

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 1955 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 of the marked progress which it has 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 these 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 its route beyond 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.

#### HELLS 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 gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, due in great measure to the yeoman work of the distinguished senior Senator from my own State—Senator WAYNE MORSE—the American public is becoming in-

creasingly aware of the exact meaning of the term "fast tax writeoff" as applied to the Idaho Power Co.'s proposal for the inadequate development of the Snake River as a sham substitute for the high Hells Canyon Dam. We who have been fighting the battle for the proper development of Oregon's great natural resources have in recent weeks been highly criticized because of our estimate that this fast tax writeoff to 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 this 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 there 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 reconsider and to deny or substantially reduce the 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 1951 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 assistance results in an increased burden on other taxpayers; and

Whereas the benefits accruing to the company will not in turn ultimately accrue to the taxpayers either from 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. in connection with its dams in Hells Canyon; be it further

*Resolved,* That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to repeal the 1951 act which was passed as a national security measure and which is now outmoded and unnecessary; and be it further

*Resolved,* That copies of 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.

EDITH BYNON LOW,

Chief Clerk.

PAT DOOLEY,

Speaker of House.

BOYD R. OVERHULSE,

President of Senate.

#### O'MALLEY'S TAXPAYER-BUILT DODGER BALL PARK

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I have really reached the saturation point with regard to the nonsense 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 item on the front page of that day's Washington Evening Star:

MAYOR WAGNER GIVEN BRUSHOFF BY O'MALLEY

NEW YORK, May 30.—Neither the Brooklyn Dodgers nor the New York Giants have announced definite moves to the west coast as of today, but 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 in their 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 huddled with Norris 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 at my office."

O'Malley, a heavy-jowled, cigar-smoking poker player, instead sat back calmly talking with Poulson, holding a pat hand.

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 will ask him to reconsider."

Wagner also made it clear that "the city does not permit itself to be blackjacked into anything," in reference to the National League vote 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 profitmaking Brooklyn Baseball Club stockholders. I would rather have a loyal AA club or



even a loyal III league team representing Dodgertown.

Let Walter O'Malley and his stockholders who have no civic pride for Brooklyn, where they made their money, move to the west coast in quest of more almighty dollars. And remember that when we talk of big-league baseball being covered by the antitrust laws Walter and his big-league cronies portray themselves as great sportsmen, as eleemosynary characters imbued with great civic pride for their communities. The present 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 following article was published here in the Washington Evening Star:

**ONLY TWO SITES CONSIDERED FOR  
DODGER STADIUM**

NEW YORK, May 23.—A special committee appointed by Mayor Wagner to work with the Brooklyn Sports Center Authority has announced that only two sites for a possible stadium for the Dodgers are under consideration.

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

The committee announcement yesterday stated that both the committee and the sports authority have been given to understand either would be acceptable to the Dodgers.

Is it not sickening to learn that we have to tear down properties, move families, and spend taxpayers' money in a manner "acceptable to the Dodgers"? I repeat, leave the folks living in the vicinity 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'Malley's former Brooklyn Dodgers.

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

Mr. POAGE. 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. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the recent editorial in Life magazine on King Cotton is appropriately subtitled "The Royal Nonesuch" for truly there is nonesuch program as described. One should not be too critical of the editor of Life on account of his lack of understanding of the cotton problem, when less than 2 weeks ago the Secretary of Agriculture himself, his Undersecretary, an Assistant Secretary and their whole staff of statisticians soberly insisted before the House Committee on Agriculture that we picked an average per acre of 530 pounds of lint cotton in Texas in the year 1956. As

every cotton farmer knows, this is pure nonesuch and is just about twice what we actually produced, but they continued to 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 about the same relationship to commercial cotton that buckwheat bears to wheat and which for purposes of the support and acreage control laws is not cotton at all. Clearly the Department of Agriculture either does not know or does not care much about cotton or cotton producers. After reading the editorial, I doubt that Life magazine either knows or cares as much as the officials of the Department.

As an illustration, the editorial refers to the losses involved in last year's cotton export program, but it fails to mention the fact that for 20 years prior to 1953 the cotton loan program had been operated at a profit and had placed over a quarter of a billion dollars into the Treasury or that all of this has been dissipated and substantial losses have accrued since the present Secretary took over. Flexible supports have not decreased the Government's losses. They have only decreased the producer's income.

This is 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 18 months ago I introduced legislation designed to let cotton move at the world price and at the same time to maintain farmer income at some reasonable percentage of a fair living standard. Recently several other representatives of cotton-growing areas have introduced rather similar bills but neither Life magazine nor the Secretary of Agriculture has suggested any plan. All they seem to be able to think of is to reduce the price. Admitting that we must reduce the price, what do they propose to do about the farmer? So far, neither have proposed to do anything but to reduce him also. To move him to the city or to let him starve.

The similarity of the arguments in this editorial and those which have been coming out of the Department of Agriculture indicate that there may be more than mere coincidence to the present rash of criticism of the cotton program and of cottongrowers. Why do we hear no such criticism of the wheat program? Every bushel of wheat that leaves American shores carries at least an 80-cent subsidy. Why do we hear no similar criticism of the corn program? Of course, there is no effective production control of corn. On the contrary, last year the President authorized the support, in the commercial corn area, of noncompliance corn—corn grown in violation of acreage allotments—at the rate of \$1.25 a bushel. Farmers in this area who complied with their allotments got supports at \$1.50. In contrast, cotton planters who overplanted their allotments were penalized 50 percent of the support price of the overproduction. Corn farmers of the commercial area alone received 79 cents out of every dollar spent for the soil bank in 1956 and they still overplanted their allotment and were given support loans

for doing so. At the same time, there were 600 million bushels of corn and 800 million bushels of corn equivalent—other feed grains—grown outside the commercial corn area for which no comparable program was available. All cotton is subject to the same controls wherever it is grown.

Apparently, the first objective of the Department of Agriculture has been to set consumer and producer at odds. Instead of pointing out that the American housewife is able today to buy more and better food for fewer hours of her husband's labor than ever before, the Department and its partisan spokesmen have tried to emphasize that certain food products are still bringing reasonably high prices on the retail market. Very rarely, indeed, are we told that the that much of the retail price is the result of the increased and improved processing that the housewife demands. Very rarely indeed are we told that the percentage of the housewife's dollar which goes to the producer of food has steadily fallen from well over one-half to just over one-third. If there were not a deliberate desire on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture and of Life magazine to widen the breach between producer and consumer, why do they not give the public these facts?

If there is not a deliberate attempt to widen the breach, between groups of American farmers, why this concerted effort to make the cotton program look bad in the eyes of the public? If the Department or Life magazine had any real idea of improving the lot of the cotton farmer, why have they not offered some constructive suggestion 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 American wage scale and maintain our standard of living. No more can we 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 Pakistan, and in Nigeria.

When the American wage scale was threatened we passed maximum hour laws. What is the basic difference between a 40-hour work week and a cotton allotment that cuts the amount of cotton the farmer can produce by 30 percent? But we were careful when we reduced the work week to keep the weekly wage just as high as it was before the cut in hours. We have cut the farmer's total effective working 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 acres, but Mr. Benson now wants to reduce the farmer's weekly and annual wage by reducing his support price.