State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6974) to extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

BILATERAL AIR TRANSPORT AGREEMENT WITH GERMANY

Mr. BOW. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, ever since the negotiation by the United States in 1856 of the bilateral air transport agreement with Germany, the subject of the policy of the Department of State in the negotiation of these air agreements has been of increasing concern to the interested committees and individuals in Congress.

We have reason to be proud of our United States-flag air transport system, and to progress which has been made over the years in becoming free of subsidy. This subsidy-free status, however, is not one which can be achieved and maintained in the face of foreign air route grants by the Department of State taken in total disregard of the economics of international air transport.

In the domestic field, careful consideration is given by the Civil Aeronautics Board to the award of competitive services. Similar considerations must be taken into account in the grant of routes to foreign countries. We must have a policy which results in sensible, controlled regulation of entry into the United States market. We cannot have one which results in every country in the world operating an airline to the United States.

It is for those and other reasons that I hope the Department of State will deny the request which I understand the Government of Australia has made for an extension of the direct route between San Francisco to New York and on to London and around the world. This is a service which is not economically needed. To grant such a route to the Australians would destroy the equity of the present route exchange between the two countries, and would result in a decided imbalance in favor of Australia. It would be wrong to grant this route to Australia, and I trust the Department of State will not permit it to be done.

HILLS CANYON DAM

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. 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 Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, in regard to the measure to the re-employment of the distinguished senator from my own state—Senator WAYNE Morse—the American public is becoming increasingly aware of the exact meaning of the term “fast tax writeoff” as applied to the idle Power Co.'s proposal for the adequate development of the Snake River as a shunt substitute for the high Hills Canyon Dam. We who have been fighting the proper day development of Oregon's great natural resources have in recent weeks been highly criticized because of our estimate that this fast tax writeoff of the Idaho Power Co. amounted to an interest-free loan of $329 million. We were told that our figures were wrong.

The figures were wrong. We underestimated the size of the loan by the taxpayers to the Idaho Power Co. by some $10 million based on figures supplied only the other day to the Kefauver Committee by the Federal Power Commission's own chief accountant. The total of the interest-free loan is not $329 million, but rather $339 million.

With this in mind, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that these be printed in the Congressional Record. House Joint Memorial No. 18, passed by the Oregon State Legislature, memorializing the President of the United States to reconvene the Idaho river agency and to nullify any fast tax writeoff granted to the Idaho Power Co.

House Joint Memorial 18

To His Excellency, the Honorable President of the United States, and to the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 49th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas Idaho Power Co. has been allowed an acceleration of depreciation on a major part of the construction costs to be expended for dams in Hells Canyon; and

Whereas such allowance was made under a 1961 act passed during the Korean war, in the interest of national security; and

Whereas Idaho Power Co. is able to finance expansion without this type of Government assistance, which results in an increased burden on other taxpayers; and

Whereas the benefits accruing to the company will not in turn ultimately accrue to the state taxpayers on the standpoint of national security or from the standpoint of reduced rates: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That the President of the United States hereby is memorialized to direct appropriate Federal officials to reconsider and to deny or substantially reduce the allowance of the fast write-off made to the Idaho Power Co. for its dams in Hells Canyon; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to repeal the 1961 act which was passed as a national security measure and which is now outmoded and unnecessary; and be it further

Resolved, that this memorial be sent by the Chief Clerk of the House to the President of the United States and to all members of the Oregon congressional delegation.

Adopted by house May 7, 1957.
Adopted by senate May 15, 1957.

Entered By BILL LOW.
Chief Clerk.

STEVE DOONEY,
Speaker of the House.
BOYD R. OVERHOLSER,
President of Senate.

O'MALLEY'S TAXPAYER-BUILT DODGER BALL PARK

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I have really reached the saturation point with regard to the non-action in connection with the threatened transfer of the Brooklyn Dodgers' franchise to the west coast. Following adjournment of the House on Thursday last I found this in the Washington Evening Star:

MAYOR WAGNER GIVEN BREKHOFF BY O'MALLEY

New York, May 30.—Neither the Brooklyn Dodgers nor the New York Giants have as yet nor will they receive any definite money. The rumblings today, both have made it plain that the old saying "Be it ever so humble, etc." is definitely passe.

O'MALLEY, long of the opinion that he and the Dodgers have been snubbed by city officials, sent a request for a new stadium, got around to doing some snubbing of his own yesterday. While New York Mayor Wagner discussed the problem with Manhattan and Brooklyn borough presidents, O'Malley made a snubbing of Wells Poulson, the dapper Los Angeles mayor.

Wagner had requested a chat with O'Malley, but was turned down.

"Tomorrow is a holiday," O'Malley told Wagner, "and I have a lot of things to clear up in my office,"

O'Malley, a heavy-rowed, cigar-smoking poker player, instead sat back calmly talking with Poulson, having a good laugh.

Wagner talked 90 minutes with his borough subordinates, then announced:

"We will seek immediate assurance from O'Malley that he intends to stay in Brooklyn. If he tells me he is not going to stay, I ask him to return to Los Angeles.

Wagner also made it clear that the "city does not permit itself to be black-jacketed into anything," in reference to the National League which gave the Dodgers and Giants permission to move their franchises to the west coast.

Now, I think the time has come to clearly express one's thoughts on this business. For years the Brooklyn Baseball Club has coined money for the few stockholders of its closely held stock. The owners never shared any of their profits with the fans. They took advantage of the Dodger fans at every turn over the years. They moved part of their schedule to Jersey City. They presently threaten to move in toto to Los Angeles. I say let them move to Los Angeles if the alternative is to succumb to an arrogant demand to spend the taxpayers' money to build a stadium for them in Brooklyn.

I am opposed to uprooting decent citizens living in my congressional district in the vicinity of the Long Island Railroad depot at Flatbush and Atlantic Avenues in order to put more money in the pockets of my dear friend Walter O'Malley, and the private pockets of the Brooklyn Baseball Club stockholders. I would rather have a loyal AA club or
even a loyal III team represent- ing Dodgertown.

Mr. O'Malley and his stock-
holders who have no civic pride for
Brooklyn, where they made their money,
moved to the west coast in quest of more
almighty dollars. And remember that
while taking big league baseball be-
ning covered by the antitrust laws Walter
and his big-league cronies portray them-
selves as great sportsmen, as elemen-
tary characters imbued with great civic
pride for their communities. The pres-
ent hassle over the Dodger franchise
move may come to have a great deal of
bearing on whether or not big-league
baseball should be exempt from our
monopoly laws.

On Thursday, May 23, 1957, the fol-
lowing article was published here in the
Washington Evening Star:

ONLY TWO SITES CONSIDERED FOR
DODGERS STADIUM

NEW YORK, May 23.—A special committee
appointed by Mayor Wagner to work with
the Brooklyn Sports Center Authority has an-
nounced that only two sites for a possi-
ble stadium for the Dodgers are under con-
deration.

Both sites have been suggested by various
city officials. But the committee said only
one site immediately north of the intersec-
tion of Atlantic and Flatbush Avenues in Brooklyn
and another almost directly opposite it on
Atlantic Avenue are being considered.

The committee announced yesterday that both the committee and the
sports authority have been given to un-
derstand either would be acceptable to the
Dodgers.

But it is not shocking to learn that we
have to tear down properties, move fam-
ilies, and spend taxpayers' money in a
manner "acceptable to the Dodgers?" I
repeat, leave the folks living in the vicin-
ity of the depot alone and stop all this
nonsense.

O'Malley will never truly transfer the
Brooklyn Dodgers to Los Angeles, for they
will not be the Brooklyn Dodgers once
they leave Brooklyn. They will be O'Mal-
ley's former Brooklyn Dodgers.

THE ROYAL NONSUCH OF LIFE
MAGAZINE—AN UNFAIR ATTACK
ON THE COTTON PROGRAM

Mr. FOAGE, 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOAGE, Mr. Speaker, the recent
editorial in Life magazine on King Cot-
ton is appropriately subtitled "The Royal
Nonsuch" for truly there is nonsuch
program as described. One should not
be too critical of the editor of Life on
account of his lack of understanding of
the cotton program, when less than 2
weeks ago the Secretary of Agriculture
himself, his Undersecretary, an Assistant
Secretary and their whole staff of stats-
ticians soberly insisted before the House
Committee on Agriculture that we picked
an average of 350 pounds of lint cotton in Texas in the year 1956. As
every cotton farmer knows, this pure
nonsuch and is just about twice what we actually produced, but they continued
not to make their figures stand by their figure even after I, as a
Texan, had disclaimed this brag. At
last it developed that they were quoting the figures on American-Egyptian cotton
which bears a direct relationship to
commercial cotton that buckwheat
bears to wheat and which for purposes of
the support and acreage control laws is
cotton at all. Clearly the Department
of Agriculture either does not know or
does not care much about cotton or cot-
ton producers.

As an illustration, the editorial refers
to the losses involved in last year's cotton
hay made as an example to support the
claim that the cotton program has only
delayed the producer's income.

This is so not to say that any support
price above the world market does not
tend to restrict our sale of cotton.
Everyone agrees that it does and that
the program is designed to let cotton
move at the world price and at the same
time to maintain farmer income at some reasonable
percentage of the world market.

Recently several other representatives
of cotton-growing areas have introduced
rather similar bills but neither Life mag-
naze nor the Secretary of Agriculture
nors at the Department of Agriculture
say they have any idea of improving the lot
of the cotton farmer, why have they not offered
some constructive suggestions rather
than to merely repeat the demand for
lower and even lower prices.

True, Secretary Benson has criticized
the wages of American workers, but as
far as I know, he is the only individual
in a responsible position who takes the
position that we can destroy the Ameri-
can wage scale and maintain our stand-
ard of living. Now the time to destroy the
income of our farmers and maintain
our standard of living. It is true that
American labor certainly cannot work
for the 10 to 20 cents an hour wage scale
of Japan, of Hong Kong, or of India. It
is equally true that American farmers
cannot produce cotton at prices which
might be acceptable in Egypt, in Pakis-
tan, and in Nigeria.

When the American wage scale was
threatened we passed maximum hour
laws. What is the basic difference be-
tween a 40-hour week work and a cotton
program that cuts the amount of cot-
ton the farmer can produce by 10 per-
cent? But we were careful when we
reduced the work week to keep the
weekly wage just as high as it we before
the cut in hours. We have cut the farmer's
total effective hours when we limited his plantings. With 90
percent of parity supports we figured we
would maintain his buying power
within 10 percent of what he had been
making before the Government limited his
plantings. But Mr. Benson wants to
reduce the farmer's weekly and annual
wage by reducing his support price.