

It did not get through in the last session. But, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS] has pointed out, the conferees went back into session to undertake to work out a bill. Finally this agreement was reached. It provides for temporary judgeships in Utah and Nevada. I do not admit that they will become permanent. No one knows about that. But let me say this to the membership: Do you want to take the responsibility of jeopardizing this whole legislation after our representatives in the conference did all they could do and after the matter was passed on? Do you want to jeopardize the enactment of this legislation and the creation of these judgeships in places where they are so desperately needed, by recommitting this bill? I do not think so. For that reason I hope the motion to recommit will be voted down and the conference report adopted.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this conference report in its present form and shall vote to recommit, with instructions.

My opposition is based mainly on the fact that there is no need for these additional judges in the States of Utah and Nevada. However, I have a further objection. I believe that this action on the part of this Republican-controlled Congress is purely political. This bill, or one very similar to it, was reported out and came up for a vote on the floor of this House in the 82d Congress. Most of the Members who are now advocating its passage opposed it at that time for frankly political reasons. They felt that in the coming presidential election there was a possibility that a Republican President would be elected. In that event, appointments to the Federal judiciary would be made by the new Republican President.

The need for additional judges was just as great in 1952 as it is today; yet the Republican Party was willing to sacrifice necessity for expediency.

One further reason for my opposition is the fact that in New York City, particularly in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, the calendar of pending cases is over 4 years behind. The bill in 1952 called for an additional 5 judges, whereas this bill gives us only 2 additional judges. This, in the face of the fact that Utah and Nevada, which are up to date, receive an additional judge, is rank unfairness; and the only way in which this situation can be corrected is to recommit the bill and have the committee of conference agree to changes in it.

The SPEAKER. All the time has expired.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. LANE. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LANE moves to recommit conference report No. 1133 on S. 15 concerning the appointment of additional circuit and district judges to the committee on conference with the following instructions to the managers on the part of the House: To insist on disagreement to section 2 (a) (I) of S. 15 on page 2, lines 20 and 21, by striking out the words "One additional district judge in the district of Nevada", and also lines 4 and 5, on page 3, by striking out the words "One additional district judge for the district of Utah."

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] to recommit the conference report.

The question was taken; and, on a division (demanded by Mr. LANE) there were—ayes 43, noes 118.

Mr. LANE. 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.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty are present, a quorum.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. METCALF DESIGNATED TO READ WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the special order agreed to on February 2, 1954, the Chair designates the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] to read Washington's Farewell Address immediately following the reading of the Journal on February 22, 1954.

COINAGE OF 50-CENT PIECES TO COMMEMORATE THE SESQUICENTENNIAL OF THE LOUISIANA PURCHASE—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 319)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, H. R. 1917, "to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase."

The proposed legislation would authorize the coinage of not to exceed 2½ million silver 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the Louisiana Purchase.

The principal objection to commemorative coins is that they detract from the fundamental function of the coinage

as a medium of exchange. Multiplicity of designs on United States coins would tend to create confusion among the public, and to facilitate counterfeiting. The Congress recognized the necessity for limiting the designs of coins by section 3510 of the Revised Statutes which provides that "no change in the design or die of any coin shall be made oftener than once in 25 years from and including the year of the first adoption of the design, model, die, or hub for the same coin."

I am further advised by the Treasury Department that in the past in many instances the public interest in these special coins has been so short-lived that their sales for the purposes intended have lagged with the result that large quantities have remained unsold and have been returned to the mints for melting.

I fully recognize the importance to the country of the event which this coin would commemorate. I recognize, too, that the authorization of 1 or 2 or 3 of such issues of coins would not do major harm. However, experience has demonstrated that the authorization of even a single commemorative issue brings forth a flood of other authorizations to commemorate events or anniversaries of local or national importance. In the administration of President Hoover, these authorizations multiplied to the point where he felt compelled to exercise his veto. The same pattern recurred in the administrations of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman. In view of this historical pattern, which by now has become so clear, I think that it is both wiser and fairer to make known my views on this subject at the outset. I therefore regretfully withhold my approval of H. R. 1917.

As has been suggested in the past, it seems to me wholly appropriate that anniversaries like this one, which the Congress deems it desirable to commemorate, should be recognized by bills authorizing the Treasury to provide suitable commemorative medals at cost.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 3, 1954.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill and message be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

AUTHORIZING HELP TO CONTROL THE LEVEL OF LAKE MICHIGAN

Mr. DONDERO. 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. 3300) to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway.

The motion was agreed to.