eration of Calendar No. 222, Senate bill 14.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 14) to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Austin, Travis County, Tex., to the State of Texas.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, as I understand, the purpose of the motion of the Senator from Mississippi is to make the bill the unfinished business.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct; the bill will be the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 14) to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Austin, Travis County, Tex., to the State of Texas, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments.

## RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if no other Senator desires the floor, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, April 28, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 26 (legislative day of April 25), 1955:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Albert G. Mumma, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Ships in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Robert C. McFadden, of Indiana, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Indiana.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations, to be effective date of acceptance:

*To be senior surgeon*

Shih Lu Chang

*To be surgeon*

Wilton M. Fisher

*To be senior assistant surgeon*

Tamarath K. Yolles

*To be assistant surgeon*

Calvin L. Young

*To be scientist director*

Louis C. McCabe

*To be senior assistant scientist*

Thomas E. Anderson

*To be assistant scientists*

Virgil R. Carlson
Donald S. Blongh
Donald S. Boomer
Philip Roos

PERMANENT PROMOTION IN THE REGULAR CORPS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

*To be senior assistant sanitarian*

James V. Smith

IN THE ARMY

Temporary appointments in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

*To be major generals*

Brig. Gen. Robert Alexis McClure, O6785, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John William Harmony, O15240, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Richard Givens Prather, O15698, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Frederic Joseph Brown, O16761, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Edward Martin, O16802, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Derrill McCollough Daniel, O29500, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

*To be brigadier generals*

Col. Benjamin Peter Heiser, O16450, United States Army.

Col. Arthur Hodgkins Bender, O16611, United States Army.

Col. Theodore Trower King, O28889, United States Army.

Col. Harry Oliver Paxson, O16764, United States Army.

Col. James Virgil Thompson, O16826, United States Army.

Col. Thomas Alphonsus Lane, O17075, United States Army.

Col. Ernest Fred Easterbrook, O18537, United States Army.

Col. William Leonard Hardick, O18558, United States Army.

Col. John Frank Ruggles, O18596, United States Army.

Col. James Winfield Coutts, O18875, United States Army.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named person as chaplain, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

*To be captain*

John J. Murphy, O966609.

The following-named persons, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), and Public Law 36, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 37, 83d Congress:

*To be captains*

William C. Fisher, MC, O979020.
Warren E. Patow, MC, O1920876.
Stanley W. White, MC, O932416.

*To be first lieutenants*

Wilbur G. Bingham, Jr., MC, O4022519.
Marion M. Carnes, MC.
Peter E. Jackson, MC.

*To be second lieutenants*

Frank Kellel, Jr., MSC, O2103085.
Lois MacTaggart, WMSC, M2972.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to completion of internship:

*To be first lieutenants*

Gene T. Blakely, O4024526.
Melvin D. Cheitlin, O2273754.
George L. Ford, Jr.
David C. Green, O4038709.
Austin D. Potenza, O2273865.
Raymond Scalettar, AO3000295.
George J. Schonholtz, O2273730.
George W. Wayman, O2063133.
David B. Weinstein, O2273765.

The following-named person for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, effective June 4, 1955, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

*To be second lieutenant*

William M. Everett, O4009342.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

*To be second lieutenants*

Morris A. Hymes
Donald Jackson, O4042676
Daniel L. Petracek
Daniel J. Rajski
David W. Stein, O4017794
Dale H. Twachtmann
Robert E. Wharrie

The nominations of Richard S. Abbott and 1,306 other officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 13, 1955, and may be found in full in the proceedings of the Senate for that day, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Richard S. Abbott, which appears on page 4377, and ending with the name of Henry G. Watson, which is shown on page 4382.

IN THE NAVY OR IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations of Robert D. Harrop and 669 other officers for appointment in the Navy or in the Marine Corps, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 13, 1955, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings for that day, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Robert D. Harrop, which is shown on page 4382, and ending with the name of John M. Wood, which appears on page 4384.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and ever-blessed God, may the legislation which is proposed and enacted by the Congress always redound to Thy glory and bring blessedness to our Republic and humanity everywhere.

Grant that our beloved country may have men and women at the helm of the Ship of State who are not steering her by the rush candles of expediency and self-interest but by the eternal stars of lofty idealism.

Show us how we may gain the mastery over our fears and may our hearts be cheered and sustained by the assurance that righteousness shall prevail.

Help us to bring in that day of prediction when men and nations shall yield themselves in glad obedience to the mind and spirit of our blessed Lord.

Hear us in the name of the great Captain of our salvation. Amen.

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

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that

the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1252. An act for the relief of Olivia Mary Orciuch;

H. R. 2839. An act to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

H. R. 4356. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, with respect to rice allotment history.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4647. An act to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 26. An act for the relief of Donald Hector Taylor;

S. 29. An act for the relief of Rica, Lucy, and Salomon Breger;

S. 36. An act for the relief of Lupe M. Gonzalez;

S. 42. An act for the relief of Selma Rivlin;

S. 68. An act for the relief of Evantiyi Yorgiyadis;

S. 71. An act for the relief of Ursula Else Boysen;

S. 89. An act for the relief of Margaret Isabel Byers;

S. 90. An act for the relief of Nejibe El-Sousse Slyman;

S. 91. An act for the relief of Luzia Cox;

S. 93. An act for the relief of Ahti Johannes Ruuskanen;

S. 94. An act for the relief of Esther Cornelius, Arthur Alexander Cornelius, and Frank Thomas Cornelius;

S. 95. An act for the relief of Peter Charles Bethel (Peter Charles Peters);

S. 99. An act for the relief of Xanthi Georges Komporozou;

S. 100. An act for the relief of Hermine Lorenz;

S. 118. An act for the relief of Leon J. de Szethofer and Blanche Hrdinova de Szethofer;

S. 119. An act for the relief of David Wei-Dao and Julia An-Fong Wang Lea;

S. 120. An act for the relief of Vasilios Demetriou Kretsos and his wife, Chryssa Thomaidou Kretsos;

S. 121. An act for the relief of Sultana Coka Pavlovitch;

S. 130. An act for the relief of Antonin Volejnicek;

S. 162. An act for the relief of Antonio Ribeiro;

S. 191. An act for the relief of Liselotte Warmbrand;

S. 192. An act for the relief of Borys Naumenko;

S. 193. An act for the relief of Louise Russu Sozanski;

S. 234. An act for the relief of Rev. Lorenzo Rodriguez Blanco and Rev. Alejandro Negredo Lazaro;

S. 236. An act for the relief of Johanna Schmid;

S. 238. An act for the relief of Andreas Georges Vlatsos (Andreas Georges Vlatso);

S. 283. An act for the relief of Andrew Wolfinger;

S. 320. An act for the relief of Mrs. Diana Cohen and Jacqueline Patricia Cohen;

S. 321. An act for the relief of Anni Marjatta Makela and son, Markku Paivio Makela;

S. 322. An act for the relief of Malbina Rouphael David (nee Gebrael);

S. 341. An act for the relief of Vittoria Alberghetti, Daniele Alberghetti, Anna Maria Alberghetti, Carla Alberghetti, and Paolo Alberghetti;

S. 353. An act for the relief of Arthur Sroka;

S. 397. An act for the relief of Maria Bertagnolli Pancheri;

S. 407. An act for the relief of Helen Zafred Urbanic;

S. 439. An act for the relief of Lucy Personius;

S. 449. An act for the relief of George Pantelas;

S. 467. An act for the relief of Dr. Luciano A. Legiardi-Laura;

S. 473. An act for the relief of Urho Paavo Potokoski and his family;

S. 504. An act for the relief of Priska Anne Kary;

S. 570. An act for the relief of James Ji-Tsung Woo, Margie Wanchung Woo, Daniel Du-Ning Woo, and Robert Du-An Woo;

S. 574. An act for the relief of Martin P. Pavlov;

S. 587. An act for the relief of Hildegarde Hiller;

S. 604. An act for the relief of Alick Bhark;

S. 633. An act for the relief of certain alien sheepherders;

S. 644. An act for the relief of Sandy Michael John Philp;

S. 650. An act for the relief of Anonios Vasillos Zarkadis;

S. 676. An act for the relief of Robert A. Borromeo;

S. 707. An act for the relief of Christos Paul Zolotas;

S. 713. An act for the relief of Romana Michelina Sereni;

S. 714. An act for the relief of Alfio Ferrara;

S. 758. An act for the relief of Marion S. Quirk;

S. 760. An act for the relief of Pietro Meduri;

S. 827. An act for the relief of Mojsze Hildeshaim and Ita Hildeshaim;

S. 844. An act for the relief of Zev Cohen (Zev Machtani);

S. 867. An act for the relief of Jacob Grynberg;

S. 974. An act for the relief of Casimero Rivera Gutierrez, Teresa Gutierrez, Susana Rivera Gutierrez, Martha Aguilera Gutierrez, and Armando Casimero Gutierrez;

S. 998. An act to authorize the conveyance of a certain tract of land in the State of Oklahoma to the city of Woodward, Okla.;

S. 1014. An act for the relief of Henry Duncan;

S. 1044. An act for the relief of Edward Naarits;

S. 1079. An act to provide for the sale of certain lands in the national forests;

S. 1180. An act for the relief of Bianca Ibarra and Dolores Ibarra;

S. 1197. An act for the relief of Slavoljub Djurovic and Goran Djurovic;

S. 1350. An act for the relief of Guiseppi Castrogiovanni and his wife and child;

S. 1367. An act for the relief of Antonio Jacoe;

S. 1372. An act to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to extend the period for emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen;

S. 1722. An act to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office; and

S. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution providing for the continued operation of the Government tin smelter at Texas City, Tex.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 2225) entitled "An act to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. PAYNE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1) entitled "An act to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. NEELY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. LANGER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

## THE LATE WILLIAM T. SHERWOOD

Mr. COOPER. 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I was very saddened to learn of the passing of Mr. William T. Sherwood last Wednesday. I am sure that my grief is shared by the many thousand present and former employees of the Internal Revenue Service, and by many present and former Members of Congress.

I know of no man who more completely and unselfishly devoted his life to Government service. Mr. Sherwood exemplified a devotion to duty and an integrity which make our career service in the Government so respected. Without such men as Mr. Sherwood, we would indeed find it difficult to make the machinery of Government function.

All of us who knew Mr. Sherwood fully appreciated his sincerity of purpose, his honesty, and his contribution to the successful operation of our tax system. At any time Mr. Sherwood could have left the tax service of the Government and bettered his economic position, but he preferred to stay and serve his Government. This is the true test of a devoted public servant.

Mr. Sherwood spent 45 years in the service of his Government, beginning as a clerk in the city post office in 1903. He was one of a nucleus of career Government men who were recruited in 1920 by then Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Hon. Daniel C. Roper, to help formulate and establish our system of tax collection and administration which has now become the Internal Revenue Service.

Few men have contributed as much to this system as Mr. Sherwood. He inculcated a devotion to duty and a high spirit of Government service in all who worked with him. He was a teacher—in fact, almost a father—to thousands of career internal revenue employees throughout the country. Many of these employees later became the most successful tax practitioners in our country, and carried with them the utmost respect and gratitude for Mr. Sherwood.

In his 25 years with what we now know as the Internal Revenue Service, Mr. Sherwood rose through various administrative positions until, at his retire-

ment in 1948, he had reached the highest career position in the Service, that of Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Even after his retirement, Mr. Sherwood continued to devote his time to the problems of the Internal Revenue Service, serving from 1952 until his death as a member of the Advisory Group on Reorganization of the Internal Revenue Service to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, of which committee I at the present time have the honor of being the chairman.

I knew Mr. Sherwood not only as a highly respected career Government servant but also as a friend. I have never known a man whom I have held in higher esteem and for whom I had greater respect. I, for one, fully appreciated his selfless devotion to the service of his Government. I am sure that I am merely expressing the feelings of his countless friends throughout the country and in the Congress.

I extend to his family my most heartfelt sympathy.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means, I wish to join wholeheartedly in the remarks of my good friend from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, with reference to Mr. Sherwood. Anyone who ever met Mr. Sherwood, especially in connection with his work, which was very exacting, found him to be not only a capable and able man but a gentleman in every respect.

## HICK TOWN

Mr. MATTHEWS. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in today's issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald an editorial entitled "Hick Town." I quote from the editorial:

A story elsewhere in this issue tells of the restrictions in Mr. MCMILLAN'S home city of Florence, S. C. The attempt to reduce the District to the status of the hickiest of hick towns is the more absurd coming at a time when Washington of necessity is considering ways to reduce downtown congestion and speed public transportation.

I think it unfortunate that the phrasing of these sentences might lead the reader to infer that Florence, S. C., is a hick town. I am sure that the Washington Post and Times Herald did not mean to imply that such is the case. The word "hick" is defined in the dictionary as "an awkward, uncouth rustic; a rube; bumpkin." The great city of Florence, S. C., which is the area of my father's ancestral home, certainly does not deserve that definition. In the Eighth District of Florida we consider a community with from 20,000 to 25,000 people as a city. Florence, S. C., certainly falls into that category. My present home in Gainesville, Fla., has between 30,000 and 35,000 people, and all who have been to our beautiful city regard it as a progressive community with all of the advantages of modern-day living. If a city of 25,000 is to be considered a hick town, I wonder what epithet would be applied to the little town where I was reared in Hawthorne, Fla. I think it is a sizable town with even less than 1,000 people. In fact, it is the metropolitan center of the eastern part of Alachua County, and is the largest community between Lochloosa and Cone's Crossing going north and south, and between McMeekin and Grove Park going east and west. One reason for the strength of our American democracy is the strength of her small towns. My district is full of these wonderful communities, and I am trying in every way I can to help them.

If the parking congestion continues to be so serious in this beautiful Capital area, I would like respectfully to recommend to the great House Committee on the District of Columbia that they consider placing some Federal activity which we now have in this area in the Eighth District of Florida. I would respectfully suggest as a starter a subsidiary of the Library of Congress. If we could just have 1,000,000 books housed in a beautiful building, I know of many towns in the Eighth District of Florida that would welcome the opportunity to have this great library, and we not only would promise to relieve the town of traffic congestion, but I believe the fine people of that community would agree not to allow any automobiles at all in the town if we could just enjoy a small portion of the Federal bounty that has been so abundantly lavished in our beautiful Nation's Capital.

The complete editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald follows:

HICK TOWN

The secret of Representative MCMILLAN'S effort to investigate the police department seems to be his perennial pique over District parking restrictions. Because of his congressional status Mr. MCMILLAN personally enjoys immunity from most restrictions except the ban against parking in front of fire hydrants; but apparently this is not enough for a rugged individualist. The South Carolina Representative wants to authorize 24-hour parking on all Washington streets of four lanes or wider—which means practically all important traffic arteries.

Almost every crossroads in America has had to adopt parking restrictions, for the simple reason that there is not enough space to permit motorists to use streets for storage and still facilitate the flow of traffic. A story elsewhere in this issue tells of the restrictions in Mr. MCMILLAN'S home city of Florence, S. C. The attempt to reduce the District to the status of the hickiest of hick towns is the more absurd coming at a time when Washington of necessity is considering ways to reduce downtown congestion and speed public transportation. It might be worth the chaos it would cause to try the proposal for a day, however, if Mr. MCMILLAN would agree to attempt to extricate his own car from the middle of the snarl.

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

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

Mr. RADWAN. I can say this to the gentleman from Florida, that the town of Hawthorne has certainly produced one good man in the gentleman addressing the House.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I am very grateful to the gentleman, and I know the people in my district will know about his compliment.

## INCREASING RATES OF BASIC COMPENSATION OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES IN THE FIELD SERVICE OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1) to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, with a House amendment thereto and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MURRAY of Tennessee, MORRISON, DAVIS of Georgia, REES of Kansas, and CORBETT.

## SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to address the House today for 15 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

## PRINCIPAL OFFICE BUILDING FOR ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 214 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5645) to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the vice chairman and ranking House minority member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of House Resolution 214 which will make in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 5645, to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District

of Columbia to serve as its principal office.

House Resolution 214 provides for an open rule, waiving points of order against the bill and would allow 1 hour of general debate on the bill itself. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 5645 was reported unanimously from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and would authorize the construction of an office building at a total cost of not to exceed $10 million and would authorize the appropriation of the amount of money necessary to build the building.

The Atomic Energy Commission was housed in the Public Health building in 1947 when the total staff of the AEC was about 300 pepole. However, the personnel of the Commission has now risen to 1200 and in addition to presently expanding its program to encompass the field of weapons production it also has, under the provisions of the AEC Act of 1954, the duty of regulating the civilian atomic energy industry. At the present time in addition to using the Public Health Building, the Commission uses two temporary buildings and a warehouse in Georgetown.

According to the report on this bill, Mr. Speaker, the members of the joint committee feel that from an economic and security standpoint it is inadvisable to continue the present physical arrangement of using the four buildings. It is necessary to have the AEC headquarters located at a sufficient distance from the main part of the city to meet the dispersal requirements which are deemed vital for the maximum safety of strategic industries and activities in the event of an emergency.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 214 would provide for an open rule and thus amendments would be in order. For this reason I hope that the House will adopt House Resolution 214 and that the House will then proceed to the consideration of the bill.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I agree with the gentleman. I think this building is needed and should be constructed. However, for myself, I have been quite disturbed at the continuing concentration of these very vital, critical operations here in Washington or in the close vicinity of Washington. Does the gentleman have any information as to just what is meant by "near"?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. My information, which I believe to be accurate, is that they plan to go out not over 30 miles, within a range of 25 to 30 miles of the District.

Mr. HALLECK. My own view is that, so far as the Atomic Energy Commission is concerned, this building might better be far removed from Washington or at least further removed than the distance the gentleman has mentioned, for reasons that certainly do not need too much discussion at this time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman, of course, understands that this is an office building; there is no manufacturing, or anything of that kind, to be done in it.

Mr. HALLECK. I understand that, but the building will certainly house the people who have the know-how and the responsibility for the whole atomic energy program.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. And they will also have the records there, and so forth.

Mr. HALLECK. That is right.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I assume that that matter has been considered by the Atomic Energy Commission and also by the Committee on Atomic Energy. They have reached this conclusion and that is what the bill provides.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] such time as he may consume.

APPOINTMENT AS OBJECTOR ON PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that Mr. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT has been placed upon the list of objectors on the Private Calendar, representing the minority, to take the place of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may sit this afternoon during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I feel much as does the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] about this bill. I cannot understand, when we have decentralized agencies and departments through the country when, probably, for purposes of efficiency, they would better be in Washington, why we should specifically state in this resolution that the Atomic Energy Commission Building should be constructed in or near the District of Columbia. If we omit that, they could still put up the building here, if they wish to do so. But I cannot conceive why we should state specifically that this building should be constructed here in the District or near the District when we have decentralized other agencies of Government. I think that is a factor that the committee should carefully consider.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Is this rule a closed rule, or does it provide for the consideration of amendments? An amendment might be in order along the lines the gentleman suggests.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. It is an open rule. The bill will be read for amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

---

AMENDMENT OF CLAYTON ACT

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 215 and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4954) to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the United States to recover damages under the antitrust laws, establishing a uniform statute of limitations, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives should be indeed proud and especially commend our colleague, Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR., of New York, for the outstanding success he accomplished as a neutral observer at the recent Bandung Conference of 29 Asiatic and African nations.

We now know that Red China leader Chou En-lai and the Kremlin originally intended that this conference of nations would be used to solidify the Communist bloc and propagandize false and misleading lies in order to undermine the prestige of the United States. Immediately upon arriving at Bandung, Congressman POWELL called a press conference and submitted true facts exposing false Communist propaganda regarding the United States position on colonialism, racial issues, and other lies which the Communist leaders wished to effectively use at the Bandung Conference. These facts from Congressman POWELL were transmitted to all delegates and given wide publicity by the newspapers throughout the world.

When the Conference was called into session, representatives of neutral and anti-Communist nations immediately followed through with the theme which Congressman POWELL used in exposing Communist propaganda and lies. Gen. Carlos P. Romulo of the Philippines, the Premier of Pakistan, and one of the leaders of Iraq, immediately elaborated on these anti-Communist facts before the Conference and Chou En-lai's strategy was completely thrown off the track for the rest of the conference.

The Bandung Conference was originally intended by the Communist leaders to split the free world on the basis of color and race. Their strategy was completely exposed and the Bandung Conference can go down in history as the

first worldwide moral defeat for the Communist aggressors.

I know the Members of the House of Representatives are indeed proud of the outstanding ability and diplomacy exercised by Congressman POWELL in enlarging the prestige of the United States in Asia by contributing so much to the enlightenment of the people of Asiatic and African nations regarding communistic colonialism and aggression.

The gratitude and thanks of the Congress and the people of the United States should be given to the great work and good accomplishment by Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL as an unofficial observer at the Bandung Conference.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to incorporate with my remarks an editorial from the New York Daily Mirror commending Congressman POWELL. I also ask unanimous consent to include an article from this weeks U. S. News & World Report which sets out a press conference-interviews with Congressman POWELL held during the Bandung Conference.

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

There was no objection.

(The items referred to are as follows:)

[From the New York Daily Mirror of April 26, 1955]

ADAM CLAYTON POWELL

Not only Harlem but the entire city of New York is proud of ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Harlem's popular clergyman and its Congressman.

ADAM CLAYTON POWELL went to Bandung as a free-lance journalist. He was there among black, brown, and yellow people, if you like to denominate human beings by their color. He was also among Europeans who expected him, as a Negro, to kick Uncle Sam in the teeth.

They were fooled. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL stood up for the United States with truthfulness and dignity and pride. He represented not only the American Negro but the American people. And the real truth is that we are one.

It was amusing that when the Communists, in their disappointment, discovered that ADAM CLAYTON POWELL was no traitor to his country, they wanted to deny that he was a Negro. He was too light colored for them. They tried to give the impression that he was really a white man masquerading as a Negro. He clinched that argument by telling them that his grandfather had been a slave.

Surprisingly, it was the Communists who raised the racial issue, even questioning the validity of POWELL'S claim to be a Negro because his color is light. It shows the utter ignorance of the Communists both as to the Negroes and as to American life. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL set them right, and in setting them right, he performed an outstanding service for his country.

It is a rare occasion when any American has an opportunity to speak up for his country under dramatic and telling circumstances. The challenge came to ADAM CLAYTON POWELL and he met it. We are proud of him.

---

RED CHINA EXPOSED—NOT DOMINANT IN ASIA—ASIANS RESIST POWER PLAYS OF INDIA AND CHINA—WORRY OVER COMMUNISM, RACIALISM, COLONIALISM

(Interview with ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR., Negro leader and Congressman from New York)

(From a prominent Negro Congressman comes this eyewitness account of a United States victory over the Communists in Asia. Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR., Democrat, of New York, went to the African-Asian Conference in Indonesia on his own. He found attempts by the Communists to exploit the plight of Negroes in the United States are missing fire; Red China's influence in the colored nations of the world is vastly overrated; Asian masses resent Chinese. Asian leaders distrust communism as a form of world imperialism. They want peace and they're against threats of force by anybody. In this interview, cabled from the conference city by regional editors of U. S. News & World Report, Mr. POWELL tells how the United States stands in the nonwhite world.)

BANDUNG, INDONESIA.

Question. As an American observer, how do you size up this Conference of the Asian and African Nations, Mr. POWELL?

Answer. The United States has definitely come off better than the fondest hopes of Washington, and particularly the State Department. We had no Far East foreign policy. We had been depending for our foreign policy to a great extent on colonial powers—the Dutch, British. Our information—the information of the American people—about the Far East is woefully scant or distorted.

Question. You mean you didn't agree with those people who expected the United States would get smeared here?

Answer. In the first place, I insisted before I came out here that the Far East was not antiwhite, not anti-American, but anti our foreign policy. I have found this to be completely true. The only antiwhite feeling you find here is indirectly the result of anti-colonialism.

We overestimated the strength of Red China amongst its Asian and African equals. Here at Bandung, China has been exposed to people who are geographically and racially in the same company. It was one thing for the Chinese Reds to have stood on the coast of China with Quemoy 1 mile away and yelled at America 6,000 miles away. It's another thing to sit down at a conference table at Bandung with your neighbors and your racial equals.

Question. Do you think this means the Chinese Communists have suffered a setback here?

Answer. Most definitely. Red China came here posing as the master of Asia. She has now been exposed as just another Asian-African power.

Question. Just how was she exposed?

Answer. I think this is something that the American people should know, and that I was totally ignorant of until I arrived here:

There is a centuries-old antipathy and, in some countries, hatred of their Chinese minority comparable to the anti-Semitism of the pre-Hitler and Hitler period in Europe. These people feel the Chinese have a stranglehold on their economies which was encouraged by colonial powers.

This was proven by the fact that many of the 2.5 million Chinese in Indonesia staged a special demonstration of welcome for Chou En-lai [Premier of Communist China] at Jakarta and Bandung. I saw them greet him with the Red flag and firecrackers. Yet, when he arrived at his headquarters here in Bandung, the street was packed with 15,000 to 20,000 Indonesians.

I stood no more than 10 feet from Chou as he awaited another hero's welcome. But when his red flag went up with all the pomp and ceremony that had been given each delegation, he received no more than 20 or 30 scattered handclaps, mainly from Chinese school children. Premier Nasser, of Egypt, coming to southeast Asia for the first time in his life, received a much greater ovation.

Question. Do you think Chou En-lai, when he arrived, expected to dominate this conference?

Answer. Most definitely. He thought that between himself and Nehru (Premier of India) they would emerge with an anti-United States bloc of eastern powers. He thought the sheer weight of India and China would force neutralists and smaller states to side with them.

Question. Was this conference revolt against Nehru or mainly fear of Chinese Communist power?

Answer. Neither. It was just the unanimous feeling of all these countries who have fought for so many years against the power of colonialism that they would not accept control by any power or combination of powers, regardless of disguises. The delegates here revolted against the phrase "Columbo Powers," and have changed it to "sponsoring nations." These people are antipower in any form—white or black, West or East, Communist or capitalist.

Question. Well, if they are afraid of power blocs, wouldn't you expect resentment among the delegates against the close relationship between Chou and Nehru?

Answer. Precisely. It was the preconference teamwork of Chou and Nehru that was resented, resisted, and challenged apparently successfully—by the other delegates. Even the so-called neutralists—whom I prefer to call the uncommitted—definitely came out against communism as a form of world imperialism.

Question. Then you don't think people in this part of the world see communism as "the wave of the future?"

Answer. Definitely not. For example, I have talked to Indonesian officials who favor freedom for all people, but privately are worried about independence for Malaya where there is already a strong Communist movement. They are afraid an independent Malaya now would be a Communist Malaya and they're against any more of southeast Asia falling into the hands of the Communists.

Question. Isn't that encouraging for America?

Answer. Of course. Actually, in some ways, Chou En-lai stupidly helped our cause.

Question. What do you mean?

Answer. For instance, take what happened toward the end of the opening session. When every single one of the delegates invoked the blessing of their god upon the conference. Chou arose and said, "We Communists are atheists." In the midst of that deeply spiritual atmosphere, Chou played right into our hands with this astounding tactical blunder. It literally shocked many delegates.

Question. Did you find any support here for America's position on the Formosan problem?

Answer. Non-Communist countries didn't want to raise this question at the conference because they didn't want to antagonize anyone, including the United States. But behind the scene, many delegates told me Quemoy and Matsu should go to Red China. All of them definitely are against the use of force by either side—Communist China or the United States—to settle the Formosa problem.

Question. How much support did you find here for Chiang Kai-shek and his Nationalist Chinese?

Answer. Very little.

Question. Did you talk to the delegates about thermonuclear weapons?

Answer. Yes, I did. They had originally placed that question on the agenda and struck it off because they thought it would give Red China an opportunity to sound off against America. However, to a man the delegates I saw were appalled at the mere thought of the United States using thermonuclear weapons. This emphasized to me again that this was a conference for peace.

Question. Did you find much support for the admission of Communist China to the United Nations?

Answer. The question of Red China's admission was not considered, by itself. You must remember that more than one-third of the countries represented here do not belong to the United Nations. If the question of Red China's membership in the U. N. had come up by itself it would have been defeated by a vote of 16 to 12. But, if the vote dealt

with the question of admitting all nations—including Red China—you will find most of the nations here supporting it.

Question. Were most of the delegates you talked to for or against continuing restrictions on strategic trade with Red China?

Answer. It so happened that Burma actually moved that these restrictions be lifted but it was opposed by the Philipines and Thailand. Since no motion could be carried without a unanimous vote, that move failed. But, on a simple majority vote, that motion would have carried.

Question. If controversial questions such as Formosa were avoided, why did this Conference devote so much time to Palestine—which certainly is a controversial subject?

Answer. The Arab bloc had the Colombo powers over a barrel from the very beginning. The Colombo powers didn't want the Arab countries to boycott the Conference, and so they were literally forced not to invite Israel. Therefore, when the question was raised by the Arab bloc it had to be dealt with. Nehru tried to pour oil on troubled waters by trying to persuade the Arabs to keep the discussion as calm as possible.

Question. As a Negro, did you feel the Communists were able to exploit the color question for their ends?

Answer. They came fully prepared to do so. They sent in advance a girl from Ceylon to ask loaded questions at all press conferences. At a Union of South Africa press conference she asked, "What aid can you hope for from the United States when it has the same doctrine of segregation toward the Negro as South Africa?"

The Communists wanted to show that the United States was practicing racialism within its own borders—but they failed to achieve their purpose.

Question. Was there any resentment here against you, as an American, attending the Conference as an observer?

Answer. Quite the opposite. I was received here with open arms. Many of the delegates were friends of mine. In fact, I felt I did a lot of good. I was able to stop Communist propaganda concerning the American Negro by holding a press conference. At least, after my press conference the Communist press gave up attempts to smear the United States on the Negro question. I did this simply by telling the truth about the race problem in the United States.

Question. But wasn't racialism as a world problem still a major question at this Conference?

Answer. Yes. The subjects of racialism and colonialism were questions on which all delegates agreed. And here our Nation was definitely hurt. Even our best friends at this Conference, such as the Philippines, stood firm for complete elimination of racialism and colonialism.

Question. You have mentioned several times the question of colonialism. What is the feeling here toward America's attitude on that issue?

Answer. We can no longer underestimate the passionate determination among these people that all men should be free. The delegates here who disagreed bitterly on the question of communism were united on the question of colonialism. They simply cannot understand why the first Nation in the world to defeat colonialism is now siding with colonial powers.

In the United Nations we abstain when the question of independence for North Africa and other colonies comes up. But this does not fool the leaders of the Asian and African nations at this Conference. They regard abstention on colonialism as a vote for it. From this Conference on, the United States, if it continues to abstain on colonial questions, will lose the support of Asia and Africa.

Question. You've talked to many delegates here. On the basis of these talks, what do you think the United States can do to win more friends among the peoples of Asia and Africa?

Answer. Here are obvious things we must do: Quit taking the side of colonialism in the U. N.; clean up the race problem in the United States as rapidly as possible, and get across the tremendous progress we've already made; appoint more Negroes to our foreign diplomatic posts.

President Eisenhower should invite the Colombo powers to a top-level conference on the problems of Asia. This is nothing unusual. It's the historic approach we have taken in formulating our European policy. There is no reason why we cannot do the same in formulating an effective policy in Asia. We must do it now because these people of Asia and Africa are on the march, demanding admission at the front door into the fraternity of modern mankind.

Question. After attending this conference, do you feel more hopeful about the prospect of stopping communism in Asia?

Answer. Most assuredly I do, but not on the basis of what we are doing now. We cannot defeat communism in the Far East with military alliances alone. These people do not want communism. They are hungry for freedom and democracy. Even Nehru, who is friendly with Red China, bitterly fights communism in his own country. To the people here, communism is not the only problem. They need the understanding and help of the United States to solve their ancient problems of poverty and colonialism.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of House Resolution 215, which will make in order the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4954) to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the United States to recover damages under the antitrust laws, establishing a uniform statute of limitations, and for other purposes.

House Resolution 215 provides for an open rule, with 2 hours of general debate on the bill itself.

H. R. 4954 would provide that whenever the United States is injured in its proprietary capacity through violations of the antitrust laws that the United States may institute action to recover actual damages incurred through these violations. Under existing case law it is now held that the United States is not a person to sue under the statute.

The proposed bill would also provide that private treble damage actions for violations of the antitrust laws as now provided in section 4 of the Clayton Act, as well as actual damage suits by the United States, shall be governed by a uniform Federal statute of limitations of 4 years.

H. R. 4954 would also provide that the statute of limitations with respect to private antitrust actions shall be tolled for an additional year after the termination of a Government antitrust proceeding in order to permit the parties to take full advantage of a final Government decree as prima facie evidence of their case and to have sufficient time in which to file suit.

Section 7 of the Sherman Act would be repealed by H. R. 4954, since this section has been superseded by section 4 of the Clayton Act, and finally the bill would provide that the effective date of the measure would be 6 months after the date of its enactment.

H. R. 4954 attempts, Mr. Speaker, to furnish the necessary statutory foundation which the Supreme Court in the Cooper case decision declared essential to a recovery by the Government. The Court declared at that time that "the Government must have statutory authorization before it can sue for treble damages under the Sherman Act." This bill, however, would only grant the Government the right to recover actual damages, since it is felt that if the Government could recover triple damages it would have a disastrous economic effect upon business concerns doing a great proportion of their business with the United States Government.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is open to amendment on the floor; there are no restrictions in the rule regarding amendments, and for this reason I hope that the House membership will adopt House Resolution 215, which would provide for the consideration of the bill under an open rule and with the very ample time of 2 hours for debate on its provisions.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

## PRINCIPAL OFFICE BUILDING FOR ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5645) to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5645, with Mr. SMITH of Mississippi in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple bill and not very difficult to explain. I am sure every Member of the House is familiar with the Atomic Energy Commission and the fine work it has done for our national defense and also the fine work it has done on the matter of dispersal. The question of dispersal has been raised here this morning. I do not believe we have any agency of the Government that has followed the dispersal principle more carefully than the Atomic Energy Commission. If one cares to look at where our laboratories are situated, he will find that they are well placed in all parts of this country. They are primarily convenient for the scientific personnel and the colleges. Storage facilities and everything connected with this work is well dispersed.

PRINCIPAL OFFICE BUILDING FOR THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The bill up for consideration will authorize the Atomic Energy Commission

to acquire a site in or near Washington, D. C., for a principal office building. It will authorize the Commission to prepare or supervise the preparation of plans, specifications, and design of such a building together with necessary auxiliary items such as guard stations, access roads, and garage.

It will authorize the Commission to handle the construction of the building itself.

The total cost of site, engineering, and construction for this building shall not exceed $10 million.

The project will be paid for from funds presently available to the Commission.

The bill, however, also authorizes additional appropriations for the project if rising costs or other necessary circumstances require them.

I should like to briefly state for the information of the House some background on this building: The AEC, when it first set up its offices in 1947, was assigned the Old Public Health Building. At the time this was perfectly adequate to meet the purposes and needs of the Commission. It had a small staff of about 300. Since that time the Commission programs for the defense of the free world have expanded mightily.

To date more than $12 million have been invested in the atomic-energy program and concurrent with this expansion the Commission administrative responsibilities and staff have increased with a Washington headquarters of about 1,200 people. With the adoption by the Congress of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 last year and with the concurrent additional responsibilities for licensing and establishing the procedures under which a new atomic industry will arise, it is estimated that the Commission staff will increase to approximately 1,300 persons by next year.

As of today the Commission's Washington headquarters, which I might point out is required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to be in or near the District of Columbia, is housed in four separate buildings. One is the Public Health Building, 19th Street and Constitution Avenue NW. The other three are temporary buildings spread along Constitution Avenue at 15th Street. The temporary office space which houses two-thirds of the Commission's staff is not well suited to the requirements of an agency like the Commission. The fact that the Commission is spread through four buildings has, in the opinion of the joint committee, two very serious objections. First and foremost, it is undesirable from a security standpoint. In order to transact Commission business classified documents must be moved in large volume among three of the buildings. This greatly increases the risk of compromise of documents. Secondly, the temporary buildings are not well laid out from a security standpoint. Not only is some security risk inevitable in the present setup, but the cost of the guard force is considerably increased since four separate buildings must be guarded, whereas if the force were all in one building, public access to the building could be controlled through one entrance and a better guard force maintained with far less personnel.



The General Services Administration has informed the Commission officially that it does not have any suitable space in the District of Columbia and its suburbs which it can make available to the Commission. The Commission was therefore authorized in the 1955 Appropriations Act to rent 250,000 square feet in the Washington area.

As an alternative to renting space the GSA and the Commission, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, first proposed to have an office building erected under the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954, on the grounds that this will be less expensive than renting available space.

The alternative of using the lease-purchase method rather than renting was favorably considered by the House Public Works Committee. The Senate Public Works Committee approved the lease-purchase method subject to consultation with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. It should be stressed that neither the House nor the Senate Public Works Committees had before them the third alternative, namely, direct Government construction.

In view of the fact that the Senate Public Works Committee sought the guidance of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Joint Committee carefully considered the matter in executive session with the Commission and decided that, in the case of the proposed AEC building, the lease-purchase method was undesirable for the following reasons:

First, the lease-purchase method of constructing public buildings was devised principally for the construction of courthouses and post-office buildings. The country faced the problem of rapidly constructing a large number of new post offices and courthouse buildings in order to make up for construction which was not performed during the war years. The lease-purchase method provides a system for having a large number of these buildings built in the near future while paying for them over a 25-year period.

Second, these buildings would normally be built in the center of a city for one long-term tenant and the builder could be sure that the tenant would be in the building long after the Government took title to the building. In the case of the Atomic Energy Commission building, however, the structure would be located in a spot removed from the center of the city, in fact probably removed from the city itself. The contractor would always have to plan for the eventuality that the Government canceled the lease before the expiration of the 25-year time. The rental payments would have to take this into consideration.

And, third, the Atomic Energy Commission's office building requirements are somewhat different from that of the average general-purpose office building, partly because of its great volume of classified documents and special security requirements.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy came to the conclusion that direct construction by the Atomic Energy Commission would be most advantageous.

TYPE OF BUILDING

The Commission proposes to have a building with a gross floor space of 400,000 square feet and a net, usable floor space of 230,000 square feet erected. The building will be a 3-story reinforced concrete structure, described by the Commission as "functional in concept and devoid of excessive embellishments and extravagant appointments."

In addition to the building, it will be necessary to provide parking space for 500 cars, a water supply system and a sewage disposal system. About 20 acres of land would be required. The location for this structure has not been selected. The Commission desires to locate this building approximately 20 to 30 miles from the center of the city of Washington in order to meet present dispersal criteria. It would also be necessary that the location be west of the north-south line through the center of the city of Washington. As a practical matter this means locating the building on an arc which passes through Frederick, Md., and Leesburg, Warrenton, and Fredericksberg, Va. The building would be located on a main arterial highway so as to be not more than 45 minutes commuting distance from the city of Washington.

The cost of constructing this building, based on 1954 materials and labor figures is estimated at $8.5 million. To protect against the contingency of rising building and labor costs in the next 2 years the joint committee has set a limit of $10 million on this building, since the Commission could not fund for increased costs without additional authorizing legislation were the figure in the bill limited to the 1954 estimate of $8.5 million. The Bureau of the Budget has informed the committee that it will limit the Commission's spending on this building to $8.5 million if the Congress passes the bill to authorize the new office building, unless an increase is justified by a rise in material and labor costs.

The Atomic Energy Commission has expressed satisfaction with the joint committee's recommendation as has the Bureau of the Budget.

COST ANALYSIS

The Commission estimates that it will cost $2.50 per usable square foot to construct its own office building and amortize it on a 40-year basis. On a 25-year basis it is estimated the cost would be $2.57 per usable square foot. This compares most favorably with the lease-purchase cost which would have been $3.47 per usable square foot, according to estimates of the General Services Administration. The GSA and the AEC estimate that the cost of renting a building in downtown Washington with 255,000 square feet of usable space would be $3.54 per usable square foot.

All square-foot costs listed above are on an annual basis.

There is another matter that entered our consideration:

The major products of the AEC, and the prime military reasons for its existence and its present large size, are atomic and hydrogen weapons. It is these very weapons which have required the country to attempt a dispersal policy with

regard to its vital industries. It thus seems to the joint committee most appropriate that the AEC, which is the country's expert on the effects of atomic weapons, should follow the dispersal recommendations for which its staff is largely responsible.

As long as the Commission maintains its headquarters in the District of Columbia it is necessary that it also maintain an emergency headquarters at a point which meets these dispersal criteria. By locating its offices at a point which meets the dispersal criteria the additional expense of an emergency headquarters in the Washington area can be dispensed with.

The precise location of the building will be a decision of the executive department, based upon the technical facts developed by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Office of Defense Mobilization.

I urge the passage of the bill.

ESTIMATED COSTS FOR AEC OFFICE SPACE

First. Rental: Rental of building on H Street in District of Columbia which has 255,000 square feet of usable space:

| | |
|---|---|
| Annual rental payments | $685,000 |
| Other housing costs | 215,000 |
| Total | 900,000 |

$\frac{\$900,000}{255,000}$ = $3.54 per square foot of usable space per year.

Second. Lease-purchase method: 232,000 square feet usable space:

| | |
|---|---|
| Interest at 3¾ percent and amortization | $498,000 |
| Managerial, custodial, heat utilities | 268,000 |
| Annual payment on construction overhead | 16,000 |
| Maintenance of property | 40,000 |
| Real-estate taxes | 135,000 |
| Insurance | 17,000 |
| Total annual operating cost | 974,000 |
| Less value of land and buildings at end of 25-year contract period | 169,000 |
| Net annual cost | 805,000 |

$\frac{\$805,000}{232,000}$ = $3.47 per square foot of usable space.

Third. Direct AEC construction:

Using 2½ percent interest rate, 25-year amortization period:

| | |
|---|---|
| Annual savings on interest | $56,000 |
| Annual savings on insurance | 17,000 |
| Annual savings on taxes | 135,000 |
| Total annual savings over lease-purchase method | 208,000 |

$806,000 less $208,000 = $597,000.

$\frac{\$597,000}{232,000}$ = $2.75 per square foot of usable space.

Using 2½ percent interest and 40-year amortization period:

| | |
|---|---|
| Annnal savings on interest and principal | $74,000 |
| Annual savings on taxes | 135,000 |
| Annual savings on insurance | 17,000 |
| Total | 226,000 |

$805,000 less $226,000 = $579,000 total annual cost.

$\frac{\$579,000}{232,000}$ = $2.50 per square foot of usable space.

AEC CONSTRUCTION EXPERIENCE

AEC expenditures for plant and equipment:

| | Million |
|---|---|
| Fiscal year 1953 | $1,100 |
| Fiscal year 1954 | 1,100 |
| Fiscal year 1955 | 900 |

During this 3-year period AEC estimates that $300 million was spent on construction of community, light laboratory, and administrative type building.

Department of Defense expenditures for construction of all types:

| | Million |
|---|---|
| Fiscal year 1953 | $2,000 |
| Fiscal year 1954 | 1,700 |
| Fiscal year 1955 | 1,400 |

The Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior construction expenditures:

| | Million |
|---|---|
| Fiscal year 1953 | $200 |
| Fiscal year 1954 | 170 |
| Fiscal year 1955 | 135 |

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. COLE. As the gentleman has indicated the original Atomic Energy law required the central office to be in the District of Columbia. When the joint committee last year undertook a general revision of the Atomic Energy Act, at the request of the chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Mr. Strauss, the statutory limitation on the location of the office was extended to beyond the boundaries of the District of Columbia. Mr. Strauss made that request, having in mind the desirability of placing the central office of the Atomic Energy Commission farther away than the District of Columbia itself, but within a reasonable distance, to make it accessible to other sensitive agencies.

Mr. DURHAM. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that this measure should be adopted.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I may say to the gentleman I still have not heard any compelling reason for the location of this structure in or near the vicinity of the District of Columbia.

Mr. DURHAM. I tried to say to the gentleman that this does not involve what one might call the strategic operations, but more or less paperwork and clearinghouse activities.

One reason why we provided that this building should be outside the District of Columbia was the matter of protection of records. We believe we can build a very safe vault.

Mr. GROSS. And does not the gentleman think a safe vault could be built out in the Midwest, for instance?

Mr. DURHAM. Unquestionably a safe vault could be built anywhere; but the gentleman well knows that in the case of a large agency like this there must be a central agency convenient to Government. The need of consultation with the members of the Commission by Members of Congress is necessary; and then in the matter of representatives of the Commission coming to Washington for appropriations and hearings could cost a great deal of money and cause a great deal of inconvience and waste of time. Think what this would be if we moved it somewhere away from the city of Washington at a long distance.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. Is not the language of the appropriation bill in conformity with the language in the existing Atomic Energy legislation?

Mr. DURHAM. That is correct.

Mr. PRICE. And is it not also a fact that this bill in providing for a possible construction within 20 or 30 miles of Washington also is in conformity with the dispersal policy enunciated by the Government?

Mr. DURHAM. It is. I believe that is a recommendation of the Security Council of the Federal Government.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not also a fact that the original Atomic Energy Commission legislation has been expanded to say that the structure may be built outside of the District of Columbia?

Mr. DURHAM. It was; yes.

Mr. PRICE. The existing legislation uses exactly the same language as the bill presented here today: "In or near the District of Columbia."

Mr. GROSS. But that is taken from the original language.

Mr. DURHAM. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Iowa to the fact that at the time the original act was passed we had no knowledge of the blast effects of an atomic explosion. The committee, therefore, is concerned about that. That is the reason we have suggested it outside the city of Washington.

Mr. GROSS. Now with knowledge of the blast effect of an atom or a hydrogen bomb, we realize that even at 30 miles it is not out of the blast zone. Is not that correct?

Mr. DURHAM. It would be out on the fringe of the blast effect.

Mr. PRICE. If the gentleman will yield further, I would say that as far as the dispersal angle is concerned this meets the criteria of dispersal.

I would like to point out that the situation here is a little different from that of the ordinary Government agency. The Atomic Energy Commission is compelled by law to keep a standing committee of the House and Senate, a joint committee, currently informed on all phases of its program. The result is that these commissioners and all the top officials of the Atomic Energy Commission spend almost as much time in congressional committee rooms as they do in their own conference rooms in their own building here in Washington. In this respect it is different from most of the Government departments.

Mr. DURHAM. The gentleman from Illinois is correct, and the committee is in almost continuous session. The cost at a great distance would be prohibitive.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, apparently the only item of controversy in connection with this proposal is with respect to the location of the office. I might take a moment to repeat what I had earlier said in explaining how it came about that this expression is used in the bill before us: That the central office of the Commission be located "in or near the District of Columbia."

The original Atomic Energy Act required the central office to be in the District of Columbia. Last year the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, being very sensitive to the need for dispersal, requested that the basic law of the Commission be changed so that the central office could be in or near the District of Columbia, leaving it to the discretion or judgment of the Commission or the appropriate committees of the Congress as to what constitutes "near," having in mind the atomic hazards to which this activity might be subjected.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is likewise sensitive to the need for dispersal and feels that if for no other reason than that this agency should set a pattern for other agencies of Government as well as industrial activities, that reason alone justifies the central office being located some reasonable distance from the District of Columbia. As the gentleman from Illinois has indicated, the Atomic Energy Commission, is in constant communication with the joint committee and other committees of Congress and, of course, with other agencies of Government located here in the District or adjacent to the District which are of equal sensitivity. I have in mind the Defense Department, the three service departments, all of which are located practically within the District of Columbia. I have in mind the proposal that the Central Intelligence Agency is about to be located somewhat near the District of Columbia. Of course, that is a very important and sensitive agency.

The House can be assured that the problem of dispersal is one which is of concern to the Commission as well as to the joint committee and what eventually will be determined to be the location will be a location that is at a reasonable distance, having in mind the need for dispersal and the obligations of the Commission to commute between the central office and the Capitol Building as well as other agencies of the Government.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. May I say that I had the honor of serving for some time on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. If the gentleman from New York who was the chairman of that joint committee tells me that the Atomic Energy Commission has passed on this matter and approved it and that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has considered it and recommend it, I guarantee to anybody that it has been given thorough consideration by competent individuals whose judgment is good enough for me.

Mr. COLE. I thank the gentleman. I should advise the House that there is an understanding between the Commission and the joint committee that before any final decision is made in respect to the exact location of this building, the Commission will apprise the joint committee of that recommendation and come to some agreement in that respect with the joint committee.

The House should also be advised that the matter of an office building was first submitted to the Committee on Public Works of the House with a request that funds for that purpose come from what is called the lease-purchase program for Government buildings. The Committee on Public Works interposed no objection to the Commission using that avenue of approach in acquiring the funds for this office building. The Commission also last year went to the Committee of the Senate on Public Works and obtained from the Senate committee an acquiescence providing the joint committee approved of the construction of the building. The Commission came before the joint committee about a month or 6 weeks ago with its request for approval of an office building. The joint committee felt that because of the peculiar nature of this office building—its type of construction necessarily must be different from the ordinary office building for reasons of security—and because of the amount of money involved, $10 million, it would be better for the Commission to obtain this authority independently of the lease-purchase program. So the joint committee recommended this procedure.

It should be pointed out also that funds for the construction of the building are already available to the Commission. It has sufficient funds in its control now to build it, but because of the fact that the Congress last year required specific authorization hereafter for the appropriation of funds for construction of any plants, buildings or property, the Commission following out the spirit of that recommendation came to the joint committee for specific authority. That is what the pending bill before the House this afternoon does; it is to authorize the appropriation of funds specifically for the construction of this office building to be built by the Commission under its own contract, its own staff, and according to its own peculiar requirements to meet the security considerations.

I would like now to comment on an aspect of this bill which I believe to be of particular importance—that is, security. The AEC now has offices in 3 different buildings. It has in temporary buildings such important divisions as Reactor Development—charged primarily with the responsibility for development of reactors for power and propulsion of naval vessels and aircraft; Raw Materials—responsible for domestic and foreign procurement of ore; Biology and Medicine, Research, Security, and other important divisions. Necessarily there must be a constant shuttling back and forth between the main building and the temporary buildings of key personnel and of records and documents. Many times these documents are carried by the persons who are going to utilize them. Some of them are quite sensitive. With thousands of classified documents flowing between buildings each year, this situation is going to result in the loss or compromise of a sensitive document sooner or later.

Moreover, the security rules of the AEC, as in the case of many other agencies, require that no classified information be discussed on the telephone. Obviously, this means a great deal more of face-to-face contact by key personnel than would otherwise be necessary. For key personnel located in separate buildings, this requires a further and considerable loss of valuable time.

This bill will permit the AEC to construct a modern building with all the latest protective security devices and vaults. At present the Commission must secure its sensitive documents by placing them in hundreds of separate locked file cabinets. In a single office building sensitive files can be placed in centrally located vault type file rooms at a greatly reduced cost and with maximum protection.

As I have pointed out the Commission is now housed in 2 temporary buildings as well as the Old Public Health Building. To guard these old temporaries requires an extremely large guard force. In fact, the AEC shares one of its buildings with another agency. Guards must be placed in all the common corridors in addition to all the doors leading out of the building. Housing the Commission in a single building will of course vastly reduce the necessary guard force.

You have seen, Mr. Chairman, the typical temporary buildings such as the AEC is now using. To make one of them secure is a complicated and expensive operation, and with the best efforts, one can never be sure. I have utmost faith in the security officers of the Atomic Energy Commission, I know they are doing a conscientious job, but there is a limit on the type of security one can have with such facilities as are available.

A modern office building equipped with all the latest protective devices would not only save money by saving executive time and reducing security guard forces but it would give a greater degree of protection to the Nation's vital atomic secrets.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of this bill not only for the important and cogent reasons expressed by my distinguished colleague the vice chairman of the joint committee, and our distinguished colleague from New York, but because I believe the building of this new headquarters in accordance with established dispersal criteria will set a splendid example for the whole country.

In these days of hydrogen bombs with utter, devastating destructive capability, we must pay attention to the one simple, yet effective, answer—disperse our industry, our cities, and our important governmental agencies. That the AEC will build its headquarters in accordance with dispersal requirements, for which

incidentally it bears a major responsibility, makes sense to me, and even if reasons of economy, and security, and prudent business did not persuade me to the need for passage of this bill, the overriding need for dispersal would.

Let me amplify my reasons. The threat of atomic attack on this country is still real and this peril may remain for many years. Most of those who have studied the problem are convinced that some measure of additional protection is afforded to this country's vital industry and key Government agencies by relocating them at sites meeting dispersal criteria. Obviously a target high on the list of any nation launching an atomic attack against this country would be the seat of its Government, Washington, D. C. Because of the huge investment in existing plants, any dispersal is going to have to take place over a period of years. I am quite convinced that the relocation of the Atomic Energy Commission headquarters at a site meeting dispersal criteria would set a splendid example for the rest of the Government and private industry. If the agency with as much knowledge of the terrible destructive capability of thermonuclear weapons relocates its headquarters, I am sure others will recognize the need for them to do likewise.

I understand that the agency believes it can meet dispersal criteria and locate its headquarters not more than 20 miles from the Washington monument. By not going a greater distance from Washington the impact on its employees should be considerably lessened.

Moreover, it will minimize the inconvenience the distance which must be traveled in order to conform with other Government agencies. Obviously no relocation such as this can take place without some inconvenience. I am as sure that the agency will take very reasonable precaution to minimize any inconvenience.

I urge the passage of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. Yes; I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Someone a few moments ago, the gentleman from Illinois or the gentleman from North Carolina, established the effective blast area as 30 miles. Why do you now speak in terms of perhaps locating this structure within the blast area?

Mr. PRICE. I said about 20 miles. I think the assurance we have from the Commission would be within 20 to 30 miles.

Mr. GROSS. The bill contains a provision "a suitable site in or near the District of Columbia." I assume from what the gentleman has said that he would not oppose striking out the language "in or near the District of Columbia."

Mr. PRICE. I would oppose any amendment that would limit the Commission to constructing the building within the District, and I think unless we have "in or near" it would be limited to the District.

Mr. GROSS. Well, how can you be 20 miles from the Washington Monument and still be in the District of Columbia?

Mr. PRICE. It says in or near the District of Columbia. I should say that anywhere within 50 miles could be considered near in this age.

Mr. GROSS. I think "in" means exactly what it says—in the District of Columbia.

Mr. PRICE. That is correct; "in" would mean that, but it does not say that. It says in or near the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROSS. It says in or near the District of Columbia.

Mr. PRICE. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. So the structure still may be constructed in the District of Columbia, if this bill is passed.

Mr. PRICE. That is correct; it could be, but it is not the intention of the Commission to do that. It is the Commission's request that we liberalize the language so that it can go outside the District of Columbia.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Why not make them go outside the District of Columbia?

Mr. GROSS. That is the point; let us make them go outside the District of Columbia. Let us get the building out of this blast area.

Mr. PRICE. I do not suppose that they would have any objection to that, because it is their intention to do that.

Mr. GROSS. I was in hopes that the gentleman would say that he would not oppose an amendment to the bill providing for construction outside the blast area.

Mr. PRICE. I do not see any need for an amendment to the bill, because I know that it is the intention of the Commission to build outside the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure the gentleman from Illinois knows that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] does not know that is the intention of the Commission.

Mr. PRICE. I can appreciate that, but I think the gentleman from Iowa can take the assurance of the Commission, through the Congressional Joint Committee, that that is the intention of the Commission. I can appreciate the gentleman's concern.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I should like to say to our good friend this: Why should we have to take everybody's word for their intention? We have been let down so many, many times, I am sure the gentleman is aware of that, why not put this outside the District of Columbia? We know the District of Columbia is overcrowded.

Mr. PRICE. Of course we do. And that is the reason why I do not see any possibility of the Commission staying within the District of Columbia. They would not have the space to stay here. They are the ones who are requesting that they be allowed to go outside.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It is not fair to the District, because here is some more property that would be Federal property and, therefore, not taxed. It is not fair to dump all this stuff onto the District. Why should we not put it in the bill that they should go outside?

Mr. PRICE. We are not going to do that. The Commission does not intend to do that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is what the gentleman says, that they do not want to do that, that they do not intend to do that and everybody is agreed. So why not put it into the bill? What is the objection to stating it?

Mr. PRICE. I do not see any necessity of stating it. There probably would not be any objection on my part, but I do not see any necessity for it in this particular case.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. We have been promising the taxpayers a great many things over the years and have not come through on many of them. Why not put it in the bill now?

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I rise for a few minutes in hearty support of this bill to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia, to serve as its principal office. I should like the record to show that there are in my congressional district, which starts right here on the borders of Washington, in Montgomery County, and in western Maryland a number of very, very suitable locations for this building; suitable not only from the standpoint of a location for an office building but desirable from the standpoint of relieving economic distress in areas within a 30-mile radius of Washington. Those areas are losing business that they now have as a result of shutdowns and changes made in industries now located there.

So I should like to commend to the Atomic Energy Commission the serious consideration of that part of Maryland known as Western Maryland for the location of this atomic-energy building.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield.

Mr. COLE. I am not sure whether the gentleman from Maryland is aware of the fact or not, although I think he undoubtedly is, but just on the outside chance that he may not know of it and for the purpose of giving him some comfort and the people he represents some degree of hope, it is a fact that the Commission has had under consideration and still has under consideration locating the office building in the section of Maryland which the gentleman represents.

Mr. HYDE. I thank the gentleman for that information. I have heard something about that. Of course, on the basis of that information we have high hopes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I notice the bill carries $10 million. Is that for the survey or the drawing of the plans?

Mr. HYDE. I know nothing about the details of the plan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What is that $10 million for? Is that just for the making of plans or the making of a survey?

Mr. HYDE. I would prefer the gentleman ask that question of someone more qualified to answer it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is satisfied with the bill as it presently stands because there is a good chance that the building will be located in his district. Is that correct?

Mr. HYDE. I would say that is substantially correct, yes.

Mr. DURHAM. If the gentleman will yield, since the question was raised by the gentleman from Michigan, I can assure him that this includes not only the surveying and planning but the completion of the building.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I want to commend the gentleman for serving his district. I do not have any criticism and I do not think my friend from Iowa has any criticism because the gentleman wants it for his district, because that is natural and commendable.

Mr. HYDE. I deeply appreciate the gentleman's commendation.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I support this bill to authorize the construction of an office building for the Atomic Energy Commission headquarters. I hope I will be pardoned for pointing out that action on this legislation justifies a position which I took last year in opposing the request of the Atomic Energy Commission for approval of the construction of the headquarters under the lease-purchase system.

The lease-purchase plan was not designed for the construction of buildings so immediately essential to the proper conduct of our national-defense effort. The funds for this building have already been appropriated by the Congress.

If this headquarters building had been built under the lease-purchase arrangement which was proposed by Admiral Strauss in 1954, the cost to the Government would have amounted to several million dollars more. The method being used to authorize construction of the building is by far the simplest and certainly the best one from the viewpoint of the American taxpayer.

The action of the House here today makes it clear hasty action should not be taken on these lease-purchase projects. It is obvious that the administration is realizing that the lease-purchase plan is not the panacea that many originally assumed it would be. Lease purchase should be used only for the construction of essential buildings for which there is no possibility of direct appropriations being provided.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Atomic Energy Commission is authorized, with funds presently available or otherwise made available to it, to acquire (by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, under the applicable provisions of chapters 14 and 15 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954) a suitable site in or near the District of Columbia and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to provide for the construction on such site, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by or under the direction of the Commission, of a modern office building (including necessary related equipment, and auxiliary structures, as well as vaults for the protection of restricted data) to serve as the principal office of the Commission at a total cost of not to exceed $10 million and for that purpose there is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 1, line 7, strike out "in or near" and substitute the words "not less than 30 miles from."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to make certain that this structure is not going to be erected at a cost of $10 million within the District of Columbia. My amendment simply provides that the structure shall be built not less than 30 miles from the District of Columbia, which would take it beyond the primary-blast area.

The members of the committee themselves have stated on the floor that the primary-blast area of an expected atomic weapon would be 30 miles. There is nothing complex about this amendment at all, Mr. Chairman. It would simply take this structure beyond the primary area.

We talk a lot about civil defense but there is only one effective civil-defense program and that is the widest possible dispersal of prime targets.

Personally, I can see no reason why this Atomic Energy Commission building should not be constructed somewhere in the country much further removed from the National Capital than 30 miles, in view of modern methods of communication, but I am willing to go along with the committee to the extent that this building be constructed beyond the primary-blast area.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment. If the threat of atomic warfare is as real as it is purported to be, and if Congress is not merely giving lip service to dispersal of prime targets, then there can be no question of the location of a new, $10 million structure safely distant from the target area of the District of Columbia.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as has been indicated in the earlier discussion of the bill, the basic law, the law which the House considered and the Congress passed last August requires that the central office of the Atomic Energy Commission be located in or near the District of Columbia. It is appreciated that the gentleman from Iowa has this concern over the safety of the Atomic Energy Commission and the people who will be employed in this new office building.

I do not know, Mr. Chairman, of any agency of Government which is more aware of the hazards of an atomic attack than the Atomic Energy Commission itself. I am not aware of any group in the Congress which is more aware of and alive to the hazards of atomic attack and the need for dispersal than the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. It has already been pointed out that it is the joint view of the Commission and the committee that the office building should be located somewhere within a reasonable distance outside the District of Columbia. If we were to adopt the gentleman's amendment, and provide a minimum distance of 30 miles, we must consider the convenience of the 1,200 people who will be required to travel to this office building. To some, 30 miles may not be a great distance for the reason that they may live nearby and, therefore, may be closer to whatever locality is selected as the site for the office building. For other persons presently employed by the Commission who will be required to travel the distance which will be necessary under this proposed amendment in order to arrive at the office building, which the gentleman proposes must be at least 30 miles away, the distance that they may be required to travel might be as much as 30, 40, or 50 miles. It would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that the House, which has had rather generous reliance upon the judgment of the joint committee in other respects will be equally reliant on the joint committee with respect to where this office building is to be located.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Is this structure being built for the convenience of the employees or for the protection of the Atomic Energy Commission?

Mr. COLE. Of course, the gentleman well knows that the building is being built to house the employees of the Atomic Energy Commission as well as the Commission itself. I do not know whether the gentleman shares my viewpoint or not, but frankly I am just as concerned about the convenience and safety of the employees of the Commission as I am about the Commission itself.

Mr. GROSS. I think the gentleman is more concerned over the convenience and travel of the employees than he is for the safety of this structure and the records and personnel.

Mr. COLE. The gentleman can be assured that the office building will be constructed in such a fashion that the important records of the Commission will be safely housed and protected against any damage.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, because the records will be in vaults. We are not thinking of the records being safe because the records would be safe almost anywhere they are placed, and they will probably be placed in deep vaults. But that is quite a different thing from the protection of the personnel.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. I yield.

Mr. HALEY. The gentleman speaks about a change in the basic laws which were passed a year ago. I know of no reason, and I wonder whether the gentleman knows of any reason, why the

Congress should not change basic laws after they are enacted, if it is found desirable to change them.

Mr. COLE. The gentleman misunderstood my statement. I did not argue that this bill does change existing law. I was simply pointing out that this amendment did not change existing law, the provisions of which still remain in the basic act for the central office to be located in or near the District of Columbia. I was simply undertaking to show that this amendment, before us now, is inconsistent with the action which the Congress took last year. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge that the amendment be rejected.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this amendment will be voted down. I think one of the worst things which would happen, in my opinion, and this was discussed quite at length in writing the original law, and also this provision, is that it would create a speculative interest immediately in land values if a 30-mile limitation were placed in the bill. So the committee felt that it would be wise to leave this in the discretion of the Atomic Energy Commission. I believe the House can be assured, and I am sure we are, that this building should be built outside the District of Columbia. I personally do, and I have insisted on that from the beginning. So I see no reason to adopt this amendment to create speculative prices around here. We have got to purchase the property wherever it is.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. That would be true no matter where you constructed the building, would it not?

Mr. DURHAM. That is possibly true, but it is different in pinpointing 20 or 30 miles and in leaving it more or less wide open.

Mr. GROSS. How many employees will this building house?

Mr. DURHAM. There are about 1,300 at the present time employed.

Mr. GROSS. How many does the gentleman anticipate putting into this building?

Mr. DURHAM. We intend to put them all in the building. Some of them may resign. I do not know.

Mr. GROSS. How many would that be?

Mr. DURHAM. I do not know, because some are on the north side of Washington and some on the south side.

Mr. GROSS. But it is a minimum of 1,300?

Mr. DURHAM. About 1,300.

Mr. GROSS. If you construct a building out here somewhere, the employees are going to go there to go to work. The gentleman does not mean you are going to establish some segment of it downtown; do you?

Mr. DURHAM. I cannot be sure that everybody is going 30 miles outside of Washington to work. We have not done that before. We are making an attempt to put it outside of the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROSS. Have we not built some kind of a sensitive agency a great deal further out here somewhere?

Mr. DURHAM. I do not know of one at the present time where 1,300 employees have had to go that distance. All employees necessarily have to have security clearances and it takes quite a long time to secure these clearances and costs a lot of money, so we cannot afford to lose them by going too far.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield before he gets started?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes. I yield.

Mr. MASON. On the question of pinpointing the rise in value, when we say "in or near," we have a circumscribed circle that is just about so big, whatever "near" might mean. But when you say "not less than 30 miles," then you have got a much greater area, and there would be less pinpointing in that than there would be in the present language in the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Occasionally there comes to my desk a letter inquiring, "Just how crazy can Congress get?"

I would not ask that question, but I will ask, "Just how illogical can we get?" Now here is a building to make a place for these people, in this very sensitive agency. The purpose is to put them in or near Washington. When the gentleman suggests that 50 miles is "near" today, permit the suggestion that over the years I have been hearing that Asia and Africa and other places, all on the other side of the world, were just next door to us, and that we were forced to spend billions to protect ourselves from them because they were so close to us. We might be called on the next moment to defend ourselves from them.

If I remember correctly, there has been more or less talk and some legislation with reference to making Washington secure, because it seemed to be the center of our national defense. Then there was some talk about defense plants being placed on outside of cities where they are now located, scattering them all around, so that no one bomb could get them all at once. Up at the locks in Michigan, at Sault Ste. Marie, we had built a new airport because we had to protect the locks.

I have heard that the President has a hideaway, and they are talking about building another one for the Speaker and the assistant minority leader and for Members of Congress, to get them away from Washington in time of danger so that someone cannot blow us all up at once.

I met with a great deal of criticism one time when someone suggested a few years back, I think it was right after the Puerto Rican shooting, that someone might drob a bomb down here and blow up the Congress. Thoughtlessly I suggested if they did maybe they would get just as a good a Congress if a new Congress was elected. You know some Members here were really indignant about that; that they could not be replaced. My own opinion is that no one is indispensable. Though some are difficult to replace.

There is now before one of the committees of this House the question of moving one of the defense organizations which is over here in Baltimore, moving it to Dayton, Ohio. It was once located at Dayton, then moved to Baltimore, now it is to be sent back to Ohio, so I hear. I do not know, although I am a member of the committee, whether it ought to be moved or whether it should not be moved. But if we are to move these agencies and defense plants away from centers, then why not support this amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa? Let the Commission put it somewhere—and I do not suppose many of us know where it should be or care where it is to be—but put it away from this very, very vital and already congested center here in Washington. Does not the amendment seem sensible? Does not that seem sound? Or should we build this $10 million building to house these employees and then in a year or two move the agency to some other city? Some say that now we should just abandon the old Capitol here, this historic room, and the whole building itself.

Over across the plaza we built a $12 million building for the Supreme Court. Go over there some day and take a look at it and ask or see if you can learn what it costs just to maintain it for those nine fine young learned gentlemen who administer the law, who not only administer the law, but with reference to segregation some say make the law. If the trend continues some day we will not need Congress at all, just turn everything over to the Executive—a man at the present time in whom we have the greatest confidence and whom we trust—and the Supreme Court, and let it go at that.

Is it not reasonable to suggest that when we build this new building it go out somewhere so that when those bombs come over, if they do—and that is another thing that is difficult to understand; this bombing business seems to be on a one-way road and schedule; one shot or drop will not wipe out the whole Government. For the last 10 or 12 years we have been frightened to death that either the Chinese—I do not know whether they are going to send over a bomb in a paper balloon—either the Chinese or the Russians would just blow us all to kingdom come.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa ought to be, but probably it will not be, adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COLE) there were—ayes 22, noes 24.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Mississippi, Chairman of

the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5645) to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office, pursuant to House Resolution 214, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER announced that the ayes appear to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings on this bill may be postponed until Thursday.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to say to the gentleman from Iowa that there is a gentleman's agreement that there would not be a rollcall vote on a substantive matter today; therefore the gentleman from Oklahoma is asking unanimous consent that further proceedings under this bill be passed over until Thursday.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Iowa withdraw his point of no quorum?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

## CLAYTON ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4954) to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the United States to recover damages under the antitrust laws, establishing a uniform statute of limitations, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4954, with Mr. HAYS of Ohio in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is a rather simple bill. In a word it provides for a uniform statute of limitations with reference to treble damage suits filed by private litigants against violators of the antitrust laws and permits a right of action on the part of the Government in its proprietary capacity by virtue of violations of the antitrust laws.

At the present time, if the United States Government is injured in that proprietary right—and it is injured many times in its procurement activities on account of violations of antitrust laws—it cannot now sue to recover actual damages. It is rather anomalous that a State can sue for such damages, a city or municipality can sue for such damages, a tri-State authority can sue for such damages, a corporation may sue, but by virtue of a decision rendered by the Supreme Court in 1941, *U. S.* v. *Cooper* (312 U. S., p. 600), the United States is deemed not a "person" and thus cannot sue. The word "person" is the key word in the statute. Only a "person" presently can sue.

When you contemplate that the United States Government through its procurement agencies buys upwards, shall I say of $6 billion a month of goods and then cannot by virtue of violations or possible violations of the antitrust laws sue for its actual damages when bidders seem to cabal and unite together to defraud the Government, it is time for us to pause. We must remedy that defect.

The Attorney General has asked for this provision and among other things he has stated:

> The United States is the largest single purchaser of goods in this country and may suffer substantial losses from antitrust violations. As shown in the Cooper case, the Government sustained extensive damages as the result of certain bids submitted on motor vehicle tires and tubes. For the half year ending March 31, 1937, 18 companies submitted identical bids on 82 different sizes of tires and tubes. This identical bidding was repeated in the next half year, but with substantially higher prices than for the preceding period. When bids were submitted for the third half year period the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department, upon the advice of the Attorney General, rejected the bids and invited new ones. The new bids were the same as those rejected. In the circumstances the Treasury Department negotiated a contract with another supplier for its full requirements.
>
> In its next invitation to submit bids the Government required the bidders to warrant that the prices bid were not the result of an agreement among them. Lower bids followed. A comparison of these bids with the earlier bids showed that the United States had been injured to the extent of $351,158.21 during the 18-month period involved. A treble-damage action against the offending companies was instituted by the Government but was dismissed on the ground that the United States is not a "person" within the treble-damage provision of the statute.

It was thus discovered that the United States Government, as the result of this illegal, illicit combination, was mulcted in the sum of a little over $351,000. Now, there have been many other instances that could be pointed out where the Government suffered. I think surely we must answer the plea of the Attorney General who incidentally has made that plea for quite a number of years that the Government should be permitted to sue for actual damages.

In addition, the bill provides for a uniform statute of limitations. In cases where individuals sue for treble damages in the various United States district courts, there are a variety of State statutes that are applicable. In one State, for example, the statute of limitations is 1 year. In other States the statute has been construed to be as long as 20 years. Thirteen States have a 3-year statute. Four States have a 4-year statute. Three States have a 5-year statute. Sixteen States have a 6-year statute. The average for the whole country is 4.85 years, and I believe in its wisdom the Committee on the Judiciary—incidentally, the report was unanimous—recommended than an average might well be struck and they determined 4 years would be a proper period.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Does that 4 years apply to conspiracy cases? Suppose there is a conspiracy, and it is 10 years before the conspiracy is known.

Mr. CELLER. In the case of conspiracy or fraud, the statute only runs from the time of discovery.

Mr. PATMAN. From the time of the discovery?

Mr. CELLER. In conspiracy cases and cases of fraud.

Mr. PATMAN. And it is not the object or intention to change that at all?

Mr. CELLER. That is correct.

Now, in some States you have a considerable degree of confusion. The courts differ as to whether an action for treble damages is, for example, an action in tort or an action in contract. If it is an action in tort, the statute of limitations differs from the statute applicable to a case in contract. In some jurisdictions the action for treble damages is deemed injury to the person; in other States it is injury to property; in still other States it is deemed a forfeiture; in some other States it is deemed a penalty. But, a varying number of statutes are involved, and to avoid the difficulty and the confusion that confronts litigants and their counsel as to what statute really applies so that they may know what the statute of limitations really is, we come forward now and we seek to resolve chaos and confusion and say that the statute shall be uniform throughout the country and shall be for a period of 4 years.

To give you an idea of that confusion, let me read to you a brief paragraph from the report:

> In *Northern Kentucky Tel. Co.* v. *Southern Bell T. & T. Co.*, a private suit for triple damages filed in the State of Kentucky which had a 5-year statute of limitations applicable to "an action upon a liability created by statute * * *," the court held that the 1-year statute of limitations governing actions for conspiracy was to be preferred to the 5-year period for statutory liability. In *Reid* v. *Doubleday & Co.*, the problem was whether the applicable period was contained in the statute of limitations pertaining to actions to enforce "a liability created by statute other than a forfeiture or penalty" or that prescribed for actions "upon a statute for a penalty of forfeiture." In this instance, it was held that the 6-year period governing proceedings of the former type rather than the 1-year period for actions of the latter was applicable.

So, in view of the fact that the Committee on the Judiciary presents a unanimous front on this bill, and in view

further that we have been endeavoring to get this remedy before this House for quite a number of years, I do indeed hope the bill will pass.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation which is now under consideration is the culmination of several years of study and hearings by the Committee on the Judiciary of a very important subject. I am particularly gratified to express my support of the bill H. R. 4954, especially so because it contains provisions which I have advocated and sponsored in the form of legislation in this and previous Congresses.

The bill before us is a relatively simple bill containing two major provisions.

The first provides the Government of the United States with the right to recover actual damages which it has suffered because of violations of the antitrust laws.

The second provision establishes a uniform statute of limitations for antitrust damage suits of 4 years.

Section 1 of the bill, which amends the Clayton Act so as to provide the United States with the right to recover actual damages arising out of violations of the antitrust laws, fills a gap in the antitrust laws which has resulted from the Supreme Court decision in the Cooper Corporation case. It was believed, up until that decision, that the existing statute in referring to "any person," included the Government of the United States. However, the Supreme Court ruled otherwise. Thus, we find a rather absurd situation in the law today. Any individual, corporation, State, or municipality can sue to recover treble damages for violations of the antitrust laws. Yet the Government of the United States, which is by far the largest single purchaser of goods and services, cannot sue for damages it may have suffered from antitrust violations.

When one recalls the billions of dollars annually expended by our Government, it is readily apparent that such a loophole in our antitrust laws must be closed immediately. The taxpayers of this country are entitled to the protection of the laws not only as individual purchasers, but also when their Government acts as their purchasing agent. Section 1 of the bill will remedy the situation. It is interesting to note, in passing, that this provision has practically the unanimous approval of everyone.

Since the United States Government is charged with the responsibility of enforcing the antitrust laws, the bill limits the recovery of damages to those actually incurred as distinguished from the individual's right to recover treble damages. There is no need to provide a motive for the Government to enforce its laws as distinguished from the case of private individuals. Moreover, it is indeed possible, in view of the fact that the Government is dealing with many small- and middle-sized business firms, it might easily cause their failure, should they be the perpetrators of antitrust violations against the Government, if the Government should be entitled to recover treble damages.

The Attorney General should be commended for the position which he has taken in recommending this legislation in his letter to the Speaker on January 20, 1955.

The right to recover damages for violations of the antitrust laws is a Federally accorded right. At the present time, these private treble damage cases are governed by the statute of limitations as set forth in the laws of the various States. That condition has caused serious and perplexing problems affecting both plaintiff and defendant.

In such cases, a determination must be made, first, as to what State law applies; then there is the added problem of a conflict of laws to determine whether the law of the forum or the law of the situs of the injury shall be controlling. And then, to add confusion to mystery, there is the problem to determine the appropriate law of the State that should govern the proceeding. When one recalls the varied gamut of the forms of legal action that exists throughout this land, the hodge-podge that results is self-evident.

A study of the problem from the standpoint of individual State statutes and case law indicates statutes running from 1 to 20 years with an average national limitation of approximately 4.85 years. Therefore, the committee, in selecting a period of 4 years, has struck a fair and equitable national average in order to establish uniformity and to obviate the confusion of the past.

In addition to establishing a uniform statute of limitations, the bill strikes at another problem flowing therefrom, namely, the tolling of such a statute. At the present time, the tolling of the statute, with respect to private treble damage suits, exists during the pendency of a suit by the United States. This period is continued by the present bill. However, in order that a person might not be deprived of the benefit of the Government suit because of an abrupt termination of the Government's litigation, the bill provides for extension of the tolling period not only for the duration of the Government suit but also for 1 year thereafter. Thus the injured parties are provided with an adequate time in which to take advantage of the Government's antitrust proceedings.

There is an added precaution also provided for in this bill to prevent undue and lengthy prolongation of stale claims. By requiring a plaintiff to institute his suit either within 4 years from the date of injury or within 1 year after the final decree in a Government case, the plaintiffs will not be afforded time to procrastinate and delay.

In addition, in order to protect existing causes of action which may be affected by the legislation, provision is made that the act shall not take effect until 6 months after the date of enactment. That 6-month period will provide adequate notice to all to look to their rights and take the necessary measures to protect them.

Over the years, the proposal to fix a uniform Federal statute of limitations has been controversial not from the standpoint of the need for such a statute nor from the desirability of establishing one, but the issue has always been the determination of the number of years. I am happy to say, however, that the committee has been informed that most of the interested parties have now agreed that the period of 4 years, as fixed in this bill is satisfactory and fair. Therefore, I urge the favorable consideration of this legislation.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman agree with the chairman that the 4-year limitation does not commence to apply in a conspiracy case until the conspiracy becomes known?

Mr. KEATING. I would want to have the law on that checked by the counsel for our committee. I have an impression that there have been decisions under the present conspiracy statute, which is not in any way interfered with by this legislation, to the effect that the statute of limitations does not begin to run until discovery of the conspiracy. But I would not want to make a positive assertion to the gentleman on that point without further investigation of the law.

Mr. PATMAN. Notwithstanding the fact that the discovery was made years later?

Mr. KEATING. I would be happy to yield to the chairman of the committee, who may have investigated that precise point.

Mr. CELLER. Yes, I have. The statute only said from the time of discovery in that kind of case. The basis for my conclusion in that regard is the cases themselves. There are innumerable cases on that score.

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to have that enlightenment.

Mr. PATMAN. Would the gentleman yield for one other question related to this discussion?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. About triple damages, I know the committee has been considering for years the question of triple damages. The contention is made it should be left to the judge of the court to determine if the amount should be less than triple damages. Does not the gentleman believe it would be fair, if you are going to leave it to the judge of a court, to permit the judge of a court to assess more than triple damages where the facts so warrant?

Mr. KEATING. That is not in this legislation at all, because the committee has not reported out any bill to make it discretionary instead of mandatory to award treble damages. Under the existing law, treble damages are mandatory in such case, so that the question which the gentleman has raised seems to me to be academic at this point.

Mr. PATMAN. I know, but this reference to not having the triple damages refers to that statute and gives the Government actual damages. It is indirectly related to it. I just wanted an expression of opinion from the gentleman as a ranking minority member of that great Committee on the Judiciary as to his belief that if we are going to

relieve the one who is guilty of the burden of triple damages and leave the discretion in the court to say it may be less, would it be fair also to leave it within the discretion of the court to say under certain circumstances where the facts warrant it could even be more than triple damages?

Mr. KEATING. I still contend that the gentleman's inquiry is purely academic at this point and has nothing to do with the legislation before us. As a matter of fact, when that issue was last considered by our committee I opposed the amendment to lodge discretion in the court about imposing treble damages. We are going to have some hearings on that subject, and I want to retain an open mind; but I believe that the gentleman's question should properly be raised in the hearings to be held on that entire subject and in the ensuing debate if the committee should later report favorably a measure to change existing law.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, we have under consideration the bill H. R. 4954, to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the United States to recover damages under the antitrust laws, and establishing a uniform statute of limitations. I am sure that most of you are well acquainted with the able statements made by the chairman of our committee, and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, that considered this legislation. It actually has as its objective three real purposes. The first one is to grant to the Government of the United States a right of action for a violation of any antitrust law where the proprietary interest of the United States Government has been damaged. When the original act was passed, it was not contemplated that the United States Government would engage in business to the extent that it has within the last 20 years, with the result that when it did begin to engage in business in the magnitude, as this report shows, of approximately $6 billion a year, they found many instances of what they believed to be collusion. The Justice Department instituted action believing that the United States Government was a person within the meaning of this act. Unfortunately, the Supreme Court of the United States determined that the legislation, as drawn, did not contemplate that the United States Government was a person within the meaning of the act. Therefore, the Committee on the Judiciary has recommended that the Federal Government be given the position of a person so that they may institute suit against individuals and corporations who may have engaged in a conspiracy to violate the Sherman-Clayton antitrust laws. That is the first objective of this legislation, and it is needless to point out that the Government is entitled to this protection because of the vast amount of purchasing that they have done in the past and will purchase in the future.

The second feature of this bill is to establish a uniform statute of limitation of 4 years. Heretofore, any person damaged, as a result of a conspiracy under a law that created a cause of action was left to the statute of limitation of his respective State. A survey was made by the Committee on the Judiciary of the respective statutes of limitation, and I direct your attention to page 7 of the report wherein is set forth the various States and their respective statutes. It was very difficult, as has previously been pointed, for the attorneys who are interested in this type of an action to ascertain the statute of limitation in each case. With the adoption of the 4-year statute of limitation, you have something that is uniform and something that should have been enacted in previous legislation.

We protect the rights of individuals where the statute of limitation is suspended under the present law. We provide that the individual must institute his action within a period of 1 year after the suspension has ended.

We, in the Committee on the Judiciary, have considered this along with other matters and unanimously recommend this to the House and trust you will adopt it in every particular.

Mr. CELLER. Does the gentleman from Texas desire me to yield time to him now?

Mr. PATMAN. I prefer to take the time under the 5-minute rule by having the amendments I have in mind read for information, and then briefly discuss each one. I shall not insist upon it now. However, I thank the gentleman from New York for offering me time in general debate.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUIGLEY].

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct my remarks to the portions of the measure now before the Committee for consideration which will affect pending litigation. I would direct the attention of the Members to page 2 of the bill, section 4B, lines 8 and 9, where it is specifically provided that—

> No cause of action barred under existing law on the effective date of this act shall be revived by this act.

It is specifically provided that this bill, in its operation, shall be prospective, so that if there is a State in the Union—and there are, of course, many—where you have a 3-year statute of limitation, upon the adoption of this measure by the Congress, it will not be possible for a litigant to go back and revive his action on the basis that there is now a 4-year statute of limitation applicable. An action that has already been barred by the statute of limitations in a State will remain barred and will not in any way be revived by any action that Congress might take in connection with the bill now before us.

I would also invite the attention of the Members to the last section of the bill, on page 3. Section 4 specifically provides:

> That this act shall take effect 6 months after its enactment.

The general purpose behind this particular provision is to take care of those States—and there are many of them—where they have a statute of limitations longer than the 4 years suggested in this bill. A great number of States have a statute of limitations period of 6 years. I know that is the normal statute of limitations applicable in my own State of Pennsylvania.

In those instances the prospective rights of litigants will be affected by this measure. There, a prospective litigant now has 6 years in which to bring his action. If H. R. 4954 is adopted, that period will be reduced by 2 years. Actually, on the basis of the provisions of section 4, it will be reduced by 1½ years, because we give a 6 months' grace period to cushion the adjustment which may have to be made in those States where the statute of limitations will be reduced from 5 years to 4 years or from 6 years to 4 years. But the important point is that this bill will not revive any rights that are already dead by reason of local State statutes of limitation, and it will give a grace period of 6 months to permit prospective litigants to take advantage of the new period of limitation.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIGLEY. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. I would like to have one point clarified. Would the limitation provided by section 4B apply to any suits that have been instituted or are pending or might be pending prior to the effective date of the act?

Mr. QUIGLEY. Suits that are already started and pending on the effective date of the act would not, in my judgment, be in any way affected by anything contained in this measure. The provisions of this measure to which I have referred are procedural in nature. It is a statute of limitation, and in a State where a suit has already been started, whether under a 3-year period or a 4-year or a 6-year period statute of limitation, that statute of limitation has been tolled, and will in no way be affected by what we do here.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. I wish to ask the gentleman if I am correct in my understanding. I notice they have a 6-year statute of limitations in Alabama. Assuming there is a suit pending in Alabama the cause of action having accrued four and a half years prior to the effective date of this act, then this limitation provided in section 4 (b) would have no application to that litigation; is that correct?

Mr. QUIGLEY. In the circumstances the gentleman cites, the action has already been begun in the State of Alabama and will not be affected by the provisions of the pending bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Then am I correct in assuming that this limitation provided by this amendment is strictly a procedural limitation and has nothing to do with substance?

Mr. QUIGLEY. It was the specific purpose of the committee in reporting this bill to in no way affect the substantive rights of individual litigants. It is simply a procedural change and suggested with the thought of setting up a uniform statute of limitations. That is the sole purpose.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730), as amended, is amended by inserting at the end of section 4 the following new sections:

"SEC. 4A. Whenever the United States is hereafter injured in its business or property by reason of anything forbidden in the antitrust laws it may sue therefor in the United States district court for the district in which the defendant resides or is found or has an agent, without respect to the amount in controversy, and shall recover actual damages by it sustained and the cost of suit.

"SEC. 4B. Any action to enforce any cause of action under sections 4 or 4A shall be forever barred unless commenced within 4 years after the cause of action accrued. No cause of action barred under existing law on the effective date of this act shall be revived by this act."

RESTORE LAW PERMITTING PRIVATE CITIZEN TO SUE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that it be read for the information of the Committee at this point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment proposed by Mr. PATMAN:

After line 4, page 2, add the following language:

"Whenever such suit has been brought, it shall not be withdrawn or discontinued without the consent, in writing, of the judge of the court and the United States Attorney, first filed in the case, setting forth their reasons for such consent."

"SEC. 4 B. Whenever any person possesses information tending to prove that the United States hereafter has been injured in its business or property by reason of anything forbidden in the antitrust laws, such person may sue therefor, without cost to the United States, in his name upon the relation of the United States of America in the United States District Court in the district in which the defendant resides or is found or has an agent, without respect to the amount in controversy, and shall recover for himself and the United States twofold the actual damages sustained by the United States by reason of said injury, together with the costs of the suit, including reasonable attorney's fee, out of which the court shall order paid over to the Treasury of the United States an amount equal to the actual damages sustained by the United States by reason of said injury. Once such suit has been brought, it shall not be withdrawn or discontinued without the consent, in writing, of the judge of the court and the United States Attorney, first filed in the case, setting forth their reasons for such consent."

And in line 5, page 2, change the language "SEC. 4 B" to read "SEC. 4 C."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PATMAN. I assume the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point as read by the reading clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, that part of this proposed amendment requiring the consent in writing of the judge of the court and the United States attorney setting forth their reasons for their consent for the withdrawal or discontinuance of any such suit or cause of action is so obvious as to its logic and soundness as to require no argument in order to secure its acceptance. Once it is alleged by a United States attorney in a complaint filed in a United States district court that the United States has been injured in its business or property by reason of anything forbidden in the antitrust laws and a prayer has been made to recover actual damages for that injury, it is too serious a matter to have such allegations of fact withdrawn and discarded without requiring the United States attorney to secure the consent of the judge and to state his reasons for such action.

The logic underlying the other part of the amendment is equally clear. For example, when it occurs that the United States is injured in its business or property by reason of things forbidden in the antitrust laws and information concerning those facts is not known to the Attorney General and his subordinates, section 4 A, of course, cannot become operative. In those instances it would be with no more effect than if it had not been enacted by the Congress. The impact of the futility of such a situation moved the War Department in the wartime administration of President Abraham Lincoln to propose a measure to the Congress providing for any citizen to bring a suit in his own name upon the relation of the United States when he had information that the United States had been injured as a result of any false claims made against the United States and to recover therefor twofold the damages to the United States, out of which the United States was to secure an amount equal to the actual damages it had sustained. It had been discovered that the United States had been unable to cope with situations in which the Government had been injured by reason of false claims having been made against it. Some of those false claims had been based upon orders for arms and munitions for delivery to the Union forces in the field. It was found that in some instances claims were made for deliveries which had not in fact taken place. In some of the instances citizens knew about the falsity of the claims but were not moved to take action to protect the Government. The Department of Justice could not act because it did not know about the falsity of the claims. Therefore, as then proposed, the Congress on March 2, 1863, enacted as a part of title 31, section 232, of the United States Code, a provision for an individual to bring and carry on a suit as well for himself as for the United States when he had information that false claims had been made to the United States Government. For more than 80 years that provision of the law stood guard against covert wrongs to the taxpayers of this Nation. However unfortunately, when we were engaged and absorbed in carrying on a great struggle to win World War II, interests which apparently saw in the Abe Lincoln provision of the law a dangerous basis for a prosecution of them should they make false claims to the Federal Government for furnishing supplies to our country to win the war, expressed their discontent and dislike for the provision put in the law during the Civil War. Therefore, that provision of the law came in for much criticism by those who were reaping the benefits of large contracts from the United States Government. Finally after the Attorney General of the United States had been innocently influenced by some of this criticism, he proposed that the law be amended so that the citizens would not be so free to sue for wrongs perpetrated against the Government, and while the Congress as well as the rest of the country was absorbed in that great struggle it acted on December 23, 1943, to take some of the teeth out of the law which was approved by President Lincoln. The amendment I propose today as section 4 B to H. R. 4954 replaces those teeth in the law insofar as violations of our antitrust laws are concerned.

I have talked with the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. He does not believe that the first part of the amendment is necessary and he has presented to me a very convincing argument to that effect. The other part I still believe should be incorporated in the law. I shall not insist upon it, however. That is the reason I asked that the amendment be read for the information of the committee. I shall not insist upon it at this time, but the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary assured me that it will be considered when it is proper to do so in his committee.

I am sure the gentleman's committee has given very thoughtful and careful consideration to this bill and I do not want to try to amend it hastily without knowing exactly what the effect of it will be. For that reason I shall not insist, in view of the chairman's objection to it, and his assurance that the amendment will be considered before his committee when it is proper to do so.

Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, after the word "accrued" in line 7, page 2, I have an amendment prepared to include the phrase "and became known" so as to make it clear that the cause of action or that limitation would not commence to run against the cause of action until it is discovered, until it became known, and, therefore, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee this question: Is it your understanding, Mr. Chairman, that the cause of action will not commence to run, that limitation will not commence to run on the cause of action until after it is discovered, 4, 6, or 10 years hence?

Mr. CELLER. The statute of limitations will start running from the time the action accrues, not from the time of discovery. If you make it time of discovery, then you practically have no

statute of limitations at all. An action could have accrued and the person aggrieved might not have heard of it for 20 years. Under the suggested amendment he would have a right to bring an action after 20 years, after the evidence will have been lost, and the defendant would be put in a rather deplorable situation in that regard. We provide that the 4-year statute shall start to run from the time of the accrual of damages, from the time the wrong was done, not from the time of discovery.

Mr. PATMAN. Even in the case of fraud or conspiracy?

Mr. CELLER. No. In the case of fraud or conspiracy the statute of limitation only runs from the time of discovery.

Mr. PATMAN. That is the point I wanted to make sure of. You are not attempting to change that particular part of it?

Mr. CELLER. Not at all.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the proposal for inserting the words "and became known" after the word "accrued" in line 7, page 2, is to emphasize and make clear in the law that the period of limitations shall not commence to run until at least covert wrongs have been discovered. We should make certain that in enacting a uniform Federal statute of limitation we will not be acting to limit the damage period to 4 years, even though a monopolistic conspiracy may have lasted for 10 years before the victim even knew of its existence. Perhaps the amendment I propose will not insure fully against such unjust result, but it will serve to improve the provision which has been presented in H. R. 4954 in making certain that the action is not barred until a period of 4 years after the victim learned of the existence of his cause of action.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 5 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 731; 15 U. S. C. 16), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. (a) A final judgment or decree heretofore or hereafter rendered in any civil or criminal proceeding brought by or on behalf of the United States under the antitrust laws to the effect that a defendant has violated said laws shall be prima facie evidence against such defendant in any action or proceeding brought by any other party against such defendant under said laws or by the United States under section 4A, as to all matters respecting which said judgment or decree would be an estoppel as between the parties thereto: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to consent judgments or decrees entered before any testimony has been taken or to judgments or decrees entered in actions under section 4A.

"(b) Whenever any civil or criminal proceeding is instituted by the United States to prevent, restrain, or punish violations of any of the antitrust laws, but not including an action under section 4A, the running of the statute of limitations in respect of every private right of action arising under said laws and based in whole or in part on any matter complained of in said proceeding shall be suspended during the pendency thereof and for 1 year thereafter: *Provided, however*, That whenever the running of the statute of limitations in respect of a cause of action arising under section 4 is suspended hereunder, any action to enforce such cause of action shall be forever barred unless commenced either within the period of suspension or within 4 years after the cause of action accrued."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may be permitted to read for the information of the committee an amendment that I have prepared.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN: Before the period in line 2, page 3, insert the following language: "except when a finding is made by the tribunal having jurisdiction, and to which the matter is presented, to the effect that the public interest would be promoted by having the section apply to consent judgments or decrees entered before testimony has been taken or to judgments or decrees entered in actions under section 4A."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the principal change proposed in section 2 under the designation of section 5 (a) of H. R. 4954 is to have the provisions of section 5 of the Clayton Act apply to the new section 4 A in the same manner as to the provisions of section 5 of the Clayton Act have heretofore applied to proceedings arising under section 4 of the Clayton Antitrust Act, that is, providing that a final judgment or decree when entered in any civil or criminal proceeding shall be prima facie evidence against the same defendant in any other action or proceeding brought by any other party under Federal antitrust laws and as to all matters respecting which said judgment or decree would be an estopper between the parties thereto. That provision is limited by a proviso to the effect that it shall not apply to consent judgments or decrees entered before any testimony has been taken. Now, the effect of my proposed amendment would continue the limitation carried in that proviso except in those instances where the judge should make a specific finding that the public interest would be promoted. In such instances, and only in such instances, would consent judgments or decrees entered before any testimony had been taken be usable as prima facie evidence, as now provided for in section 5 of the Clayton Antitrust Act. I am not unmindful of the reasons which have been advanced heretofore against the use of consent judgments entered before the taking of testimony as evidence in subsequent litigation. Today I stand ready to accept those arguments except when the judge makes a specific finding that those arguments do not apply and that in a specific case the public interest would be served and promoted by having a consent judgment or decree which had been entered before testimony had been taken used as evidence in subsequent litigation.

Mr. Chairman, after discussing this amendment with the chairman of the committee and knowing that he wants to make any correction that he believes should be made in the antitrust laws, I am not going to insist on this amendment, with the knowledge and understanding that when it is appropriate to do so on any bill considered by the Committee on the Judiciary, this question will be taken into consideration.

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE HALF OF ALL BILLS

Mr. Chairman, I realize that the Committee on the Judiciary has a very difficult job. It so happens that about half of the bills that are presented to the House of Representatives are referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Of course, that comes about by reason of the Reorganization Act of 1946. The Reorganization Act caused the Committee on the Judiciary to take in immigration bills and private bills of other committees and reduced the number of committees from 54 to 18, and since the Committee on Un-American Activities has been made a standing committee of the House, we have 19 committees. And, out of the first 5,805 bills that were presented, 2,825 of them went to the Committee on the Judiciary. Members of the Judiciary Committee introduced 406 of them. Out of a House membership of 435, approximately 375 of them have bills pending before this committee. I realize that having almost half of the bills that are introduced in the House of Representatives this committee has more work to do, several times as much, than any other committee of the House.

H. R. 11

Mr. Chairman, I bring this up because I have been disappointed in the past because we have not received consideration of certain bills. I particularly refer to H. R. 11 that I introduced in the House of Representatives the first day of this session. I wrote the chairman on January 20, 1955, and asked for an early hearing on this bill. An identical bill was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, in the other body, Senate bill 11, incidentally, and we have not been able to get consideration of that bill in the House. But I feel sure that the chairman will make every effort to give us a hearing on that bill as soon as he can. I would like to have some assurance from the chairman that he will, as quickly as he can, get to it and give us a hearing on H. R. 11.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman has pointed out the stupendous task confronting the Committee on the Judiciary with this avalanche of bills. I can assure the gentleman that at an appropriate time we shall be very glad to hear the gentleman on his bill.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman understands the nature of the bill and the real need for it?

Mr. CELLER. That is the equal opportunity bill?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. The equality of opportunity bill.

Mr. CELLER. I would be very happy, as far as I am personally concerned, to turn over to the gentleman's committee quite a number of those private bills we have. I can tell the gentleman they are just a perfect nuisance to us, and if you want to handle those private bills, I will be glad to give them to you.

Mr. PATMAN. I am not asking for any part of the jurisdiction of the gentleman's committee, but I just wonder

if we have imposed too much of a burden on that committee. I just wonder if we have imposed so much of a burden that we cannot expect the committee to give sufficient consideration to the major bills that are referred to it. I know the gentleman has a very fine staff. It is my privilege to work with his staff. It is our privilege as members of the Committee on Small Business of the House to have our staff work with his staff. They work together shoulder to shoulder. They exchange information. And, I am mighty glad that the members of our staff are working together that way and we are working together, the Committee on Small Business with the Committee on the Judiciary. We are working to the same end to make sure that the people have as near an equality of opportunity in this country as is possible.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. Section 7 of the act approved July 2, 1890 (26 Stat. 210), is repealed.

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect 6 months after its enactment.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAYS of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4954) to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the United States to recover damages under the antitrust laws, establishing a uniform statute of limitations, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 215, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## BUREAU OF RECLAMATION ECONOMICS PHONY AS $3 BILL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the expressed philosophy of the Bureau of Reclamation embraces the contention that reclamation is all things to all men. As it has done year after year in the past, the Bureau has come forward again with a thesis attempting to illustrate the great benefits to be derived by the Nation from a proposed western irrigation project. The subject this time is the multibillion-dollar upper Colorado River project. It is the Bureau argument that if the doors of the Federal Treasury are opened to the proponents of this fiscal monstrosity, every State of the Union will get some of the loot.

The Bureau undoubtedly employs accomplished hydrologists and construction engineers, but when it comes to economists the Bureau is woefully deficient. The economics of the Bureau of Reclamation are as unsound and as phony as a $3 bill.

If the Congress were to accept the Bureau's affirmations, then it follows that the Federal Government should subsidize all new industrial development in the United States on the ground that the spending of such public money would benefit all States.

The Bureau's thesis is that if General Motors, for instance, desires to build a new plant at Denver, the Federal Government should put up the money for it, because construction materials, equipment and labor would come from many States, and thereby those States would benefit.

The Bureau's policies have been called creeping socialism. I submit that the Bureau's economics would not be tolerated by the most ardent Socialist, and they certainly are not creeping policies. They are advancing with the speed of a jet plane and, if the Congress does not halt them, they will have the taxpayers of the Nation burdened to the point of complete collapse, the national debt will be increased beyond any hope of future reduction, and the national economy will be in a straitjacket.

The Bureau has furnished the House Interior Committee with a statement purporting to show how many dollars each State will get from the building of the upper Colorado River project. This is the largest conglomeration of dams and irrigation ditches ever put together under one title. It contains either 2, 4, or 6 power dams and either 11, 12, or 33 irrigation projects. Nobody seems to know exactly what it contains, how much it will cost, or much else about it.

In its learned paper analyzing the dollar benefits to be derived for each State, however, the Bureau conveniently has omitted mentioning anything about subsidy. This is considerable. In other reports the Bureau has admitted that the project would cost the taxpayers $1,153,000,000 in lost interest. Evidence has been presented to the Congress showing that this subsidy by the Federal Treasury would amount to $4 billion, possibly more.

In its analysis, the Bureau presents a table which is intended to show the amount of money to be spent in each State for materials and equipment for the project.

I have appended to this table the amount of money which the taxpayers of each State will have to pay if the project is built.

The comparisons are somewhat startling.

For instance, the State of New York will receive, according to the Bureau, $77,398,000, but the taxpayers of New York will have to fork out $493,600,000 for the project.

Who does the Bureau of Reclamation think it is kidding?

Here is the table:

| State | Amount Bureau says it will receive | Cost to taxpayers |
|---|---|---|
| Alabama | $7,025,000 | $46,000,000 |
| Arizona | 37,036,000 | 20,400,000 |
| Arkansas | 2,145,000 | 27,200,000 |
| California | 125,248,000 | 372,800,000 |
| Colorado | 47,981,000 | 36,400,000 |
| Connecticut | 15,181,000 | 69,600,000 |
| Delaware | 1,429,000 | 14,800,000 |
| District of Columbia | 774,000 | |
| Florida | 2,797,000 | 67,600,000 |
| Georgia | 8,157,000 | 61,200,000 |
| Idaho | 5,963,000 | 13,600,000 |
| Illinois | 53,463,000 | 276,000,000 |
| Indiana | 23,815,000 | 102,400,000 |
| Iowa | 5,357,000 | 62,000,000 |
| Kansas | 10,270,000 | 52,400,000 |
| Kentucky | 5,953,000 | 50,800,000 |
| Louisiana | 5,536,000 | 53,600,000 |
| Maine | 3,452,000 | 18,800,000 |
| Maryland | 9,108,000 | 102,400,000 |
| Massachusetts | 26,970,000 | 127,600,000 |
| Michigan | 41,556,000 | 196,400,000 |
| Minnesota | 8,157,000 | 69,600,000 |
| Mississippi | 2,382,000 | 26,000,000 |
| Missouri | 12,980,000 | 100,000,000 |
| Montana | 4,275,000 | 16,000,000 |
| Nebraska | 6,547,000 | 34,000,000 |
| Nevada | 4,667,000 | 6,800,000 |
| New Hampshire | 2,441,000 | 12,000,000 |
| New Jersey | 33,400,000 | 144,000,000 |
| New Mexico | 17,006,000 | 15,200,000 |
| New York | 77,398,000 | 493,600,000 |
| North Carolina | 13,158,000 | 66,800,000 |
| North Dakota | 1,403,000 | 12,000,000 |
| Ohio | 50,844,000 | 236,000,000 |
| Oklahoma | 7,809,000 | 44,800,000 |
| Oregon | 9,847,000 | 44,000,000 |
| Pennsylvania | 55,549,000 | 277,600,000 |
| Rhode Island | 5,240,000 | 20,800,000 |
| South Carolina | 6,370,000 | 34,400,000 |
| South Dakota | 2,056,000 | 13,200,000 |
| Tennessee | 7,681,000 | 55,600,000 |
| Texas | 34,575,000 | 194,400,000 |
| Utah | 61,716,000 | 16,000,000 |
| Vermont | 1,191,000 | 7,600,000 |
| Virginia | 8,395,000 | 67,600,000 |
| Washington | 14,631,000 | 68,400,000 |
| West Virginia | 5,299,000 | 35,600,000 |
| Wisconsin | 18,100,000 | 88,000,000 |
| Wyoming | 10,719,000 | 8,000,000 |

All told, the Bureau claims that $923,052,000 will accrue to the 48 States.

The Bureau says nothing about the fact that the taxpayers of the same 48 States will spend $4 billion.

Thus, if the upper Colorado River project is built the States stand to lose a cool $3,076,948,000.

In the depth of the recent great depression, there was little argument against public spending. Pump priming was necessary for the simple reason of sustaining life and to give our battered economy a chance to recuperate.

The Bureau of Reclamation is advocating the upper Colorado River project in the face of the greatest prosperity we have ever known.

When the warehouses and storerooms of the country are bursting with $8 billion worth of surplus food and fiber, the Bureau of Reclamation wants Congress to authorize a gigantic loss to the taxpayers of the Nation so that a desert project can be built to grow more surplus food.

With only a comparatively small amount of unemployment in the country, largely consisting of unskilled and white-collar workers, the Bureau of Reclamation asks Congress for permission to transport thousands of skilled men thousands of miles to build a project that cannot be justified on any sound basis.

Most of the dams and irrigation works in the proposed upper Colorado River project are located in the most remote

sections of the United States. Some of them are in places accessible only to mountain goats or intrepid explorers. Some of them have been seen by only a few persons, most of whom have been Bureau engineers who get a wild gleam in their eyes every time they see an undammed canyon.

Construction of the various, widely separated units of this project would involve, in addition to the transporting of thousands of men from all parts of the Nation, the building of towns, business houses, and perhaps brothels. The workers who would be uprooted from their home communities would also be taken from their families. There would be no schools, no churches, few physicians in these windswept, barren desert towns that would have to be built.

Of course, it is possible the Bureau of Reclamation intends to ask Congress for another subsidy for churches and schools. The Bureau will build anything. All it needs is more taxpayers' money. The zeal and spirit of the Bureau officials are boundless and inborn.

I forgot to mention that the Bureau also would have to build highways, utility plants, fire and police stations, and motels for visitors.

Now, what happens to all this after the dams are built? Let us consider Echo Park Dam. It would stand in one of the most magnificent canyons in the world, in the midst of a land of unsurpassed natural beauty, the Dinosaur National Monument.

A lake longer than a press agent's nightmare will lie behind Echo Park Dam. This is a power dam. Some years will be dry years. The lake level will go up or down each year. The shoreline will be made up of mud, dirty rock walls, smelly reaches, deep cracks. It will be barren of vegetation. The fishing in the lake will be lousy. There will be no algae in the water, no weeds, no beneficial conditions for fish.

The proponents of the upper Colorado River project cite Lake Mead, behind Hoover Dam, as an example of fine recreation areas made from big dams. They ought to look at Lake Mead today. The only good recreation there is enjoyed by lizards. The beaches are a mile from the beach houses. Boats are several miles inland from water. Fishing is horrible.

What does the Bureau mean by recreation areas? This?

Echo Park today is really a fine recreation area. All that is needed to make it easily accessible are a few roads. God put everything else there for people to enjoy.

Now, what about building the project? Does the Bureau know who will be the successful contractor? Maybe the Bureau has that all figured out.

If the company who gets the major contract is from Arkansas, then the benefits to other States will be vastly different from the table supplied by the Bureau?

This is just one point that makes the Bureau's table worthless.

And what about equipment contracts? If the major equipment contract comes from Chicago, will the Bureau credit it to Illinois?

The ridiculousness of such figuring seems to be obvious.

Let us look at the States that will benefit from this project—Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and New Mexico.

According to the Bureau, if the project were built, these States would get the following:

| | |
|---|---|
| Colorado | $47,981,000 |
| Wyoming | 10,719,000 |
| Utah | 61,716,000 |
| New Mexico | 17,006,000 |
| Total | 137,422,000 |

How much would the taxpayers of these States pay for the hidden subsidies of the bill?

This is the answer to that:

| | |
|---|---|
| Colorado | $36,400,000 |
| Wyoming | 8,000,000 |
| Utah | 16,000,000 |
| New Mexico | 15,200,000 |
| Total | 75,600,000 |

The only 4 States which would get more money than they pay for construction of the project are the 4 States that benefit from it. The other 44 States pay through the nose.

How, then, can the Bureau of Reclamation honestly make the statement that such projects benefit the Nation as a whole?

In the face of this evidence, how can Reclamation Commissioner W. A. Dexheimer tell Congress, as he did in February of this year, "reclamation is good sound business"?

The Federal reclamation projects that are "good sound business" can be counted on 1 hand of a man with 3 fingers.

It is up to Congress to stop this phoney propaganda of the Reclamation Bureau. For more than 50 years now, the Bureau has been able to make Eastern States swallow its line.

If anyone chooses to swallow it—well, this is a free country. But those of us who are fighting for a sound economy, built on national benefits, had better put a stop to this unfair scheme of giving a few mountain and desert areas billions of dollars of public money for projects we do not want or need.

I, for one, want to stop this Treasury raiding.

---

## REVISING OUR ELECTION LAWS

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, revising our obsolete laws governing Federal elections is one of the tasks facing this Congress. It is my hope that the House will soon have an opportunity to consider such legislation. This morning I appeared before the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Senate on Rules and Administration to make a statement on behalf of a bill pending before that body which would accomplish the needed modernization. I am informed that hearings will soon be held by a subcommittee of this body on similar bills, and I am presenting my statement here today in order that Members may consider this particular point of view before the matter comes before them.

STATEMENT ON FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1955 (S. 636) PRESENTED TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION APRIL 26, 1955, BY REPRESENTATIVE STEWART L. UDALL, SECOND DISTRICT, ARIZONA

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to appear before your committee to testify in favor of S. 636. It seems to me that this bill represents the first serious attempt that has been made to draft a realistic statute to effectively control election spending and insure full disclosures by candidates and their supporters of all expenditures.

I have long been interested in seeing our Federal election laws revised, and, therefore, when I studied this carefully prepared legislation last January I introduced an identical bill (H. R. 3139) in the House without any hesitation whatsoever. I understand that hearings will be held on the House side in the near future on election law revision, and it is my hope that this Congress will enact legislation on this important subject.

It is my opinion that nothing has done more to lower politics and politicians in public esteem than our lax election laws which have produced widespread cynicism, and placed men in public life under needless suspicion. As Members of Congress we need a full measure of public confidence, and I strongly believe we cannot afford to further postpone the day when our election procedures command universal respect.

I do not pretend to be an expert on many aspects of this legislation, and I intend to confine my presentation this morning to what I consider to be the most vital parts of this proposed law. As I read your bill, Mr. Chairman, I note it proposes four major changes in the existing law. Three of these proposals (regulation of primary election campaigning; raising of spending limits; and sterner enforcement provisions) have won near-unanimous support. However, the fourth, the real kernel of this bill (sec. 201), which would broaden the law by requiring all campaign committees to report expenses, and would prevent them from operating without written authorization from the candidate himself, has met with some disapproval.

If this law is enacted without section 201, our Corrupt Practices Act would be as meaningless, practically speaking, as it is today. This is the provision which puts teeth in the statute, and without it there would be no purpose in making the other changes. Consequently, this morning I want to stress the necessity for retaining this section, or a substantial equivalent, in this bill.

Under the old statute the very letter of the law invited circumvention and it has not been surprising that the spirit of the law, if it has existed at all, has been likewise the spirit of evasion. All a candidate needed to do in the past was to be discreetly ignorant of what his friends were doing on his behalf.

I was disappointed that the two national chairmen of our political parties did not give stronger support to this provision when they testified before your committee. I was surprised to learn that Chairman Hall stated this type of law would be unworkable, as it is his function to improve the caliber of our political life, and the old special-committee, friend-spending loophole has perhaps done more to bring politics into disrepute than any other current practice. This criticism came unexpectedly, as other countries, notably England, Canada, and Australia,

have found that such laws are workable and readily accomplish the purpose of restricting and equalizing expenditures and promoting full disclosure of election facts.

For example, the Commonwealth Electoral Act of Australia provides:

"Any person incurring or authorizing any electoral expense on behalf of a candidate without the written authority of the candidate shall be guilty of a contravention of this act."

So we see that other nations have had ample experience under this law to warrant the assertion that such a regulatory statute is both realistic and necessary to assure that election facts are fully disclosed.

I seriously hope that Mr. Hall will reconsider his expressed reservations, as the enactment of this law is a nonpartisan task and we need his approval and support.

This principal argument made against section 201 is that it would require reports from all of the 165,000 precincts in the country. In my opinion this is a completely mistaken view of the practical operation of this law. It is hardly that complicated. Let us take my own State of Arizona as an example: we have 12 rural counties, 2 urban counties with cities of over 200,000 population, and a total of 519 precincts. If this provision were enacted into law and both political parties in my State continued their present practices, the only reports that would have to be made to Federal authorities under this bill would be reports by the 14 county committees and the two State central committees. Unless I am mistaken, it is the practice in all except a few of the largest cities for party campaign spending to be centered at and controlled by county committees. If this is true, I cannot believe that the great merits of this provision are outweighed by the inconvenience that would be caused these political workers. We would probably find that once reporting techniques were mastered, this system would work well and practically all county committees would tend to handle contributions and disbursements and precinct workers would have no occasion to file reports.

The argument was made, too, that it would be impossible for a candidate to control the amount spent by various organizations working for the entire ticket. Admittedly, this would present a minor problem, but certainly not one which would render the law unwieldy. This bill, as it is written, is flexible and unquestionably alert party workers could adapt themselves to the new requirements.

The real answer to these objections, however, is that unless the restrictive provisions of section 201 are enacted, the law will not be strengthened in the least. Surely we can ask our politicians to put up with minor inconveniences in order to bring new respect to our electoral process.

There is a good reason to believe that one highly important byproduct of a stricter law would be that the level of our campaigns would be raised by fixing personal responsibility on the candidate himself for the activities of his friends and committees. Many of the excesses, usually in the form of personal attacks engaged in by committees would be eliminated if the candidate had to assume clear moral responsibility for such actions. Only last week the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee heard testimony from the notorious Harvey Matusow that he falsely pictured a Senator as pro-Communist in speeches given in the Senator's home State during the 1952 campaign. He was paid $1,100 by a candidate's committee for these 2 speeches, he said, and it is almost certain that his services would never have been employed had the candidate who benefited from his efforts been required to openly sponsor him and accept responsibility for his statements.

DEBUNKING THE "SHOCKING TRUTH"

There is one other matter which I would like to comment on before your committee today. Last Sunday I read an article in the New York Times, written by a competent and reliable reporter, which stated that passage of the Hennings bill would give the public for the first time what some Members of Congress fear might be the shocking truth about the cost of obtaining political office. This same reporter, reflecting the generally held view, stated further:

"Altogether, candidates for the 84th Congress spent, or had spent in their behalf, $13,654,236, according to the reports.

"Even these figures, however, give only a fraction of the true picture. Informed guessers estimate that the true cost of electing the 83d Congress was somewhere between $100 million and $200 million. The lowest estimate advanced by any informed guesser in this field put the cost at $75 million.

"That even the informed guessers can't get closer than $100 million to the true cost is a tribute to the inadequacy of existing laws."

To me, the appearance of this statement in a conservative newspaper famous for its factual reporting is highly disturbing. The average reader of such a statement cannot avoid conclusions about our political life that are both ugly and untrue. Some of the more obvious of these would be: Most elections are bought; politicians are a tricky lot and their campaigns are usually corrupt; politicians are indebted to large secret contributors and probably sell votes for substantial campaign contributions; it takes big money to succeed in politics, and the average person doesn't stand a chance.

It is my opinion, without qualification, that these informed guessers are all wet and that their calculations, to use Mark Twain's expression, are "greatly exaggerated."

Yet, wrong as they are, such figures and the ugly, erroneous conclusions they suggest enter the public mind because our laws are inadequate and tend to leave the impression that honest men are dishonest. Our laws should reward, instead of punish, the honest, and should bring together in one place all of the pertinent information to achieve this end. Too, they should promote candidate responsibility and, where possible, produce campaigning on the highest moral level.

It is time someone debunked this myth of fantastic spending. During the past few days I have conducted a private canvas of Members of the House in order to determine as best I could the true spending picture. At the risk of being called naive, I want to state that I arrived at the refreshing conclusion that the overwhelming majority of them are conscientious and filed complete or substantially complete reports. In my opinion better than 90 percent of my fellow Congressmen make such substantially complete reports. Under existing Federal law they are not required to file full reports in Washington (or, actually, any reports at all) and many of them file fuller reports at their State capitols, as they are required to do by State law.

After making this cross-section canvas, I concluded that at least 75 percent of the money actually spent is reported either at the State or Federal level. It would be my estimate that the total amount spent to elect the 84th Congress was not $100 million or $200 million, but, in fact, did not exceed $25 million and was probably nearer $20 million.

There are several reasons why these informed guessers are badly mistaken. Let me list a few of them:

1. All of the big-cost items (TV, newspaper advertising, radio, billboards, etc.) by their very nature cannot be concealed;

2. Candidates eye each other closely and any officeseeker can make a good estimate as to the money his opponent has spent;

3. Most important, with few exceptions, politicians are basically honest and would rather risk the unfavorable publicity resulting from disclosure of excessive spending than the more serious disclosures which would destroy their reputations for integrity;

4. Perhaps two-thirds of the Members of the House do not have serious primary opposition;

5. At general election time 20 percent of the House candidates are unopposed, and another 40 percent have such secure margins that they hardly bother to wage a personal campaign that entails substantial expense; and

6. Most strong House incumbents, and candidates having districts with a pronounced Republican or Democratic character, are content to ride the party bandwagon and wage modest campaigns.

Our armchair guessers are misled by one other misapprehension—another false impression easily created in the absence of loophole-proof laws—the idea that money is all important in political campaigns. No one will deny that a certain minimum fund is indispensable, but any good politician knows that willing friends are the big story in politics, and not money. Funds are no substitute for stanch supporters, key party workers, and endorsements from good organizations. The candidate who can command the loyal support of a cross section of his community, or district, for his stand on vital issues, can ward off the challenge of a contender with four times the cash.

A revision of our election laws is long overdue. It would elevate public life and bring new respect to persons in positions of public trust. And, above all, it would give new encouragement to those of us who dare to believe that politics can be a noble calling, a calling where moral principles are the paramount consideration.

## DISTRIBUTION OF ANTIPOLIO VACCINE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include a letter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the following is a letter I have received from a prominent pharmacist of my district on the distribution of Dr. Salk's vaccine:

APRIL 24, 1955.

Congressman HUGH SCOTT,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I would like to bring to your attention factors in the publicity and distribution of Dr. Salk's vaccine, which I feel should be scrutinized by Congress.

Lack of proper planning, premature promotion, and solicitation of purchases, unfair distribution, contradictory statements, and unnecessary promotion. Continuous misleading publicity, contradictory statements and press releases plus photographs of shipments being made has tended to create doubt in the public's mind as to fair distribution, plus an anxiety as to their ability to secure the product and the cost of the same plus medical service charges.

Manufacturer's representatives in some instances solicited orders from physicians based upon the physician's past acceptance of their respective company's products, rather than impartial distribution. One manufac-

turer is quoting lower prices to the physician than the prices of the other five firms. This manufacturer is offering one vial to each physician as fair distribution. Present method of solicitation and distribution directly to physicians is contrary to all previous practices. Many physicians resent the control and pressure put upon them as the source of supply. This method compels them to become distributors, invest large sums of money for stocks, and their limited quarters to store the perishable vaccine properly. Many physicians would prefer their patients to purchase and provide the vaccine and only inject the same. Therefore may I suggest the following:

1. Have two Members of the House and from the Senate, one from each party, form a committee with Mrs. Oveta C. Hobby, invite the executive administrators of the six manufacturers, of the Polio Foundation, national head of the Red Cross; Dr. Salk and Dr. Francis; John W. Dargavel, executive secretary of the National Association of Retail Druggists, and Robert P. Fischelis, secretary of the American Pharmaceutical Association. Have them bring in all correspondence, intra-office and sales and advertising, etc. Then find an agreement on what can be done and issue a public statement to reassure the millions of parents.

I do not believe the medical profession has the manpower, nor the facilities to handle this tremendous job in the limited time needed this year. The physician may become so involved and overworked he may be unable to take care of the needy sick. He may be tempted to sacrifice needed medical attention because of heavy demand for polio injections. Therefore, I would suggest the following for the first year of immunization:

2. All municipalities set up emergency stations; city health, Red Cross, Civilian Defense and all hospital clinics; if nccessary, call in medical staffs of the Armed Forces and National Guard.

3. Fee should cover cost only on evidence of inability to pay.

4. Part of supply should be allocated for individual public purchase and supplied through regular pharmaceutical channels at stipulated prices.

The AMA should suggest a fair basic fee of $4 for both injections, provided patient brings own vaccine. The office nurse in many instances will no doubt do the physical injection.

Let us try to do this humane project without a profit-making motive. Let us show the world in practice, we still have humanitarian ideals. No family should be deprived of this vaccine, because of poor planning, or avoidable human error.

Sincerely,

DANIEL COOPERMAN.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

## THE WASHINGTON POST AND TIMES HERALD SHOULD APOLOGIZE

Mr. McMILLAN. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, during the 18 years I have been a Member of this body I have made it a point never to dignify one of these newspapers in Washington by answering one of its editorials. But when they mention my home town and call it a hick town, I feel that I should call their hand. I care not what they say about me personally. But in this morning's Post and Times Herald, in one of their editorials, they refer to my home town as a hick town. I think the editor should write to the mayor of my good city and its newspapers and offer an apology.

I know why this came about. It is for the simple reason that I have made an effort during the past few years to improve the parking conditions here in the Nation's Capital so that your constituents and mine can find a place to park when they come to see their Capital. Another item is the fact that I have made some mention of doing some checking to see how the taxpayers' money from my home town and your home town is being spent here in the city of Washington. They have come to the conclusion that we have no reason to investigate, or to learn how this money is being spent. The Federal Government owns just about as much property in my home district as they own here in the city of Washington, but they pay no taxes and do not give us $20 million a year to help operate our State, city, or county government.

## COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H. R. 5715.

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

There was no objection.

## SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to postpone the special order for 15 minutes granted him for today until tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered.

## COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report.

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

There was no objection.

## MAYBE THE WORLD IS NOT ROUND

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am in the unhappy position today of having to admit ignorance, which of course is not very good politics. Generally it goes better with the folks back home, at least at election time, to profess ignorance of politics and at the same time to modestly let it be understood, even if you have to leak the news yourself by inference, that on all other subjects you just happen to be well informed. I hasten to explain this statement is not intended to impugn the motives of any Member of Congress other than my own.

What, Mr. Speaker, would the good people of the First District of the State of Washington, who not only elected me once but returned me to Congress, think of their Representative if he confessed ignorance, or what may be just as bad, if he admitted confusion on a simple subject like geography? However, it looks as though that is the situation.

What may make matters even worse, out in the State of Washington we have always had a fine public-school system. When I was a boy in the fifth or sixth grade I had the advantage of a fine course in elementary geography. Now it seems what I was taught was wrong. Columbus was wrong. We have been under a delusion—the world is not round.

It seems hard to believe, Mr. Speaker, that my teachers in the Summit School in Seattle would have misled me on that one point. They were right about other matters. Not even the Socialists nor reactionaries; nor a depression nor prosperity; nor peace nor war; nor anything since has changed the arithmetic of simple economics taught me in my youth. Two plus two is still four. Reading, writing, and arithmetic are the same. So is the history of this great land of freedom and opportunity; it has not changed. But with geography it may be different.

I say this because I distinctly remember my teachers explaining the shape of the earth so that in circumnavigating the surface of the world the farther one traveled north, for example, from the equator, the less the distance between two locations. Thus a ship from Seattle to the Orient making a circular swing northward, taking advantage of the shorter distance, saved about 1,200 miles as against a ship sailing from San Francisco. In terms of time this was a saving of about 48 hours, or in today's values, figuring present operating costs of modern ships, a huge saving in running a ship.

Now, Mr. Speaker, imagine my disillusionment; for it turns out that all these years I have been in error. Only yesterday I was informed by a high official in the Pentagon that the Army operates on a formula that it is 350 miles shorter in winter and 200 miles shorter in summer from San Francisco than from Seattle to Japan. This was a severe shock and the extent of the seasonal variation was, too. I know about expansion and contraction under heat and cold, but the page in my geography book must have been missing on this earthly phenomenon.

The operators of private ships use the northern route winter and summer crossing the Pacific Ocean, and according to their old-fashioned chronometers and calendars this reduces the trip by a couple of days. But not the Military Sea Transportation Service, which appears to follow the modern army system of measuring distance, and possibly, too, may follow a fairly recent California Chamber of Commerce shipping bulletin which authoritatively says the northern

route from Seattle is unusable 95 percent of the time. We have all heard that the world is getting smaller; what some of us did not know was that the world, unlike people who get older, is shrinking at the girth and not at the neck. Not too seriously speaking, Mr. Speaker, I should have been given sixth-grade geopolitics—not geography. You can see that is about the size of it. Because if I was a member of the House Committee on Armed Services, maybe I could have asked Army witnesses a few questions about geography and learned the new system.

The great State of California is fortunate. It has four distinguished Representatives—more members than any other State—on the House Armed Services Committee. They are fine gentlemen and certainly not ignorant, like the gentleman from Washington who still clings to the old-fashioned notion that a GI by air or by sea can get home from the Orient quicker to his loved ones by the northern route.

It is not often that we find the branches of our military service in agreement, but as to the modern science of geography of the Pacific there would seem to be no clash of opinion. It is true that on the east coast the Navy maintains various operational bases besides Norfolk for combat ships. There are so-called home ports from north to south for various types of ships at Boston, Newport, New London, Charleston, and Key West. On the west coast the only such bases are at Long Beach and San Diego. This traditional concentration near the morale building and excellent year-round golf facilities of southern California, I assume, is owing to its location, to its strategic proximity to what I am discovering should be called the nearer to California Far East. While my maps are not up to date and fail to show this, it may be that the Pacific Northwest and Alaska are so remote from Asia they are quite safe and do not need protection.

A while back I seem to recall the military decided we did not need an airlift across the northern route. It was too expensive. The Post Office Department ought to catch up because it pays on a per-mile basis, and since it pays the private airline on the old measurement basis, the Army mail in increasing amounts is designated via Seattle, which by old-fashioned geography, and old-fashioned economics, too, saves the Post Office Department a lot of money.

Of course, money, particularly other people's, is not everything.

That was demonstrated yesterday when the Pentagon announced Operation Gyroscope. This is a rotation movement of troops. The 187th Airborne Regimental Combat Team will come back and the 508th will replace it on the island of Kyushu, Japan. C–124 Globemaster troop carriers will make this 12,000-mile round-trip airlift across the Pacific.

This will be an interesting experiment in overseas troop movement, but it will be of particular interest to me to find out from the final study and evaluation, first, why this operation is not planned via the North Pacific; and, second, how much differential in cost, in extra gasoline alone, would the operation entail as between San Francisco and Seattle.

As I say, my old-fashioned geography must be all wrong. Perhaps Operation Gyroscope will straighten out my thinking. Then I can tell my constituents and taxpayers, and they will be happy that the armed services have been right all along—and sorry for me on account of the poor geography taught me in my youth. Maybe the world is not round.

## RICE MARKETING QUOTAS

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4647) to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate admendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "5 percent" and insert "2 percent or by such greater acreage as may be necessary to provide such State with an allotment equal to its 1950 allotment."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "1955" and insert "1955 (i)."

Page 2, line 3, after "acreage" insert ", and (ii) the 1955 allotment for any county in which the 1950–54 average planted plus diverted acreage of rice, adjusted for trends in acreage, exceeds the 1945–49 average planted acreage of rice, similarly adjusted, by more than 2 percent shall then be further increased by such additional acreage as may be necessary to provide such county with an allotment equal to its 1950 allotment."

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to ask the gentleman from Texas whether or not this bill is intended to give and does give the State of Oklahoma a reserve acreage of not less than 500 acres for apportionment to farms operated by persons who have not produced rice during the preceding 5 years or farms on which rice has not been planted in the preceding 5 years.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. The gentleman's question is whether that protects Oklahoma?

Mr. ALBERT. The question is whether this bill gives not less than 500 acres to the State of Oklahoma.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. That is correct. That is correct in my understanding. That was the understanding of our committee when we held the hearings on it and when we reported the bill out.

Mr. ALBERT. And that is the gentleman's understanding of the language in the bill?

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. That is my understanding. It is the language of the bill.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. HAGEN. Reserving the right to object, as I understand it, the House version of this bill increased the acreage, which treated every State equally, with some minor exceptions with reference to North Carolina. That has been upset by the Senate, and they have written this language so that certain States will get an undue amount of this new acreage. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. I would not say so. The language of the Senate version reestablishes the acreage as it was in 1950, or at least says that no State shall have less than that acreage. Frankly, that was a very moving factor when our committee was considering the original measure, as the gentleman will recall.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that this bill as passed by the Senate makes special provision for one and possibly two States, at the disadvantage of the rest of the rice-growing States. I do not want to be obnoxious in this matter, but I am constrained to object to these amendments, and I do object, Mr. Speaker.

## PURPLE HEART STAMP

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, Boston is signally honored and privileged this year to be the convention city of the Military Order of the Purple Heart. The order has chosen Boston because it is one of the oldest and most historic cities of the Nation and will meet there on August 9 through 14 for its annual convention.

As a well-deserved tribute to this outstanding patriotic organization, I have today introduced in the House a bill providing for the issuance of a special commemorative postage stamp in honor of the Order of the Purple Heart with the added provision that the first-day sale be made at Boston the day before the 1955 convention opens.

A constituent of mine, Mr. Rosaire J. Rajotte, of Northbridge, Mass., legislative officer of the Department of Massachusetts, Military Order of the Purple Heart, has furnished me with background material concerning the establishment of the Purple Heart award.

The Badge of Military Merit, designed as the figure of a heart, in purple, was created by George Washington and the first award was made on August 7, 1782. The following is the text of General Washington's order, which established this award:

UNITED STATES ARMY HEADQUARTERS,
*Newburgh, N. Y., August 7, 1782.*

Orders of the day:

For fatigue tomorrow, the Second Massachusetts Regiment.

Countersign:

YORK LANCASTER.

The general, ever desirous to cherish a virtuous ambition in his soldiers, as well as to foster and encourage every species of military merit, directs that whenever any singularly meritorious action is performed, the author of it shall be permitted to wear on his facings over the left breast, the figure of a heart in purple cloth or silk, edged with narrow lace or bindings. The road to glory in a

patriot army and free country is thus open to all. This order is also to have retrospect to the earliest stages of the war, and to be considered a permanent one.

G. WASHINGTON,
*Commander in Chief.*

Thus, Mr. Speaker, was created an award which honored the heroes of the war for independence. It was in 1932 that attention was again focused on the Purple Heart when General Douglas MacArthur issued orders to reactivate this outstanding decoration for military achievement. This is the text of General MacArthur's order:

THE PURPLE HEART
GENERAL ORDERS NO. 3
WAR DEPARTMENT,
*Washington, February 22, 1932.*

Purple Heart: By order of the President of the United States, the Purple Heart, established by Gen. George Washington at Newburgh, N. Y., August 7, 1782, during the War of Revolution, is hereby revived out of respect of his memory and military achievements.

By order of the Secretary of War:

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR,
*General, Chief of Staff.*

While the Post Office Department was not too encouraging when I first took up this proposal, I hope that the stamp in honor of the Military Order of the Purple Heart can be included in the 1955 series of special commemorative stamps. Such a stamp will be a deserving tribute to this organization and the wounded of World War II and the Korean war.

The text of my bill follows:

A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the Military Order of the Purple Heart

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to issue a special postage stamp to commemorate the Military Order of the Purple Heart, an award first made by George Washington on August 7, 1782. Such special postage stamp shall be issued in such denomination and design, and for such period beginning August 9, 1955, as the Postmaster General may determine, and shall be placed on sale in Boston, Mass., site of the 1955 annual convention of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, 1 day before it is made available to the public elsewhere.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. GUBSER (at the request of Mr. YOUNGER) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of California and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EDMONDSON (at the request of Mr. ALBERT).

## SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 26. An act for the relief of Donald Hector Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 29. An act for the relief of Rica, Lucy, and Salomon Breger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 36. An act for the relief of Lupe M. Gonzalez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 42. An act for the relief of Selma Rivlin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 68. An act for the relief of Evantiyi Yorgiyadis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 71. An act for the relief of Ursula Else Boysen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 89. An act for the relief of Margaret Isabel Byers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 90. An act for the relief of Nejibe El-Sousse Slyman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 91. An act for the relief of Luzia Cox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 93. An act for the relief of Ahti Johannes Ruuskanen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 94. An act for the relief of Esther Cornelius, Arthur Alexander Cornelius, and Frank Thomas Cornelius; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 95. An act for the relief of Peter Charles Bethel (Peter Charles Peters); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 99. An act for the relief of Xanthi Georges Komporozou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 100. An act for the relief of Hermine Lorenz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 118. An act for the relief of Leon J. de Szethofer and Blanche Hrdinova de Szethofer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 119. An act for the relief of David Wei-Dao and Julia An-Fong Wang Lea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 120. An act for the relief of Vasilios Demetriou Kretsos and his wife, Chryssa Thomaidou Kretsos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 121. An act for the relief of Sultana Coka Pavlovitch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 130. An act for the relief of Antonin Volejnicek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 162. An act for the relief of Antonio Ribeiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 191. An act for the relief of Liselotte Warmbrand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 192. An act for the relief of Borys Naumenko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 193. An act for the relief of Louise Russu Sozanski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 234. An act for the relief of Rev. Lorenzo Rodriguez Blanco and Rev. Alejandro Negredo Lazaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 236. An act for the relief of Johanna Schmid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 238. An act for the relief of Andreas Georges Vlatsos (Andreas Georges Vlatso); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 283. An act for the relief of Andrew Wolfinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 320. An act for the relief of Mrs. Diana Cohen and Jacqueline Patricia Cohen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 321. An act for the relief of Anni Marjatta Makela and son, Markku Paivio Makela; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 322. An act for the relief of Malbina Rouphael David (nee Gebrael); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 341. An act for the relief of Vittoria Alberghetti, Daniele Alberghetti, Anna Maria Alberghetti, Carla Alberghetti, and Paolo Alberghetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 353. An act for the relief of Arthur Sroka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 397. An act for the relief of Maria Bertagnolli Pancheri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 407. An act for the relief of Helen Zafred Urbanic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 439. An act for the relief of Lucy Personius; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 449. An act for the relief of George Pantelas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 467. An act for the relief of Dr. Luciano A. Legiardi-Laura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 473. An act for the relief of Urho Paavo Potokoski and his family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 504. An act for the relief of Priska Anne Kary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 570. An act for the relief of James Ji-Tsung Woo, Margie Wanchung Woo, Daniel Du-Ning Woo, and Robert Du-An Woo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 574. An act for the relief of Martin P. Pavlov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 587. An act for the relief of Hildegarde Hiller; to the Committe on the Judiciary.

S. 604. An act for the relief of Alick Bhark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 633. An act for the relief of certain alien sheepherders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 644. An act for the relief of Sandy Michael John Philp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 650. An act for the relief of Anonios Vasillos Zarkadis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 676. An act for the relief of Robert A. Borromeo; to the Committee on the Judiciary

S. 707. An act for the relief of Christos Paul Zolotas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 713. An act for the relief of Romana Michelina Sereni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 714. An act for the relief of Alfio Ferrara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 758. An act for the relief of Marion S. Quirk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 760. An act for the relief of Pietro Meduri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 827. An act for the relief of Mojsze Hildeshaim and Ita Hildeshaim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 844. An act for the relief of Zev Cohen (Zev Machtani); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 867. An act for the relief of Jacob Grynberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 974. An act for the relief of Casimero Rivera Gutierrez, Teresa Gutierrez, Susana Rivera Gutierrez, Martha Aguilera Gutierrez, and Armando Casimero Gutierrez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 998. An act to authorize the conveyance of a certain tract of land in the State of Oklahoma to the city of Woodward, Okla.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1014. An act for the relief of Henry Duncan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1044. An act for the relief of Edward Naarits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1079. An act to provide for the sale of certain lands in the national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1180—An act for the relief of Blanca Ibarra and Dolores Ibarra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1197. An act for the relief of Slavoljub Djurovic and Goran Djurovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1350. An act for the relief of Guiseppi Castrogiovanni and his wife and child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1367. An act for the relief of Antonio Jacoe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1372. An act to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to extend the period for emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution providing for the continued operation of the Government tin smelter at Texas City, Tex.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1252. An act for the relief of Olivia Mary Orciuch;

H. R. 2839. An act to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

H. R. 4356. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, with respect to rice allotment history.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 27, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

734. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract with Martin Kilian, which, when executed by the Superintendent, Mount Rainier National Park, Wash., will authorize Mr. Kilian to provide accommodations, facilities, and services for the public within the Ohanapecosh Hot Springs area of Mount Rainier National Park during a 1-year period beginning January 1, 1955, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271), was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## 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. LONG: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, House Report No. 440. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 4778. A bill to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover postmasters, officers, and employees of the Post Office Department, contractors with the Post Office Department, mail clerks of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 441). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. PFOST: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 4817. A bill relating to the payment of money orders; with amendment (Rept. No. 442). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 4659. A bill to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department," approved October 24, 1951 (65 Stat. 632; 39 U. S. C. 876c); with amendment (Rept. No. 443). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3486. A bill to amend the act increasing the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service in order to make such increase permanent; without amendment (Rept. No. 444). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 37. An act to amend the act increasing the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service in order to make such increase permanent; without amendment (Rept. No. 445). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 4646. A bill to amend section 4421 of the Revised Statutes, in order to remove the requirement as to verifying under oath certain certificates of inspection, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 446). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 5715. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, and to authorize the Administrator to make additional types of direct loans thereunder, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 447). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 222. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 2107, a bill to amend the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 to provide for additional facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 448). 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. CHELF:

H. R. 5836. A bill to amend the act of August 3, 1950, Public Law 638, 81st Congress, relating to the Young American Medal for Bravery and the Young American Medal for Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 5837. A bill to provide for the payment of more adequate compensation to the Indians of the Pine Ridge Reservation for land taken from them by the United States in 1942 for military purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 5838. A bill to provide that payments be made to certain members of the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians as reimbursement for damages suffered as the result of the establishment of the Pine Ridge aerial gunnery range, and to provide a rehabilitation program for the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 5839. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to review reports on the Roanoke River Basin, N. C. and Va.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 5840. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHATHAM:

H. R. 5841. A bill to repeal the fee stamp requirement in the Foreign Service and amend section 1728 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 5842. A bill to repeal a service charge of 10 cents per sheet of 100 words, for making out and authenticating copies of records in the Department of State; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 5843. A bill to provide leave of absence for officers and employees stationed outside the United States for use in the United States, its Territories or possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 5844. A bill to increase the fee for executing an application for a passport from $1 to $3; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 5845. A bill to facilitate the establishment of local self-government at the communities of Oak Ridge, Tenn., and Richland, Wash., and to provide for the disposal of federally owned properties of such communities; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 5846. A bill to extend and improve the program of assistance under Public Law 874, 81st Congress, to local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 5847. A bill to establish a Columbia Interstate Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 5848. A bill to reduce the interest rate from 5 percent to 3 percent on certain emergency loans made by the Farmers' Home Administration; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 5849. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia, to provide penalties, to prescribe rules of evidence, and for other purposes," approved July 8, 1932; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 5850. A bill to consolidate and make uniform the laws relating to public assistance in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 5851. A bill to provide for the bonding of certain officers and employees of the government of the District of Columbia, for the payment of the premiums on such bonds by the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 5852. A bill to extend the period of authorization of appropriations for the hospital center and facilities in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 5853. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of veterinary medicine in the District of Columbia," approved February 1, 1907; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 5854. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from the excise tax on gasoline which is used to operate or propel farm equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 5855. A bill to incorporate the 29th Division Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 5856. A bill to repeal the requirement for heads of departments and agencies to report to the Postmaster General the num-

ber of penalty envelopes and wrappers on hand at the close of each fiscal year; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 5857. A bill to provide limited dental care for certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 5858. A bill to provide that admissions to entertainment events conducted by certain civic and community membership associations shall be exempt from the admissions tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 5859. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. R. 5860. A bill to authorize certain officers and employees of the Department of State and the Foreign Service to carry firearms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. R. 5861. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 5862. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon United States district courts to adjudicate certain claims of Federal employees for the recovery of fees, salaries, or compensation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. J. Res. 289. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim May 11, 1955, Colonel-Commandant Michael Kovats Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Colonel-Commandant Michael Kovats; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 290. Joint resolution to give the consent of the Congress to interstate compacts or agreements dealing with juveniles and delinquent juveniles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 291. Joint resolution to give the consent of the Congress to interstate compacts or agreements dealing with juveniles and delinquent juveniles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. J. Res. 292. Joint resolution designating the month of June of each year as National Dairy Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## MEMORIALS

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

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Concurrent resolution of the Senate and Assembly of the State of New York memorializing the Congress of the United States to cede and grant to the State of New York and/or the city of New York jurisdiction over and the title to all of the lands, properties, and facilities located at Ellis Island to be used as a clinic for the reception, care, treatment, and rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the inclusion of United States Highway 101 (from Los Angeles to the Oregon State line) and United States Highway 199 (from Crescent City to the Oregon State line) in the National System of Interstate Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation giving the States the power to levy and collect nondiscriminatory privilege taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to adopt House Joint Resolution No. 102, proposing the designation of the rose as the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to give a full hearing on the proposed Proctor Dam on the Leon River; 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. ASHMORE:

H. R. 5863. A bill for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD:

H. R. 5864. A bill to authorize the advance on the retired list of 1st Lt. Nicholas Mainiero, United States Marine Corps Reserve (retired), to the grade of captain; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 5865. A bill for the relief of Gerhard Kamp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 5866. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Lazarich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 5867. A bill for the relief of Anthony Hourzamanis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 5868. A bill for the relief of the estate of Gertrude I. Keep; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. R. 5869. A bill for the relief of Andreas (or Andrew) Voutsinas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 5870. A bill for the relief of Jesajahu Braun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEEHAN:

H. R. 5871. A bill for the relief of Guy Francone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 5872. A bill for the relief of the Orange County Machine Works; 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:

219. Mr. BUSH presented a petition of railroad employees of the Williamsport area, urging every Member of Congress to support any bill that contains the following provisions: "To provide retirement at age of 60 after 30 years of service or after 35 years of service regardless of age, annuities to be based on one or more of one's highest year's earnings. Rail retirement annuities and pensions to be increased by 15 percent," which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Military Job Changes Since 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. LEROY JOHNSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 26, 1955*

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to insert a brief analysis and accompanying charts on changes of duties and training requirements of military jobs in the armed services.

In any look at the technological changes in the offensive and defensive methods of maintaining our national security, one is apt to overlook the tremendous revamping necessary to provide a workable scheduling of adequate proficiency levels of service personnel.

To give some guidance in our thinking on this vital problem, which I have discussed at some length with Assistant Secretary of Defense, Carter L. Burgess, the following information will, I believe, prove most helpful:

MILITARY JOBS IN THE ARMED SERVICES—CHANGING DUTIES AND TRAINING REQUIREMENTS, 1949–55

A review of the jobs of the enlisted men in the armed services during the past 6 years reveals a series of changes in each service. These job changes have been made in the interest of better manpower management to reflect the changing technology of the armed services. Table I is a list of major job changes since 1949, including new, revised, and deleted jobs. The training time to reach an entrance level of proficiency in these jobs is also shown.

A significant number of new jobs have been created, such as, guided missile propellant explosive specialist, jet mechanic aircraft and atomic weapons nuclear assembly specialist, reflecting the results of technological development in new scientific fields. Some jobs have become obsolete, such as, the signalman in the Navy, due to these same technological improvements. The complexity of many jobs has become sufficiently great so as to require the breakdown of 1 military job in 1949 into 2 or more separate new jobs. For example, in radar maintenance in the Army in 1949 there were 3 specific jobs. Today the Army requires 7 different jobs for this area of work. Major developments in each service are summarized in succeeding paragraphs.

Between 1949 and 1955 the Army's system of classifying military jobs has undergone two major revisions, in 1950 and now in 1955. The general trend has been that jobs are grouped and related to one another on a functional basis. Likewise, substantial changes have been made in school-training requirements due to increased complexity of the specialty and the division of a single job into two or more new jobs. This tends to simplify training and to accelerate productive time on the job. This latter point is especially noticeable in Army with 2-year inductees as compared to the other services with 3- and 4-year enlistments.

Both the Navy and the Marine Corps have made considerable changes in their job classifications since World War II. The changes, as in Army, represent new skill requirements commensurate with technical innovations. For example, a Navy destroyer in 1940 had