

duces are enjoyed not only by thousands of Utah families but by their neighbors in many States.

Second, the Utah dairy industry has achieved standards of purity, flavor, and quality by which it makes an important contribution to the general excellence and the steady improvement of the dairy foods which nourish this Nation.

In recent years the grade A milk supplied the Provo, Salt Lake, Ogden, and Logan markets has consistently placed upon the honor roll of the United States Public Health Service. Right now the grade A milk supplied Salt Lake, Ogden, and Logan is on this honor roll, and the milk in the Provo market is in the process of being rated.

In the tabulations which the Public Health Service makes on the milk which interstate shippers produce and distribute, Utah's pasteurized milk has ranked, and today, ranks with the finest in the Nation.

In 1957, all 48 fluid milk processing plants in Utah achieved an honor roll rating by standards of the U.S. Public Health Service. At the time of that rating, Guy P. Stevens, supervisor of dairying for the agricultural department of the State of Utah, observed: "So far as we have been able to determine, Utah is the first State in the Union to complete ratings for all its fluid milk plants and their supplying farms." A score of 90 or better is necessary to achieve honor roll status.

Items considered in the rating include: Quality of milk received from the farms, and milk quality after processing; type of processing; sanitation on farms and in plants; type and condition of equipment used; processing records; and the quality of administration and enforcement being applied in each area.

At that time Mr. Stevens said further: "Utahans can be very proud of their milk supply. Our State's milk ranks with the Nation's finest and is in heavy demand both in and out of the State. While tests are based primarily on safety and sanitation, the flavor quality of our milk is outstanding. We found milk plants across the State spotlessly clean. These ratings are not only a tribute to our fluid milk processing plants, but also to Utah's dairy farms."

During Utah's June Dairy Month commemoration in 1959, George S. Bulkley, of Los Angeles, chairman, national June Dairy Month committee, visited Utah. Mr. Bulkley at this time was chairman of the board of directors of the National Dairy Council.

This statement was made by Mr. Bulkley during his visit: "America's dairymen are now milking only 77 percent as many cows as they were in 1944 when the cow population reached its peak. Yet, the fewer cows are producing a total milk output 7 percent greater than in 1944. In Utah, your average cow yields 17 percent more milk than the national average."

According to figures released by Welby W. Young, president of the American Dairy Association of Utah, there are now approximately 8,000 dairy farm families in Utah, with a total of 100,000 milking cows. These cows last year produced approximately 750 million pounds of milk. Approximately 60 percent of Utah's milk production last year was from grade A farms. In 1959, 20 percent of Utah's milk output went into the manufacture of cheese, and the balance of the State's milk production was made into high-score butter, cottage cheese, evaporated milk or dry milk powder, and ice cream.

Utah's cheese has become a growing favorite from coast to coast, and for some years has been served at the famed Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York City.

The State's evaporated milk is sent to broad markets in the Western States, and traditionally has been of superior quality.

Utah's ice cream and butter similarly have scored high in tests for flavor and texture.

While Utah's dairy products have won national acclaim, the State's dairy leaders have also been known for their progressiveness and for their major roles on the national dairy scene. Merrill N. Warnick of Pleasant Grove, Utah, served two terms as national president of the American Dairy Association, which represents approximately a million American dairy farmers.

In March 1959 Mr. Warnick was appointed by President Dwight D. Eisenhower to a 3-year term on the 18-man National Agricultural Advisory Commission.

Welby W. Young of Heber, Utah, currently president of the American Dairy Association of Utah, was recently named to the national board of directors of the National Dairy Council. He is also chairman of the important national research committee of the American Dairy Association.

Walter R. Holdaway of Provo is a member of the board of directors National Milk Producers Federation, and is also president of Federated Milk Producers Association, Utah's largest grade A dairy farmer association.

Utah's dairymen have been among the Nation's leaders in cooperative public relations and advertising. For approximately 10 years they have had an aggressive cooperative plan in Utah, in addition to giving full support to the national program of the American Dairy Association.

In conclusion, I would like to point out that the performance of the Utah dairy industry and its members reflects the best traditions of my State. The diligence, the perseverance, and the desire to excel which have been hallmarks of the Utah people since they carved their farms, homes, and industries from the mountain wilderness more than a century ago are demonstrated in the achievements and high standards of Utah's dairy industry.

### Retired Officers and Selling

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1960

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer this splendid news article by Jack Steele of the Scripps-Howard papers and an editorial which accompanied the story in the Washington News.

There is no necessity to comment on either piece, but I do take the occasion to say that I am quoted accurately and correctly by Mr. Steele and that I subscribe in the fullest to the editorial.

This is an issue the House will be given the opportunity of resolving next Wednesday when this bill is called to the floor for action.

Here is the article and editorial:

[From the Washington Daily News, Mar. 30, 1960]

HÉBERT WILL FIGHT HOUSE BILL ON MILITARY SELLING—WOULD ENCOURAGE INFLUENCE PEDDLING

(By Jack Steele)

Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT, Democrat, Louisiana, charged today that a proposed House bill would legalize and encourage influence peddling by retired military officers.

The measure denounced by HÉBERT has approval of the Armed Services Committee, but faces a fight on the House floor next Monday.

Representative HÉBERT heads the Armed Services Investigations Subcommittee which last year inquired into the role of retired officers in the munitions lobby and drafted a tough bill to curb their selling to the military services.

But Chairman CARL VINSON, Democrat, Georgia, and other committee members—apparently as a result of objections from the Pentagon and retired officers—insisted on watering down the bill before sending it to the House.

#### AMENDMENTS

Representative HÉBERT announced today that he will offer amendments Monday to restore criminal provisions to the bill so as to bar officers from selling anything to the Defense Department within 2 years after they retire.

His amendments would provide penalties of up to \$10,000 in fines and a year in jail both for retired officers who violated this 2-year ban and for defense contractors who hired them.

Representative HÉBERT pointed out that the committee-approved bill provides only one penalty for officers who take selling jobs with defense contractors within 2 years after they retire—temporarily loss of their retirement pay.

He said this loss of retirement pay would become, in effect, the fee that a retired officer would pay for the privilege of selling to the Defense Department for 2 years.

#### PROFITABLE

And he noted that many officers would find it profitable to give up a few thousand dollars of retirement pay temporarily to take \$25,000 to \$50,000 a year jobs with defense contractors.

"The committee-approved bill simply would not prohibit retired officers from selling their influence to these contractors," he said. "Instead, it would legalize, encourage, and promote such influence peddling.

"A high ranking officer, within 24 hours after he retired, could be right back in the Pentagon using his influence on behalf of a contractor. As long as he was willing to give up his retirement pay, the committee bill would not touch him."

Representative HÉBERT also noted that laws already on the books provide the same pay-loss penalties for retired Army and Air Force officers as the committee bill, and require the Navy to deprive its officers of retirement pay if they sell to the Navy anytime after they retire.

#### EX-OFFICERS AND INFLUENCE

When a House subcommittee headed by Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT, was investigating the "munitions lobby" last year, it turned up the names of 1,453 retired military officers who had taken jobs with the 100 biggest contractors doing business with the Pentagon.

On the other side of the Capitol, Senator DOUGLAS of Illinois revealed similar findings.

This year, as a result, Representative HÉBERT sponsored a bill to bar all military

officers from selling anything to the Pentagon within 2 years of their retirement. He put some teeth in the bill.

The Armed Services Committee, headed by Representative CARL VINSON, extracted the teeth and reported a bill Representative HEBERT says would curb none of these practices, but actually would "legalize and encourage" influence peddling by retired officers.

Representative HEBERT will try to get the fangs put back in his bill when it goes before the House next week. He will be up against a potent lobby. The Pentagon in general has opposed the bill, and the retired officers—although they also are drawing retirement pay from the taxpayers' till—naturally are against it. We hope the House agrees with Representative HEBERT.

Even the Vinson committee, in its report, concedes that influence can be "prejudicial to the free and unfettered decisions of the Government," although the bill it recommends does nothing to prevent it.

The Defense Department is planning to spend nearly 25 billion taxpayer dollars on procurement next year. If the zeal of contractors hungry for huge slices of this cake influences the decisions which lead to this vast spending, rather than the strict merits of the projects, the taxpayers are bound to take a licking. And the defense program to suffer in proportion.

House Members voting next week on the influence bill shouldn't be permitted to forget this.

### Funds for Jefferson National Expansion Memorial

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1960

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am submitting for inclusion in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD one of the best statements I have ever read on the importance and significance of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial being constructed jointly by the Federal Government and the city of St. Louis on our great riverfront park along the Mississippi River in the Third Congressional District of Missouri.

The statement I am referring to is an editorial which appeared Sunday in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch entitled "Gateway of the West."

It is most encouraging to know that the Senate in passing the Department of Interior appropriation bill for the coming fiscal year has agreed to provide the funds needed to maintain an effective rate of progress in construction of the memorial. Thanks to the efforts of our two Missouri Senators, the bill contains \$4,663,125. This is a substantial increase over the amount provided in the President's budget. It is an amount, however, which can be spent efficiently and which must be available for disbursement in the coming fiscal year if we are to have any chance at all of completing this project by the target date set by the Secretary of Interior and the Director of the National Park Service, as well as by the mayor of St. Louis, that is, by 1964 when the city observes the

200th anniversary of its beginning. I am very hopeful that the conferees from the House of Representatives on the appropriations bill will agree to the amount provided by the Senate.

I am sure if they read the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch they will see and recognize why this money is so important:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Mar. 27, 1960]

#### GATEWAY OF THE WEST

"We're going West tomorrow, where the promises can't fail.

O'er the hills in legions, boys, and crowd the dusty trail."

—Stephen Vincent Benet.

"Napoleon Bonaparte, like Milton's Satan on his throne, sat unapproachable in his bad eminence." So Henry Adams begins his characterization of the enemy who "had to be faced and overawed by the gentle optimism of President Jefferson." Talleyrand, "who never forgave himself for having once believed in a popular revolution," had persuaded Napoleon to "pacify Europe and turn the energies of France toward the creation of an empire in the New World and was the more sure of success because, in the reactionary spirit of the time, he commanded the sympathies of all Europe in checking the power of republicanism in its last refuge."

It seemed that "10,000 French soldiers, trained in the school of Hoche and Moreau, and commanded by a future marshal of France, might have occupied New Orleans and St. Louis before Jefferson could have collected a brigade of militia in Nashville." The Federalists blindly cried for a war against France—a war which probably would have reestablished French power along the whole length of the Mississippi, which might have brought about the secession of the territory between the Appalachians and the river, and which would have entrenched British and Spanish power on the young nation's flanks.

Americans, too, rarely recall how their country was almost confined to the Original Thirteen States—divided by slavery—on a continent under European control. The prudence, the vision, and the daring of Jefferson overcame this dark threat. Through the Louisiana Purchase he made possible the expansion of the United States from ocean to ocean as a world power. This work must stand in the first rank of American accomplishments. Surely the people, especially western people, will insist that it be commemorated by the national monument which has been started on the St. Louis riverfront.

The riverfront national park—to be dominated by a 619-foot stainless steel arch symbolic of the Gateway of the West—was suggested by a committee of St. Louis citizens appointed December 15, 1933, by Mayor Bernard F. Dickman and headed by the late Luther Ely Smith. Franklin D. Roosevelt responded with enthusiasm. On June 15, 1934, he signed a congressional joint resolution establishing the U.S. Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission to formulate plans for the monument. St. Louis was proud to join in financing it on the basis of \$1 for each \$3 of Federal money. On September 10, 1935, the voters approved a \$7,500,000 bond issue. And on December 21, 1935, the President made available \$6,750,000, matched by \$2,250,000 in city funds, for the acquisition of the 41-block site.

From the beginning this was a national project. Three Senators and three Members of the House of Representatives had to be among the nine members of the Memorial Commission. Title to the site was given to the Government. The development was put in charge of the National Park Service. St. Louis made its bargain with Washington because, after all, it was on the St. Louis river-

front that Capt. Amos Stoddard took over the Louisiana Territory from the French. Here was the starting point of Lewis and Clark, Pike, Ashley, Fremont and the "mountain men" who blazed trails to Oregon, to Santa Fe, and to California. And it was the jumping-off point for the settlers who went west in their mover wagons.

Enthusiasm was high a quarter of a century ago. The preliminary work was pushed along rapidly. By May 1942, all buildings had been cleared from the site and from the city's tax books. The beautiful old courthouse—in which Dred Scott started his suit for freedom—was added to the site by the city. The war, however, forced a halt until 1945 when St. Louis citizens raised \$225,000 for an architectural competition for the design of the memorial. The winner was the conception of Eero Saarinen which Aline B. Loucheim praised in the New York Times as "a noble, symbolic monument, fitting, beautiful, and impressive."

The arch and the other elements in the Saarinen design were approved by the Federal authorities on May 25, 1948. But the war's delay, the use of the area as a vast parking lot, and the reluctance of the railroads to relocate their riverfront tracks gave objectors in Congress and elsewhere their opportunity. President Truman did dedicate the site on June 10, 1950, but it was not until May 17, 1954, that Congress authorized construction. And it was not until 1956 that it voted \$2,640,000 for preliminary work. But slowly enthusiasm was rekindled, and the National Park Service set 1964, the bicentenary of St. Louis, as its target for completion of the arch.

With this assurance that the Government would keep its part of the bargain, public and private interests in St. Louis committed themselves to the enhancement of the areas adjacent to the national memorial. Almost 50 additional blocks are to be cleared. New approaches have been built. A new bridge across the Mississippi, a stadium and accommodations for visitors to the memorial have been given the green light. In all, St. Louis will expend far more in the neighborhood than it will cost the Government to finish the memorial. Yet now Washington again threatens to allow the work to come to a money-wasting halt. The administration's budget includes only \$1,650,000 for the project. A minimum of \$4,603,125—to be supplemented by \$1,534,375 in city funds—is needed to keep the work on schedule.

The St. Louis delegation in Congress is making a fight for this appropriation. This is not a grab for "pork." It is a request that the Government honor its pledge. And St. Louis, we trust, will have the support especially of all the Representatives in Congress of the trans-Mississippi West. The national park is a memorial to those who made the West a part of the Nation. It seems inconceivable that Congress—which has freely commemorated lesser men and lesser events—will not raise this monument to Jefferson and those others who laid the foundation of the grandeur and the power of the United States.

### Another Member of the Eisenhower Clean as a Hound's Tooth Club

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. MELVIN PRICE**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1960

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I