer peace

and calm to the bankers. But that was not its primary purpose. I was thinking of the larger economic question.

The question is, What would a program of moderate support for the Government security market by the Federal Reserve do, not going back to the pre-1951 levels, but supporting when you can? I think immediately that would be very constructive, if the gentleman agrees with me on the basic economic position of this country, which he probably does not. I think that at a time of 5 million unemployed and one-quarter of our resources unused we should relax our present tight money policy. A very expeditious way of relaxing it would be for the Federal Reserve once more to resume the purchase of Government obligations, including long-term obligations. This would serve the purpose of supplying needed credit, and it would also vastly facilitate the problem of debt management.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. RHODES of Arizona, Mr. REUSS was permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman. I shall proceed as quickly as I can.

It would, as I said, also facilitate the Treasury's job of debt management. We would get toward an inflationary position when and only when a large number of the unemployed would be put back to work and a large percentage of the unemployed resources had its wheels turning once again. When that happened, or began to get close to happening, I should like to see the Federal Reserve tighten the reserve requirement, and thus make general credit more difficult to obtain, and finally cease or ease up its program of bond support, at such a time, but not before such a time, as there was no slack left in the economy. In other words, it seems to me almost perverse for the Treasury and the Federal Reserve to add to the lack of recovery in the country, the continuance of the recession, though I grant them the best will in the world, and by so doing enormously to complicate their own debt management problem. The things interact on each other and produce a situation where we have to go to the money market time and again, each time at a higher interest rate, and each time with more delicate results as far as the floating debt is concerned.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. When the gentleman mentioned the 5 million unemployed, that is where he left me, because I do not see what the price of bonds has to do with the 5 million unemployed unless the gentleman follows the thesis, as he apparently does, that we should always be in a position of inflation.

Mr. REUSS. The price of bonds, if I may answer that question at this point, has to do with the 5 million unemployed in just this way: One of the incidents of the Treasury's present difficulties is the high interest rate of Government bonds and the difficulties of marketing them. It therefore has to go increas-

ingly to the banks, something which we all admit is just what should not be done, because, in the administration's own phrase, all this "inflationary tinder" is lying around waiting for a spark to drop on it. So it feels it necessary to tighten the screws even more on Federal Reserve monetary policy in general, as was done just a week ago Friday when the rediscount rate was raised by another half a point. The only point of doing that is to keep business from borrowing and expanding, and as a calculated risk, as a necessary consequence of these noble anti-inflationary acts, men who otherwise would get jobs in an expanding business do not get jobs.

Let me be clear, I am not accusing the administration of being mean-spirited or doing these things because they do not want to help men get jobs. Of course, they do. I am saying that their economics is wrong and that they ought to take a new look at it; and in a constructive spirit, I would like to help them.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. In other words, the gentleman has gone clear around Robin Hood's barn and now we are finally getting down to the point. The reason the gentleman suggests that the Federal Reserve should support Government bonds is to increase the Federal Reserve supply of Government bonds so that it again may issue more money which, of course, it can do, and which is inflationary.

Mr. REUSS. No, no.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. If I may proceed just a minute, please. This in lieu of a frontal attack on the Federal Reserve for having increased its discount rates. In other words, the thing which the gentleman is trying to do is to follow a policy for which he feels very strongly and very sincerely. This policy would have us in a continuing state of inflation in this country, on the basis that this is prerequisite to prosperity. Am I wrong about that?

Mr. REUSS. I did not say that, and I do not think the gentleman can point to anything that I have said as evidence of that. What I have said is that the Government bond market is in a serious pickle. One of the things which I think will help make Government bonds more attractive to investors is some modest program of support. We can have a modest program of support without getting into any inflationary difficulties. If and when we do get close to getting into inflationary difficulties, this modest bond support program should end. The mere fact that a program is helping our national debt to become manageable, and has the incidental effect of making our economy work and putting unemployed men back to work, and making the bankers happy, does not in my opinion constitute a reason for not adopting it.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, for 75 percent of the gentleman's talk I was completely in accord with him. When he talked about the principles of debt management, he was absolutely correct. When he talked about the desirability of debt management and that we should, if we could, comply with these things, he was absolutely correct. Where I left the gentleman was when he answered my question as to what effect this would have on the economy. Right there I think we got into the very basic difference which I suspect is the difference between the gentleman from Wisconsin and me, probably for much longer than either of us would care to remember. The gentleman appears to be advocating a policy which he must agree is inflationary. I think it could be inflationary to a dangerous degree.

Anyway, I want to compliment the gentleman on bringing this to the floor. I certainly think he is absolutely sincere and that his reasons for speaking as he does are, in his opinion very good reasons. Certainly, I have a great amount of respect for the gentleman and for his intellectual attainments.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman. In conclusion I would just say this. There is obviously a difference between the gentleman's views and my own views, but I do not think or concede for one moment that the difference has anything to do with the depth of sincerity of our respective opposition to inflation. I would not advocate one measure this afternoon which I thought in any way would cause a cyclical rise in the general level of prices which is inflation, and I do not believe a new look at some of our debt management policies is necessarily instinct with the kind of danger and the amount of danger that the gentleman from Arizona seems to think it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. ULLMAN. 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 Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for one of the most penetrating analyses of the problem that is at the very heart of the economic dilemma confronting this Nation today. I certainly recommend the gentleman's statement to all Members of the House and to all others to whom it may be made available.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman.

#### IS IT A QUESTION OF TIRED MILK OR ACTIVE MONOPOLISTS?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I did not realize until I picked up my Saturday Washington Post that the dairy products of our wonderful Wisconsin farms are being advertised on radio and television as tired milk. I quote, in part, the ad which has been given on our local radio and television stations.

You, the milk consumer, should consider how much you have to lose if present District of Columbia milk regulations are relaxed, thereby allowing certain dairies to import tired old milk from Wisconsin and other areas—even halfway across the continent. If these dairies have their way, the entire Washington area can become a dumping ground for milk that has been bounced and bumped a thousand miles or more, surplus milk of minimum standards. Why should you be asked to accept this kind of tired old milk instead of the world's highest quality milk that you now buy?

This is but another attempt to prejudice the housewife with misleading statements against a high quality product. As everyone should know, with today's modern dairying techniques and with rapid transportation, it is possible to ship milk or any other perishable food product across the United States without affecting its quality. All I can suggest is that the local milk monopolists, who have been sponsoring those ads, get themselves some Geritol as this is supposed to increase the iron in the blood. Then they would not have to design special milk sanitation rules to protect themselves from the high-quality milk that family-type Midwestern farmers could deliver to the Nation's capital for less money than the local monopoly charges.

I am wondering how many of the dairy establishments now serving the Washington, D.C., market are really family-type farms, and how many of these dairy establishments are owned by bankers, businessmen, and financiers, who hire high-salaried managers to operate them. Back in Wisconsin, these kinds of farms are called "hobby farms."

To quote an old saying, there are two kinds of farmers—the farmer and the agriculturist. The farmer makes his money on the farm and spends it in the city. The agriculturist makes his money in the city and spends it on the farm.

I know what the reaction of the owners of Wisconsin's Holsteins, Guernseys, and Jerseys will be when they hear that their top-quality milk is being called "tired" in Washington. These family-type farmers know their grade A milk meets the standards of the U.S. Milk Code and, with today's modern transportation, would be anything but tired even after the thousand-mile trip from Wisconsin to Washington.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert the Washington Post's editorial in the RECORD:

Moo

"I never saw a purple cow,  
I never hope to see one;  
But I can tell you anyhow  
I'd rather see than be one!"

—Gelett Burgess.

We have never seen a purple cow either, but after reading about all the tender care that is given cows today we can't help wondering

whether Mr. Burgess would change his mind if he were still alive. As anyone who has been following the current District milk controversy knows, cows not only get washed more often than a baby nowadays; they also live in idyllic fashion.

No longer does a cow spend her days scrounging for grass in a rocky pasture and her nights sleeping fitfully in the cramped stall of a drafty barn. Now there are loafing sheds and milking parlors which by law must be spacious, antiseptically clean, and well lighted. There are even automatic feeders, although we understand that cows still must chew their own cuds. The solicitude for high bovine standards is truly touching, particularly in the effort to extend District-type regulations to Maryland. We wonder, however, what those picture-postcard Wisconsin Holsteins would say if they knew that the product of their labors was being called "tired old milk" by the representatives of their Maryland and Virginia sisters.

It is always reassuring, of course, to be reminded of how much progress man has made in his dealings with animals. In fact, we don't think we have been so conscious of cows since the good old days a decade ago when Congress was able to find time to discuss the relationship between cows and daylight saving time in the District.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the majority leader, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], I would like to announce the program for tomorrow. First, I should like to call to your attention that there will be a joint meeting to hear the President of Ireland at 12:30 p.m. Following the conclusion of the joint meeting, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] plans to bring up the bill, H.R. 1011, Federal aid to airports. Two hours of debate are provided for on that bill. If time permits, two other bills will be considered. There is the bill, H.R. 5132, a bill relating to the retention of reserve officers and then the bill, H.R. 2575, a bill authorizing an appropriation of \$500,000 for the pan-American games in Chicago. If these two bills are not reached on tomorrow, they will go over until Friday of this week, after which the House will consider the bill, H.R. 3366, a bill relating to the loan of certain naval vessels to Italy and Turkey.

House Joint Resolution 257, a bill from the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee relating to a meeting of the International Radio Consultative Committee.

Of course there is the Treasury, Post Office appropriation bill for 1960, which will be considered on Thursday.

If there are any other bills to be programmed this week, the majority leader will give ample notice.

#### THE COLUMBIA RIVER

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, "Sphaerotilus" sounds like the name of a disease. And that is what it is—a disease

that afflicts rivers rather than humans. Like many diseases, it is caused by bacteria. One of the principal rivers of the Nation, the Columbia, suffers from this disease, and its effects are felt by many of the people who depend upon the river.

Sphaerotilus is a slimy, filamentous growth which occurs when a certain type of bacteria feeds upon nutrients which are plentiful in the wastes of some industries, particularly pulp and paper manufacturing. It grows as chains or filaments of bacteria surrounded by a sheath. The filaments are encased in gelatinous capsular material. Colonies of the filaments develop into either tufts or plumes. These may be an inch or more in diameter and several inches long. They break away from their points of growth at times, float downstream, and wrap around and adhere tenaciously to any small object they may encounter.

To the casual reader this may not seem momentous, but to fishermen who depend upon the Columbia River for their livelihood, Sphaerotilus has been a source of increasing economic loss. Large clumps of slime, floating freely in the river, catch on fishermen's nets, clog and sink them, making the nets inoperative. The fishermen must then haul in the "goop"-laden nets, hang them on racks, and by repeated hosing, picking and drying, attempt to make them usable again. A particularly infuriating aspect of the slimes is their rapid deterioration effect on these extremely expensive nets.

Sports fishermen, too, are affected by Columbia River pollution. Their lines become covered with Sphaerotilus, making them almost impossible to reel in. Fishing lines become brittle and break when a salmon or a steelhead is hooked. In addition, the finish on boats is eaten away, necessitating frequent repainting. Sometimes the waterlines in outboard motors get plugged up from river goop and the motors are damaged. Often sportsmen get their hands, clothes and the insides of their boats covered with the dirty, evil-smelling slime and other forms of pollution from the river.

A spokesman for one of the industries, after having heard vociferous protests from commercial and sports fishermen against the slime-causing pollution from pulp and paper mills, made the following remarks:

We have been informed that some gillnetters have, during limited periods and in a few locations, incurred increased operating expenses as a result of such formations. Like other users of the waters of the Columbia, the gillnetters should expect to experience some inconvenience and expense in accommodating their use to competing uses.

This provides small solace to the fisherman who is picking slime from his costly nets for several hours that could otherwise have been used for fishing.

Many diseases can be cured, and Sphaerotilus is one of them. Industries which discharge the materials causing the disease can and should clean up their waste prior to its entry into the stream, instead of urging people to accept it as inevitable.

In the final analysis, the inert acceptance of this pollution will mean a continuing increase in its magnitude and the end of the salmon industry, as we know it, with its concomitant losses to fishermen, packers, middlemen, and retailers not to mention those of us who like to eat this delicious fish. This has already happened on our east coast. We should not permit it to occur in the Northwest.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana (at the request of Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana), for today, March 16 through March 26, inclusive, on account of active duty, Air Force Reserves.

#### 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. BAILEY, to cancel the special order he had for today, and to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, on Monday next, for 60 minutes.

Mrs. DWYER, for 10 minutes, on Thursday next.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BAILEY and include a letter from Mr. TEAGUE, of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Mrs. WEIS (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COFFIN (at the request of Mrs. SULLIVAN) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ABBITT (at the request of Mrs. SULLIVAN) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mrs. SULLIVAN) and include extraneous matter.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1776. An act to amend the act of June 28, 1958, to provide for a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 18, 1959, 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:

726. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report on the 1958 soil bank conservation reserve program, pursuant to Public Law 540, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

727. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Treasury Department for "Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary," for the fiscal year 1959, has been apportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

728. A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the Eighth Annual Report of the Federal Civil Defense Administration for the fiscal year 1958, pursuant to Public Law 920, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

729. A letter from the Chief, Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy, transmitting the semiannual report pertaining to military construction contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder covering the period July 1 through December 31, 1958, pursuant to Public Law 85-685; to the Committee on Armed Services.

730. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the administration of a contract between the Department of the Army, Office of the Surgeon General, the Illinois State Medical Society, Monmouth, Ill., and the Illinois Medical Service, Chicago, Ill., negotiated pursuant to the authority provided in the Dependents' Medical Care Act, approved June 7, 1956 (37 U.S.C. 401); to the Committee on Government Operations.

731. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting the annual report for the calendar year 1958 with respect to tort claims paid within the Housing and Home Finance Agency by the Office of the Administrator, pursuant to Public Law 601, 79th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

732. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to change the designation of Child Health Day from May 1 to the first Monday in October of each year"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

733. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

734. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4603. A bill to amend the Organic Act of Guam for the purpose of permitting the government of

Guam, with the consent of the legislature thereof, to be sued; with amendment (Rept. No. 214). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. KELLY: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 254. Joint resolution to authorize participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences with Canada; without amendment (Rept. No. 215). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 211. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 5132, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to active duty agreements for Reserve officers, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 216). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 212. Resolution for consideration of House Joint Resolution 257, a joint resolution providing that certain communication activities at the IX Plenary Assembly of the International Radio Consultative Committee to be held in the United States in 1959 shall not be construed to be prohibited by the Communications Act of 1934 or any other law; without amendment (Rept. No. 217). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 213. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 3366, a bill to authorize the extension of loans of naval vessels to the Governments of Italy and Turkey, without amendment (Rept. No. 218). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 214. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 2575, a bill to authorize the appropriation of \$500,000 to be spent for the purpose of the III Pan American Games to be held in Chicago, Ill.; without amendment (Rept. No. 219). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 215. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 1011, a bill to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time for making grants under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes, without amendment (Rept. No. 220). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 5737. A bill to require the use of humane methods of trapping animals and birds on lands and waterways under the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H.R. 5738. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer to the Waukegan Port District the commitment of the city of Waukegan, Ill., to maintain a public wharf in Waukegan Harbor on land conveyed to the city in 1914, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 5739. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of certain water soluble compounds as cutting oils; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 5740. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act to transfer responsibility for making appraisals from the Farm Credit Administration to the Federal land banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5741. A bill to amend section 377 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the extension of the automatic preservation of acreage history provision, with certain modifications; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5742. A bill to provide a revolving fund for certain loans by the Secretary of Agriculture, for improved budget and accounting procedures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5743. A bill to amend the Crop Insurance Act to permit inclusion of administrative costs in insurance premiums; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H.R. 5744. A bill to authorize an increased program of research in forestry and forest products and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DENTON:

H.R. 5745. A bill to provide that certain findings of disability made for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, shall be binding upon Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 5746. A bill to amend Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H.R. 5747. A bill to amend section 152, title 18, United States Code, with respect to the concealment of assets in contemplation of bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANT:

H.R. 5748. A bill to recognize the authority of the States relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water within their boundaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 5749. A bill to establish an agricultural program which imposes limitations on agricultural production directly rather than indirectly through acreage controls; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5750. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for additional personnel engaged in hazardous occupations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H.R. 5751. A bill to amend sections 4081 and 4082 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to include wholesale distributors within the definition of "producers" of gasoline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H.R. 5752. A bill to provide for absence from duty by civilian officers and employees of the Government on certain days, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 5753. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Wabash Valley compact, and for related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 5754. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to provide the cost of land acquisition with respect to flood prevention features of works of improvement under that act shall be borne by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 5755. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1958 to grant certain increases in compensation to employees of the agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees, to bring employees of agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act and the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H.R. 5756. A bill to provide for absence from duty by civilian officers and employees of the Government on certain days, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 5757. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow income tax deductions for certain payments made and expenses incurred in providing or securing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5758. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 5759. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Wabash Valley compact, and for related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H.R. 5760. A bill to exempt allowances received by members of State legislatures from Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 5761. A bill to amend the law relating to homesteads in Alaska to provide for the donation of surplus agricultural commodities to homesteaders in Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 5762. A bill to provide for a study by the Secretary of the Interior of strip-mining operations in the United States and for a report to Congress of the results of such study, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 5763. A bill to authorize the payment of claims resulting from sonic blasts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SILER:

H.R. 5764. A bill to change the name of the Abraham Lincoln National Historical Park at Hodgenville, Ky., to Abraham Lincoln's Birthplace, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 5765. A bill to authorize the Federal Government to guard strategic defense facilities against individuals believed to be disposed to commit acts of sabotage, espionage, or other subversion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5766. A bill to prescribe the oath of office of justices and judges of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H.J. Res. 311. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a statue of Taras Shevchenko on public grounds in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.J. Res. 312. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Missouri, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to initiate plans for the development of the Meramec River Basin, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 5767. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Karolina Kucharska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5768. A bill for the relief of Joseph Schneck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
H.R. 5769. A bill for the relief of Earl H. Spero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H.R. 5770. A bill for the relief of Ben Chassin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 5771. A bill for the relief of Emmett P. Dyer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLIKEN:

H.R. 5772. A bill for the relief of Howard A. and Helen S. Flogaus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 5773. A bill for the relief of Peter Kopanica; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H.R. 5774. A bill for the relief of Marie F. Balish; 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:

110. By Mr. HORAN: Petitions of 341 citizens of Lincoln County, Wash., urging the

Congress to confine their expenditures to existing sources and limits of revenue and not to increase taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

111. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the clerk, village of Brocton, N.Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing deepest sympathy to the members of his family and to the House of Representatives for an irreplaceable loss in the death of Congressman Daniel A. Reed; to the Committee on House Administration.

112. Also, petition of the president, Red Oak Ruritan Club, Alberta, Va., requesting our Government to reaffirm the rights of the States regarding (1) education of our Nation's children; (2) the prosecution of those enemies who would destroy this Republic by insidious peaceful, or violent outward acts; and (3) and specifically give clarification to the 10th amendment of the U.S. Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

113. Also, petition of the president, Edwardsville Amusement Corp., Edwardsville, Pa., with reference to expediting action in the cases of *Edwardsville Amusement Corp. v. Monogram Distributing Corp.*, and *Edwardsville Amusement Corp. v. 20th Century*

*Fox Film Corp.*, pending in the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

114. Also, petition of Clifford Crall, Cincinnati, Ohio, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to an investigation to consider a condition involving suppression of the freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

115. Also, petition of the president, Associated Students of the University of Hawaii, Honolulu, T. H., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to granting statehood to the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

116. Also, petition of the clerk, county of Kauai, Lihue, Kauai, T.H., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to granting statehood to the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

117. Also, petition of Nicolas Estates (Eugenio C. Nicolas), Inc., Manila, Philippines, petitioning consideration of their resolutions with reference to war damages claims payable to the Nicolas Estates; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### Presentation of Plaque Honoring Late Congressman William B. Oliver, of Alabama

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 1959

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, at the seventh annual meeting of the Warrior-Tombigbee Development Association in Tuscaloosa, Ala., on March 6, 1959, tribute was paid to a distinguished Alabamian and former Member of the House of Representatives, the late William Bacon Oliver. Mr. Oliver represented the Sixth Alabama District which has as its able Congressman today my good friend, ARMISTEAD SELDEN.

In 1957 Congressman SELDEN introduced legislation providing that the lock and dam on the Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway near Tuscaloosa be officially named the William Bacon Oliver lock and dam in honor of the former Congressman. This legislation was enacted into law, and a plaque inscribed with the law was presented by Mr. SELDEN at the river association meeting to Mrs. William B. Oliver, widow of the great Alabamian. She in turn presented it to Col. R. W. Love, Mobile district engineer of the U.S. Corps of Engineers, who indicated that the plaque will be appropriately placed at the site of the William Bacon Oliver lock and dam.

Because there are Members of the present House of Representatives and Senate who knew and loved William Bacon Oliver and will be interested in this event, I am including below Mr.

SELDEN's remarks, as well as an account of the presentation ceremony:

Mr. SELDEN. This evening we pause to pay tribute to a distinguished Alabamian whose name is ascribed to the first modern navigational structure built on the Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway. I refer, of course, to the late William Bacon Oliver, who for almost a quarter of a century represented our State's Sixth Congressional District in the Congress of the United States.

During his dedicated service in the House of Representatives, Congressman Oliver made many lasting contributions to his district, State, and Nation. He was always alert to the needs of national defense, to the potentialities of our youth, and to the problems of working men and women. He was a man of keen intelligence, an eminently qualified attorney, and a forceful and highly regarded legislator.

William B. Oliver, or Buck Oliver as he was affectionately known to his friends and constituents, was born in 1867 near the banks of the Warrior River at Eutaw, Ala. He received his education at schools in his hometown, at the Verner College Preparatory School in Tuscaloosa and at the University of Alabama.

He received his law degree at the University of Alabama in 1889 and in that same year, after taking a special law course at the University of Virginia, he was admitted to the Alabama bar. He began active participation in his chosen profession at the age of only 22 here in Tuscaloosa.

In 1898 he was appointed solicitor for the Sixth Judicial Circuit of Alabama and served with distinction in that position for nearly 10 years. He resigned as solicitor to become dean of the law school of the University of Alabama.

In 1914 Buck Oliver was elected to Congress where he served 11 consecutive terms, retiring voluntarily in 1937. When he first entered the House of Representatives, he was assigned to the Naval Affairs Committee, a post he held for 6 years. During much of this period, the world was at war and the work of the Naval Affairs Committee was highly important to the United States and to our allies.

When the 68th Congress convened in 1921, Mr. Oliver was appointed to membership on

the powerful House Appropriations Committee. He was an outstanding member of this committee for his remaining 16 years in Congress and, among other accomplishments, played an important part in instituting a Federal budgetary system.

Although he had planned to retire when he chose not to seek reelection in 1937, he was called to serve his Government once again 2 years later—this time as special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States. He held this post until 1944 when, at the age of 77, he retired permanently from public affairs. Four years later, on May 27, 1948, Mr. Oliver died while on a visit to New Orleans. He was buried in the cemetery in Eutaw, the town where he was born and where he grew up.

The ideals of democracy and the principles of the Democratic Party were of the utmost importance to Mr. Oliver throughout his life. In the words of his friend and colleague, the late Congressman Sam Hobbs, of Alabama, Mr. Oliver "was a Democrat without apology, but too much of a gentleman ever to give offense to political foes even in the fiercest fights. His was a perfect voice, and his skill in using it made his forensic ability both feared and admired."

And indeed Buck Oliver was recognized for his great ability as a speaker who never wasted words. He was not noted for giving frequent or lengthy talks; but when he did speak, his remarks were direct and to the point, relevant to the subject matter, and so penetrating that it was obvious they were backed up by clear understanding and forethought.

Mr. Oliver was blessed with the attributes of high character, integrity, honesty, and faith in God, as well as in his fellow man. He was a devout member of the Presbyterian Church which he served as an elder and as the moderator of the synod of Alabama.

The high qualities Mr. Oliver possessed were clearly recalled by Representative CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, the present chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, when he said: "He was a man of lofty ideals and strength of character, tactful, considerate, and courteous, and generous in his friendships. He measured up in every respect to the high standards of his native State which has sent more than its share of