

with respect to countries benefiting and United Nations participating countries, is something like 20 percent. I desired to have this statement appear, because the situation is not as though we were paying the whole cost. The countries which are benefiting also contribute to a great extent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Wisconsin have been strong supporters of the bill. I join with them in the expressions which they have just made.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a brief statement I have prepared with reference to the United Nations Children's Fund. I am hopeful that no effort at all will be made to limit or to reduce the amount of \$13,500,000. I am certain that no effort will be made to do that, because to me this program is a wonderful expression of the really compassionate desire and attitude of the American people toward the underprivileged people throughout the world.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON THE UNITED NATIONS  
CHILDREN'S FUND

At this time I should like to call the attention of the Members to one of the small but very important parts of the mutual-security program, the United Nations Children's Fund. The children's fund has been one of the few outstanding examples of effective cooperation for constructive purposes among the 55 nations participating. It has demonstrated in a practical way that the whole world can see that the technical knowledge and resources of all the contributing countries can be put to work to solve the problems of disease and malnutrition that still plague vast areas of the world and millions of its peoples. Through the leadership of the children's fund, the governments of the underdeveloped areas are learning to help their own people; they are being taught to help themselves to eradicate yaws, the crippling tropical ulcers that debilitate and even maim its child victims, to control tuberculosis, to destroy the malaria-carrying mosquito. In short, these are projects of permanent improvement and development which the country benefited can continue indefinitely long after the external aid from UNICEF has ended.

We know that strong, healthy people who see the promise of a brighter future for themselves through these tangible evidences of goodwill from the free nations will not fall prey to deceptive doctrines preached to them from Communist sources. UNICEF has offered such hope already to 60 million children and their parents. It is my hope that this great work, where so much good is being done with comparatively small cost, will go on at its present level of achievement. I hope that nothing will be done by this Government to dim the hopes of the peoples in those countries where UNICEF projects are already underway, or approved for early initiation.

I urge that the full \$13,500,000 as requested by the President be approved by the Senate, and that this contribution to the Children's Fund be made without drastic administrative restrictions.

The American people believe in this work. They have expressed their wish to see it encouraged and continued without any crippling restrictions. Among the important national organizations, representing many million members, supporting the full unre-

stricted appropriation for the Children's Fund are the National Congress of Parents and Teachers; the General Federation of Women's Clubs; American Association of Social Workers; American Parents Committee; Association for Childhood Education International; Child Study Association of America; Child Welfare League of America, Inc.; Friends Committee on National Legislation; Methodist Church, Women's division of Christian Service of the Board of Missions; National Board of Young Women's Christian Association; National Council of Jewish Women; United Church Women; and Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

CONVENTION WITH REPUBLIC OF  
GERMANY FOR AVOIDANCE OF  
DOUBLE TAXATION WITH RE-  
SPECT TO TAXES ON INCOME—  
REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF  
SECRECY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate Executive J, 83d Congress, 2d session, a convention between the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to taxes on income, signed in the English and German languages at Washington on July 22, 1954.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the convention, and that the President's message and the convention be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed, and the convention, together with the President's message will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the President's message will be printed in the RECORD.

The message of the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the convention between the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to taxes on income, signed in the English and German languages at Washington on July 22, 1954.

I also transmit for the information of the Senate the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the convention. The convention has the approval of the Department of State and the Department of the Treasury.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 29, 1954.

(Enclosures: 1. Report by the Secretary of State. 2. Income tax convention between the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany.)

RECESS TO 9 O'CLOCK A. M.  
TOMORROW

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate

stand in recess until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, July 30, 1954, at 9 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate July 29 (legislative day of July 2), 1954:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Theodore E. Munson, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for division No. 1, district of Alaska, vice Patrick J. Gilmore, resigned.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate July 29 (legislative day of July 2), 1954.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Lawrence Quincy Mumford, of Ohio, to be Librarian of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 29, 1954

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

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

Almighty God, we are again turning unto Thee in the sacred attitude of prayer, compelled by needs which Thou above canst supply and constrained by a love that is far beyond all our human understanding.

Inspire us now with a stronger conviction of the power of spiritual ideals and principles as we struggle against the forces of evil which are seeking to conquer and enslave the world.

Grant that in our longings and labors for peace on earth and good will among men we may never feel that we are following a forlorn hope or a vague impossibility.

May we daily be strengthened and sustained by a clear vision of the triumph of reason and righteousness and the assurance that Thou art able to do for us exceeding abundantly above all we can ask or think.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Ast, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 102. Concurrent resolution to make corrections in the enrollment of H. R. 7839.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3137. An act to make the provisions of the act of August 28, 1937, relating to the

conservation of water resources in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States, applicable to the entire United States, and to increase and revise the limitation on aid available under the provisions of the said act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 9757) entitled "An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes," 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. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, and Mr. ANDERSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7839) entitled "An act to aid in the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, and the conservation and development of urban communities."

#### INCREASE BORROWING POWER OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question of the passage of the bill (H. R. 9756) to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The question was taken and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors; the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 317, nays 57, not voting 58, as follows:

[Roll No. 125]  
YEAS—317

Abbutt	Bolton	Colmer
Abernethy	Oliver P.	Condon
Adair	Bonin	Cooley
Albert	Bonner	Coon
Alexander	Bow	Cooper
Allen, Calif.	Bowler	Corbett
Allen, Ill.	Boykin	Crosser
Andersen,	Bramblett	Crumpacker
H. Carl	Bray	Cunningham
Andersen,	Brooks, Tex.	Curtis, Mass.
August H.	Brown, Ga.	Curtis, Mo.
Andrews	Brown, Ohio	Dague
Arends	Brownson	Davis, Ga.
Ashmore	Broyhill	Davis, Wis.
Aspinall	Buchanan	Dawson, Utah
Auchincloss	Budge	Deane
Ayres	Burdick	Dempsey
Bailey	Burleson	Devereux
Baker	Bush	D'Ewart
Barden	Byrnes, Wis.	Dies
Battle	Campbell	Dodd
Beamer	Cannon	Dolliver
Belcher	Carlyle	Dondero
Bender	Carnahan	Dorn, S. C.
Bennett, Fla.	Carrigg	Dowdy
Bentley	Cederberg	Doyle
Berry	Chelf	Durham
Betts	Chenoweth	Edmondson
Bishop	Chiperfield	Elliot
Boggs	Church	Ellsworth
Bolling	Clevenger	Engle
Bolton	Cole, Mo.	Fenton
Frances P.	Cole, N. Y.	Fernandez

Fisher	Lovre	Rogers, Colo.
Ford	McCarthy	Rogers, Fla.
Forrester	McConnell	Rogers, Mass.
Fountain	McCormack	Rogers, Tex.
Frazier	McCulloch	Sadlak
Frelinghuysen	McDonough	St. George
Gathings	McGregor	Saylor
Gentry	McIntire	Schenck
George	McMillan	Scudder
Golden	McVey	Seely-Brown
Goodwin	Mack, Ill.	Selden
Gordon	Mack, Wash.	Shafer
Graham	Madden	Shelley
Grant	Magnuson	Sheppard
Gregory	Mahon	Shuford
Gross	Marshall	Sieminski
Gubser	Martin, Iowa	Sikes
Hagen, Calif.	Matthews	Simpson, Ill.
Hagen, Minn.	Meador	Simpson, Pa.
Hale	Merrill	Small
Haley	Merrow	Smith, Kans.
Halleck	Metcalf	Smith, Miss.
Hand	Miller, Calif.	Smith, Va.
Harden	Miller, Kans.	Smith, Wis.
Hardy	Miller, Md.	Spence
Harrison, Va.	Miller, Nebr.	Springer
Harvey	Mills	Staggers
Hays, Ark.	Mollohan	Stauffer
Hays, Ohio	Moss	Steed
Herlong	Moulder	Stringfellow
Hiestand	Mumma	Sullivan
Hill	Natcher	Taber
Hillelson	Neal	Talle
Hillings	Nelson	Taylor
Hinshaw	Norblad	Teague
Hoffman, Ill.	Norrell	Thomas
Hollfield	Oakman	Thompson, La.
Holmes	O'Brien, Ill.	Thompson, Mich.
Holt	O'Brien, N. Y.	Thompson, Tex.
Hope	O'Hara, Ill.	Thornberry
Horan	O'Hara, Minn.	Tollefson
Hosmer	Ostertag	Trimble
Hruska	Passman	Tuck
Hunter	Patman	Utt
Hyde	Patterson	Van Pelt
Ikard	Pelly	Van Zandt
Jackson	Pfost	Veide
James	Phillips	Vorys
Jarman	Pilcher	Vursell
Jenkins	Pillion	Wainwright
Johnson, Calif.	Poage	Walter
Johnson, Wis.	Poff	Wampler
Jonas, Ill.	Polk	Watts
Jonas, N. C.	Preston	Westland
Jones, Ala.	Price	Wharton
Jones, Mo.	Prouty	Whitten
Jones, N. C.	Rabaut	Wickersham
Judd	Radwan	Widnall
Karsten, Mo.	Rains	Wier
Kearney	Ray	Williams, Miss.
Kee	Rayburn	Williams, N. Y.
Kelley, Pa.	Reams	Wilson, Calif.
Kersten, Wis.	Reece, Tenn.	Wilson, Ind.
Kilday	Reed, Ill.	Wilson, Tex.
King, Calif.	Reed, N. Y.	Winstead
Kirwan	Rees, Kans.	Withrow
Kluczynski	Rhodes, Ariz.	Wolcott
Knox	Rhodes, Pa.	Wolverton
Krueger	Richards	Yorty
Laird	Riehlman	Young
Landrum	Riley	Younger
Lanham	Rivers	Zablocki
LeCompte	Roberts	
Lesinski	Robeson, Va.	
Lipscomb	Robison, Ky.	

NAYS—57

Addonizio	Fine	Kelly, N. Y.
Bates	Pino	Keogh
Becker	Fogarty	King, Pa.
Boland	Forand	Klein
Bosch	Friedel	Latham
Busbey	Fulton	Mason
Byrd	Gamble	Miller, N. Y.
Byrne, Pa.	Garmatz	Morano
Canfield	Gary	Multer
Celler	Gavin	Nicholson
Chudoff	Granahan	O'Neill
Delaney	Green	Osmer
Derounian	Heseltun	Philbin
Dollinger	Hess	Rodino
Donohue	Hoffman, Mich.	Rooney
Donovan	Holtzman	Scherer
Dorn, N. Y.	Javits	Scott
Eberhart	Kean	Sheehan
Fallon	Keating	Yates

NOT VOTING—58

Angell	Cotton	Gwinn
Barrett	Coudert	Harris
Bennett, Mich.	Cretella	Harrison, Nebr.
Bentsen	Curtis, Nebr.	Harrison, Wyo.
Blatnik	Davis, Tenn.	Hart
Brooks, La.	Dawson, Ill.	Hébert
Buckley	Dingell	Hoeven
Chatham	Evins	Howell
Clardy	Feighan	Jensen

Kearns	Murray	Short
Kilburn	O'Brien, Mich.	Sutton
Lane	O'Konski	Vinson
Lantaff	Patten	Warburton
Long	Perkins	Weichel
Lucas	Powell	Wheeler
Lyle	Priest	Wigglesworth
Machrowicz	Regan	Williams, N. J.
Mailliard	Roosevelt	Willis
Morgan	Scrivner	
Morrison	Secrest	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hoeven with Mr. Chatham.  
Mr. Short with Mr. Brooks of Louisiana.  
Mr. Wigglesworth with Mr. Hébert.  
Mr. Kilburn with Mr. Morrison.  
Mr. Clardy with Mr. Roosevelt.  
Mr. Angell with Mr. Vinson.  
Mr. Mailliard with Mr. Willis.  
Mr. Curtis of Nebraska with Mr. Lane.  
Mr. Harrison of Nebraska with Mr. Barrett.  
Mr. Cotton with Mr. Long.  
Mr. Bennett of Michigan with Mr. Evins.  
Mr. Kearns with Mr. Dingell.  
Mr. O'Konski with Mr. Powell.  
Mr. Gwinn with Mr. Buckley.  
Mr. Cretella with Mr. Machrowicz.  
Mr. Weichel with Mr. Williams of New Jersey.

Mr. Jensen with Mr. Priest.  
Mr. Scrivner with Mr. O'Brien of Michigan.  
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Lantaff.  
Mr. Harrison of Wyoming with Mr. Feighan.

Mr. Warburton with Mr. Perkins.

Mr. DORN of New York changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BOSCH changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GAVIN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. FALLON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. EBERHARTER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

#### ADJOURNMENT DATE OF CONGRESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 265) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring therein), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Saturday, July 31, 1954, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.*

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 183, nays 193, not voting 56, as follows:

[Roll No. 126]  
YEAS—183

Abbutt	Arends	Barden
Adair	Auchincloss	Bates
Allen, Calif.	Ayres	Beamer
Allen, Ill.	Baker	Becker



Belcher  
Bender  
Bentley  
Berry  
Betts  
Bishop  
Bolton,  
    Frances P.  
Bonin  
Bonner  
Bosch  
Bow  
Boykin  
Bramblett  
Brown, Ohio  
Brownson  
Broyhill  
Budge  
Bush  
Byrnes, Wis.  
Canfield  
Carraig  
Chenoweth  
Chipfield  
Church  
Clevenger  
Cole, N. Y.  
Colmer  
Cooley  
Coon  
Crumpacker  
Cunningham  
Curtis, Mass.  
Curtis, Mo.  
Dague  
Davis, Wis.  
Derounian  
Devereux  
D'Ewart  
Dies  
Dolliver  
Dondero  
Durham  
Ellsworth  
Fenton  
Fisher  
Ford  
Frelinghuysen  
Gamble  
Gavin  
Gentry  
George  
Golden  
Goodwin  
Graham  
Gubser  
Gwinn  
Hale

Halleck  
Hand  
Harden  
Harvey  
Hess  
Hiestand  
Hill  
Hillelson  
Hillings  
Hinshaw  
Hoffman, Ill.  
Hoffman, Mich.  
Holmes  
Holt  
Horan  
Hosmer  
Hruska  
Hunter  
Hyde  
Jackson  
James  
Jenkins  
Johnson, Calif.  
Jonas, N. C.  
Jonas, N. C.  
Kean  
Kearney  
Kersten, Wis.  
King, Pa.  
Knox  
Krueger  
Laird  
Latham  
LeCompte  
Lipscomb  
Lovre  
McConnell  
McCulloch  
McDonough  
McGregor  
McIntire  
McVey  
Mack, Wash.  
Martin, Iowa  
Meador  
Merrill  
Morrow  
Miller, Md.  
Miller, Nebr.  
Miller, N. Y.  
Mumma  
Neal  
Nelson  
Nicholson  
Norblad  
Oakman  
O'Konski  
Osmer

Patterson  
Pelly  
Phillips  
Pillion  
Poage  
Poff  
Preston  
Prouty  
Radwan  
Ray  
Reams  
Reece, Tenn.  
Reed, Ill.  
Reed, N. Y.  
Rees, Kans.  
Rhodes, Ariz.  
Riehlman  
Rivers  
Robeson, Va.  
Robson, Ky.  
Rogers, Colo.  
Rogers, Fla.  
St. George  
Scherer  
Scudder  
Shafer  
Sheehan  
Shuford  
Simpson, Pa.  
Small  
Smith, Kans.  
Smith, Va.  
Smith, Wis.  
Springer  
Stauffer  
Taber  
Talle  
Taylor  
Thompson, Mich.  
Tollefson  
Tuck  
Utt  
Van Pelt  
Velde  
Vorys  
Wampler  
Westland  
Wharton  
Whitall  
Williams, N. Y.  
Wilson, Calif.  
Wilson, Ind.  
Wilson, Tex.  
Wolcott  
Young  
Younger

## NAYS—193

Abernethy  
Addonizio  
Albert  
Alexander  
Andersen,  
    H. Carl  
Andresen,  
    August H.  
Andrews  
Ashmore  
Aspinall  
Bailey  
Battle  
Bennett, Fla.  
Biatnik  
Boggs  
Boland  
Bolling  
Bowler  
Bray  
Brooks, Tex.  
Brown, Ga.  
Buchanan  
Burdick  
Burleson  
Byrd  
Byrne, Pa.  
Campbell  
Cannon  
Carlyle  
Carnahan  
Celler  
Chelf  
Chudoff  
Cole, Mo.  
Condon  
Cooper  
Corbett  
Crosser  
Davis, Ga.  
Dawson, Ill.  
Dawson, Utah  
Deane  
Delaney

Dempsey  
Dodd  
Dollinger  
Donohue  
Donovan  
Dorn, N. Y.  
Dorn, S. C.  
Dowdy  
Doyle  
Eberharter  
Edmondson  
Elliott  
Engle  
Fallon  
Feighan  
Fernandez  
Fine  
Fino  
Fogarty  
Forand  
Forrester  
Fountain  
Frazier  
Friedel  
Fulton  
Garmatz  
Gary  
Gathings  
Gordon  
Granahan  
Grant  
Green  
Gregory  
Gross  
Hagen, Calif.  
Hagen, Minn.  
Haley  
Hardy  
Harrison, Va.  
Hart  
Hays, Ark.  
Hays, Ohio  
Herlong  
Heseltan

Holifield  
Holtzman  
Hope  
Howell  
Ikard  
Jarman  
Javits  
Johnson, Wis.  
Jonas, Ill.  
Jones, Ala.  
Jones, Mo.  
Judd  
Karsten, Mo.  
Keating  
Kee  
Kelley, Pa.  
Kelly, N. Y.  
Kilday  
King, Calif.  
Kirwan  
Klein  
Kluczynski  
Landrum  
Lanham  
Lantaff  
Lesinski  
McCarthy  
McCormack  
McMillan  
Mack, Ill.  
Madden  
Magnuson  
Mahon  
Marshall  
Matthews  
Metcalfe  
Miller, Calif.  
Miller, Kans.  
Mills  
Mollohan  
Morano  
Moss  
Multer  
Natcher

Norrell  
O'Brien, Ill.  
O'Brien, N. Y.  
O'Hara, Ill.  
O'Hara, Minn.  
O'Neill  
Ostertag  
Passman  
Patman  
Patten  
Pfost  
Philbin  
Pilcher  
Polk  
Price  
Rabaut  
Rains  
Rhodes, Pa.  
Richards  
Riley  
Roberts

Rodino  
Rogers, Mass.  
Rogers, Tex.  
Rooney  
Sadlak  
Saylor  
Schenck  
Scott  
Seely-Brown  
Selden  
Shelley  
Sheppard  
Sieminski  
Sikes  
Simpson, Ill.  
Smith, Miss.  
Spence  
Staggers  
Steed  
Stringfellow  
Sullivan

Teague  
Thomas  
Thompson, Tex.  
Thornberry  
Trimble  
Van Zandt  
Vursell  
Wainwright  
Walter  
Watts  
Whitten  
Wickersham  
Wier  
Williams, Miss.  
Williams, N. J.  
Winstead  
Withrow  
Wolverton  
Yates  
Yorty  
Zablocki

## NOT VOTING—56

Angell  
Barrett  
Bennett, Mich.  
Bentsen  
Bolton,  
    Oliver P.  
Brooks, La.  
Buckley  
Busbey  
Cederberg  
Chatham  
Clardy  
Cotton  
Coudert  
Cretella  
Curtis, Nebr.  
Davis, Tenn.  
Dingell  
Evins

Harris  
Harrison, Nebr.  
Harrison, Wyo.  
Hébert  
Hoeven  
Jensen  
Kearns  
Keogh  
Kilburn  
Lane  
Long  
Lucas  
Lyle  
Machrowicz  
Maillard  
Mason  
Morgan  
Morrison  
Moulder

Murray  
O'Brien, Mich.  
Perkins  
Powell  
Priest  
Rayburn  
Regan  
Roosevelt  
Scrivner  
Secrest  
Short  
Sutton  
Thompson, La.  
Vinson  
Warburton  
Weichel  
Wheeler  
Wigglesworth  
Willis

So the concurrent resolution was rejected.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

MESSRS. JUDD, DAWSON of Utah, BOGGS, SHEPPARD, JONAS of Illinois, FINO, DORN of New York, MORANO, BRAY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## CORRECTIONS IN ENROLLMENT OF HOUSING ACT

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 102) making corrections in the enrollment of H. R. 7839.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 7839) entitled "An act to aid in the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, and the conservation and development of urban communities," the Clerk of the House is authorized and directed to make the following corrections:*

In the third sentence of section 221 (g) (3) of the National Housing Act, as added to that act by section 123 of the bill, insert the words "is assigned to the Commissioner," the clause "shall mature 10 years after such date."

In section 100 of the Housing Act of 1949, as added to that act by section 301 of the bill, substitute "sections 102 and 103" for "sections 103 and 104."

In section 613 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as added to that act by section 805 (3) of the bill, insert after the words "San Diego County" the words "or Imperial County."

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a brief summary review of the Housing Act of 1954, H. R. 7839.

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

There was no objection.

## DISCHARGE RULE

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, the inquiry is with reference to paragraph 908 of the rules of the House relative to a motion to discharge a committee. My question is, Is it possible during the last 6 days of the session after a motion to recess or adjourn sine die has been adopted by both Houses, to call up the bill H. R. 9245, the postal-pay bill, under the rules of the House?

The SPEAKER. In response to the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman, the Chair invites attention to the second paragraph of clause 4 of rule XXVII, which contains the following statement:

On the second and fourth Mondays of each month, except during the last 6 days of any session of Congress, immediately after the approval of the Journal, any Member who has signed a motion to discharge which has been on the calendar at least 7 days prior thereto, and seeks recognition, shall be recognized for the purpose of calling it up.

It seems perfectly clear to the Chair that the meaning of the rule is that when a motion has been on the calendar 7 legislative days a Member who signed the motion can call it up on the second or the fourth Monday, except when the second or fourth Monday comes during the last 6 days of a session. The exception then means that during the last 6 days of a session the motion cannot be called up at all.

## SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

## AMENDING MINERAL LEASING LAWS

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 3344) to amend the mineral leasing laws to provide for multiple mineral development of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.  
The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2552)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3344) to amend the mineral leasing laws to provide for multiple mineral development of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language of the House amendment insert the following: "That, (a) subject to the conditions and provisions of this Act and to any valid intervening rights acquired under the laws of the United States, any mining claim located under the mining laws of the United States subsequent to July 31, 1939, and prior to February 10, 1954, on lands of the United States, which at the time of location were—

"(1) included in a permit or lease issued under the mineral leasing laws; or

"(2) covered by an application or offer for a permit or lease which had been filed under the mineral leasing laws; or

"(3) known to be valuable for minerals subject to disposition under the mineral leasing laws,

shall be effective to the same extent in all respects as if such lands at the time of location, and at all times thereafter, had not been so included or covered or known: *Provided, however*, That, in order to be entitled to the benefits of this Act, the owner of any such mining claim located prior to January 1, 1953, must have posted and filed for record, within the time allowed by the provisions of the Act of August 12, 1953 (67 Stat. 539), an amended notice of location as to such mining claim, stating that such notice was filed pursuant to the provisions of said Act of August 12, 1953, and for the purpose of obtaining the benefits thereof: *And provided further*, That in order to obtain the benefits of this Act, the owner of any such mining claim located subsequent to December 31, 1952, and prior to February 10, 1954, not later than one hundred and twenty days after the date of enactment of this Act, must post on such claim in the manner required for posting notice of location of mining claims and file for record in the office where the notice or certificate of location of such claim is of record an amended notice of location for such claim, stating that such notice is filed pursuant to the provisions of this Act and for the purpose of obtaining the benefits thereof and, within said one hundred and twenty day period, if such owner shall have filed a uranium lease application as to the tract covered by such mining claim, must file with the Atomic Energy Commission a withdrawal of such uranium lease application or, if a uranium lease shall have issued pursuant thereto, a release of such lease, and must record a notice of the filing of such withdrawal or release in the county office wherein such notice or certificate of location shall have been filed for record.

"(b) Labor performed or improvements made after the original location of and upon or for the benefit of any mining claim which shall be entitled to the benefits of this Act

under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section 1, shall be recognized as applicable to such mining claim for all purposes to the same extent as if the validity of such mining claim were in no respect dependent upon the provisions of this Act.

"(c) As to any land covered by any mining claim which is entitled to the benefits of this Act under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section 1, any withdrawal or reservation of lands made after the original location of such mining claim is hereby modified and amended so that the effect thereof upon such mining claim shall be the same as if such mining claim had been located upon lands of the United States which, subsequent to July 31, 1939, and prior to the date of such withdrawal or reservation, were subject to location under the mining laws of the United States.

"Sec. 2. (a) If any mining claim which shall have been located subsequent to December 31, 1952, and prior to December 11, 1953, and which shall be entitled to the benefits of this Act, shall cover any lands embraced within any mining claim which shall have been located prior to January 1, 1953, and which shall be entitled to the benefits of this Act, then as to such area of conflict said mining claim so located subsequent to December 31, 1952, shall be deemed to have been located December 11, 1953.

"(b) If any mining claim hereafter located shall cover any lands embraced within any mining claim which shall have been located prior to February 10, 1954, and which shall be entitled to the benefits of this Act, then as to such area of conflict said mining claim hereafter located shall be deemed to have been located one hundred and twenty-one days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

"Sec. 3. (a) Subject to the conditions and provisions of this Act and to any valid prior rights acquired under the laws of the United States, the owner of any pending uranium lease application or of any uranium lease shall have, for a period of one hundred and twenty days after the date of enactment of this Act, as limited in subsection (b) of this section 3, the right to locate mining claims upon the lands covered by said application or lease.

"(b) Any rights under any such mining claim so hereafter located pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section 3 shall be subject to any rights of the owner of any mining claim which was located prior to February 10, 1954, and which was valid at the date of the enactment of this Act or which may acquire validity under the provisions of this Act. As to any lands covered by a uranium lease and also by a pending uranium lease application, the right of mining location under this section 3, as between the owner of said lease and the owner of said application, shall be deemed as to such conflict area to be vested in the owner of said lease. As to any lands embraced in more than one such pending uranium lease application, such right of mining location, as between the owners of such conflicting applications, shall be deemed to be vested in the owner of the prior application. Priority of such an application shall be determined by the time of posting on a tract then available for such leasing of a notice of lease application in accordance with paragraph (c) of the Atomic Energy Commission's Domestic Uranium Program Circular 7 (10 C. F. R. 60.7 (c)) provided there shall have been timely compliance with the other provisions of said paragraph (c) or, if there shall not have been such timely compliance, then by the time of the filing of the uranium lease application with the Atomic Energy Commission. Any rights under any mining claim located under the

provisions of this section 3 shall terminate at the expiration of thirty days after the filing for record of the notice or certificate of location of such mining claim unless, within said thirty-day period, the owner of the uranium lease application or uranium lease upon which the location of such mining claim was predicated shall have filed with the Atomic Energy Commission a withdrawal of said application or a release of said lease and shall have recorded a notice of the filing of such withdrawal or release in the county office wherein such notice or certificate of location shall be of record.

"(c) Except as otherwise provided in subsections (a) and (b) of this section 3, no mining claim hereafter located shall be valid as to any lands which at the time of such location were covered by a uranium lease application or a uranium lease. Any tract upon which a notice of lease application has been posted in accordance with said paragraph (c) of said Circular 7 shall be deemed to have been included in a uranium lease application from and after the time of the posting of such notice of lease application: *Provided*, That there shall have been timely compliance with the other provisions of said paragraph (c) or, if there shall not have been such timely compliance, then from and after the time of the filing of a uranium lease application with the Atomic Energy Commission.

#### "Sec. 4. Every mining claim or millsite—

"(1) heretofore located under the mining laws of the United States which shall be entitled to benefits under the first three sections of this Act; or

"(2) located under the mining laws of the United States after the effective date of passage of this Act,

shall be subject, prior to issuance of a patent therefor, to a reservation to the United States of all Leasing Act minerals and of the right (as limited in section 6 hereof) of the United States, its lessees, permittees, and licensees to enter upon the land covered by such mining claim or millsite and to prospect for, drill for, mine, treat, store, transport, and remove Leasing Act minerals and to use so much of the surface and subsurface of such mining claim or millsite as may be necessary for such purposes, and whenever reasonably necessary, for the purpose of prospecting for, drilling for, mining, treating, storing, transporting, and removing Leasing Act minerals on and from other lands; and any patent issued for any such mining claim or millsite shall contain such reservation as to, but only as to, such lands covered thereby which at the time of the issuance of such patent were—

"(a) included in a permit or lease issued under the mineral leasing laws; or

"(b) covered by an application or offer for a permit or lease filed under the mineral leasing laws; or

"(c) known to be valuable for minerals subject to disposition under the mineral leasing laws.

"Sec. 5. Subject to the conditions and provisions of this Act, mining claims and millsites may hereafter be located under the mining laws of the United States on lands of the United States which at the time of location are—

"(a) included in a permit or lease issued under the mineral leasing laws; or

"(b) covered by an application or offer for a permit, or lease filed under the mineral leasing laws; or

"(c) known to be valuable for minerals subject to disposition under the mineral leasing laws;

to the same extent in all respects as if such lands were not so included or covered or known.



"Sec. 6. (a) Where the same lands are being utilized for mining operations and Leasing Act operations, each of such operations shall be conducted, so far as reasonably practicable, in a manner compatible with such multiple use.

"(b) Any mining operations pursuant to rights under any unpatented or patented mining claim or millsite which shall be subject to a reservation to the United States of Leasing Act minerals as provided in this Act, shall be conducted, so far as reasonably practicable, in a manner which will avoid damage to any known deposit of any Leasing Act mineral. Subject to the provisions of subsection (d) of this section 6, mining operations shall be so conducted as not to endanger or materially interfere with any existing surface or underground improvements, workings, or facilities which may have been made for the purpose of Leasing Act operations, or with the utilization of such improvements, workings, or facilities.

"(c) Any Leasing Act operations on lands covered by an unpatented or patented mining claim or millsite which shall be subject to a reservation to the United States of Leasing Act minerals as provided in this Act shall be conducted, so far as reasonably practicable, in a manner which will avoid damage to any known deposit of any mineral not so reserved from such mining claim or millsite. Subject to the provisions of subsection (d) of this section 6, Leasing Act operations shall be so conducted as not to endanger or materially interfere with any existing surface or underground improvements, workings, or facilities which may have been made for the purpose of mining operations, or with the utilization of such improvements, workings, or facilities.

"(d) If, upon petition of either the mining operator or the Leasing Act operator, any court of competent jurisdiction shall find that a particular use in connection with one of such operations cannot be reasonably and properly conducted without endangering or materially interfering with the then existing improvements, workings, or facilities of the other of such operations or with the utilization thereof, and shall find that under the conditions and circumstances, as they then appear, the injury or damage which would result from denial of such particular use would outweigh the injury or damage which would result to such then existing improvements, workings, or facilities or from interference with the utilization thereof if that particular use were allowed, then and in such event such court may permit such use upon payment (or upon furnishing of security determined by the court to be adequate to secure payment) to the party or parties who would be thus injured or damaged, of an amount to be fixed by the court as constituting fair compensation for the then reasonably contemplated injury or damage which would result to such then existing improvements, workings, or facilities or from interference with the utilization thereof by reason for the allowance of such particular use.

"(e) Where the same lands are being utilized for mining operations and Leasing Act operations, then upon request of the party conducting either of said operations, the party conducting the other of said operations shall furnish to and at the expense of such requesting party copies of any information which said other party may have, as to the situs of any improvements, workings, or facilities theretofore made upon such lands, and upon like request, shall permit such requesting party, at the risk of such requesting party, to have access at reasonable times to any such improvements, workings, or facilities for the purpose of surveying and checking or determining the situs thereof. If damage to or material interference with a party's improvements, workings, facilities,

or with the utilization thereof shall result from such party's failure, after request, to so furnish to the requesting party such information or from denial of such access, such failure or denial shall relieve the requesting party of any liability for the damage or interference resulting by reason of such failure or denial. Failure of a party to furnish requested information or access shall not impose upon such party any liability to the requesting party other than for such costs of court and attorney's fees as may be allowed to the requesting party in enforcing by court action the obligations of this section as to the furnishing of information and access. The obligation hereunder of any party to furnish requested information shall be limited to map and survey information then available to such party with respect to the situs of improvements, workings, and facilities and the furnishing thereof shall not be deemed to constitute any representation as to the accuracy of such information.

"Sec. 7. (a) Any applicant, offeror, permittee, or lessee under the mineral leasing laws may file in the office of the Secretary of the Interior, or in such office as the Secretary may designate, a request for publication of notice of such application, offer, permit, or lease, provided expressly, that not less than ninety days prior to the filing of such request for publication there shall have been filed for record in the county office of record for the county in which the lands covered thereby are situate a notice of the filing of such application or offer or of the issuance of such permit or lease which notice shall set forth the date of such filing or issuance, the name and address of the applicant, offeror, permittee or lessee and the description of the lands covered by such application, offer, permit or lease, showing the section or sections of the public land surveys which embrace the lands covered by such application, offer, permit, or lease, or if such lands are unsurveyed, either the section or sections which would probably embrace such lands when the public land surveys are extended to such lands or a tie by courses and distances to an approved United States mineral monument.

"The filing of such request for publication shall be accompanied by a certified copy of such recorded notice and an affidavit or affidavits of a person or persons over twenty-one years of age setting forth that the affiant or affiants have examined the lands involved in a reasonable effort to ascertain whether any person or persons were in actual possession of or engaged in the working of such lands or any part thereof, and, if no person or persons were found to be in actual possession of or engaged in the working of said lands or any part thereof on the date of such examination, setting forth such fact, or, if any person or persons were so found to be in actual possession or engaged in such working on the date of such examination, setting forth the name and address of each such person, unless affiant shall have been unable through reasonable inquiry to obtain information as to the name and address of any such person, in which event the affidavit shall set forth fully the nature and results of such inquiry.

"The filing of such request for publication shall also be accompanied by the certificate of a title or abstract company, or of a title abstractor, or of an attorney, based upon such company's, abstractor's, or attorney's examination of the instruments affecting the lands involved, of record in the public records of the county in which said lands are situate as shown by the indices of the public records in the county office of record for said county, setting forth the name of any person disclosed by said instruments to have an interest in said lands under any unpatented mining claim heretofore located, together

with the address of such person if disclosed by such instruments of record.

"Thereupon the Secretary of the Interior, or his designated representative, at the expense of the requesting person (who, prior to the commencement of publication, must furnish the agreement of the publisher to hold such requesting person alone responsible for charges of publication), shall cause notice of such application, offer, permit, or lease to be published in a newspaper having general circulation in the county in which the lands involved are situate.

"Such notice shall describe the lands covered by such application, offer, permit, or lease, as provided heretofore in the notice to be filed in the office of record of the county in which the lands covered are situate, and shall notify whomsoever it may concern that if any person claiming or asserting under, or by virtue of, any unpatented mining claim heretofore located, any right or interest in Leasing Act minerals as to such lands or any part thereof, shall fail to file in the office where such request for publication was filed (which office shall be specified in such notice) and within one hundred fifty days from the date of the first publication of such notice (which date shall be specified in such notice), a verified statement which shall set forth, as to such unpatented mining claim:

"(1) The date of location;

"(2) The book and page of recordation of the notice or certificate of location;

"(3) The section or sections of the public land surveys which embrace such mining claim; or if such lands are unsurveyed, either the section or sections which would probably embrace such mining claim when the public land surveys are extended to such lands or a tie by courses and distances to an approved United States mineral monument;

"(4) Whether such claimant is a locator or purchaser under such location; and

"(5) The name and address of such claimant and names and addresses so far as known to the claimant of any other person or persons claiming any interest or interests in or under such unpatented mining claim; such failure shall be conclusively deemed (i) to constitute a waiver and relinquishment by such mining claimant of any and all right, title, and interest under such mining claim as to, but only as to, Leasing Act minerals, and (ii) to constitute a consent by such mining claimant that such mining claim and any patent issued therefor, shall be subject to the reservation specified in section 4 of this Act, and (iii) to preclude thereafter any assertion by such mining claimant of any right or title to or interest in any Leasing Act mineral by reason of such mining claim.

"If such notice is published in a daily paper, it shall be published in the Wednesday issue for nine consecutive weeks, or, if in a weekly paper, in nine consecutive issues, or, if in a semiweekly or triweekly paper, in the issue of the same day of each week for nine consecutive weeks.

"Within fifteen days after the date of first publication of such notice, the person requesting such publication (1) shall cause a copy of such notice to be personally delivered to or to be mailed by registered mail addressed to each person in possession or engaged in the working of the land whose name and address is shown by an affidavit filed as aforesaid, and to each person who may have filed, as to any lands described in said notice, a request for notices, as provided in subsection (d) of this section 7, and shall cause a copy of such notice to be mailed by registered mail to each person whose name and address is set forth in the title or abstract company's or title abstractor's or attorney's certificate filed as aforesaid, as having an interest in the lands described in said notice under any unpatented mining claim heretofore located,

such notice to be directed to such person's address as set forth in such certificate; and (2) shall file in the office where said request for publication was filed an affidavit showing that copies have been so delivered or mailed.

"(b) If any claimant under any unpatented mining claim heretofore located which embraces any of the lands described in any notice published in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) of this section 7 shall fail to file a verified statement, as above provided, within one hundred and fifty days from the date of the first publication of such notice, such failure shall be conclusively deemed, except as otherwise provided in subsection (e) of this section 7, (1) to constitute a waiver and relinquishment by such mining claimant of any and all right, title, and interest under such mining claim as to, but only as to, Leasing Act minerals, and (ii) to constitute a consent by such mining claimant that such mining claim and any patent issued therefor, shall be subject to the reservation specified in section 4 of this Act, and (iii) to preclude thereafter any assertion by such mining claimant of any right or title to or interest in any Leasing Act mineral by reason of such mining claim.

"(c) If any verified statement shall be filed by a mining claimant as provided in subsection (a) of this section 7, then the Secretary of the Interior or his designated representative shall fix a time and place for a hearing to determine the validity and effectiveness of the mining claimant's asserted right or interest in Leasing Act minerals, which place of hearing shall be in the county where the lands in question or parts thereof are located, unless the mining claimant agrees otherwise. The procedures with respect to notice of such a hearing and the conduct thereof, and in respect to appeals shall follow the then established general procedures and rules of practice of the Department of the Interior in respect to contests or protests affecting public lands of the United States. If, pursuant to such a hearing, the final decision rendered in the matter shall affirm the validity and effectiveness of any mining claimant's right or interest under the mining claim as to Leasing Act minerals, then no subsequent proceedings under this section 7 of this Act shall have any force or effect upon the so-affirmed right or interest of such mining claimant under such mining claim. If at any time prior to a hearing the person requesting publication of notice and any person filing a verified statement pursuant to such notice shall so stipulate, then to the extent so stipulated, but only to such extent, no hearing shall be held with respect to rights asserted under that verified statement, and to the extent defined by the stipulation the rights asserted under that verified statement shall be deemed to be unaffected by that particular published notice.

"(d) Any person claiming any right in Leasing Act minerals under or by virtue of any unpatented mining claim heretofore located and desiring to receive a copy of any notice of any application, offer, permit, or lease which may be published as above provided in subsection (a) of this section 7, and which may affect lands embraced in such mining claim, may cause to be filed for record in the county office of record where the notice or certificate of location of such mining claim shall have been recorded, a duly acknowledged request for a copy of any such notice. Such request for copies shall set forth the name and address of the person requesting copies and shall also set forth, as to each mining claim under which such person asserts rights in Leasing Act minerals:

"(1) the date of location;

"(2) the book and page of the recordation of the notice or certificate of location; and

"(3) the section or sections of the public land surveys which embrace such mining claim; or if such lands are unsurveyed, either the section or sections which would probably embrace such mining claim when the public land surveys are extended to such lands or a tie by courses and distances to an approved United States mineral monument. Other than in respect to the requirements of subsection (a) of this section 7 as to personal delivery or mailing of copies of notices and in respect to the provisions of subsection (e) of this section 7, no such request for copies of published notices and no statement or allegation in such request and no recordation thereof shall affect title to any mining claim or to any land, or be deemed to constitute constructive notice to any person that the person requesting copies has, or claims, any right, title, or interest in or under any mining claim referred to in such request.

"(e) If any applicant, offeror, permittee, or lessee shall fail to comply with the requirements of subsection (a) of this section 7 as to the personal delivery or mailing of a copy of notice to any person, the publication of such notice shall be deemed wholly ineffectual as to that person or as to the rights asserted by that person and the failure of that person to file a verified statement, as provided in such notice, shall in no manner affect, diminish, prejudice or bar any rights of that person.

"Sec. 8. The owner or owners of any mining claim heretofore located may, at any time prior to issuance of patent therefor, waive and relinquish all rights thereunder to Leasing Act minerals. The execution and acknowledgment of such a waiver and relinquishment by such owner or owners and the recordation thereof in the office where the notice or certificate of location of such mining claim is of record shall render such mining claim thereafter subject to the reservation referred to in section 4 of this Act and any patent issued therefor shall contain such a reservation, but no such waiver or relinquishment shall be deemed in any manner to constitute any concession as to the date of priority of rights under said mining claim or as to the validity thereof.

"Sec. 9. Lands withdrawn from the public domain which are within (a) Helium Reserve Numbered 1, pursuant to Executive orders of March 21, 1924, and January 28, 1926, and (b) Helium Reserve Numbered 2 pursuant to Executive Order 6184 of June 26, 1933, shall be subject to entry and location under the mining laws of the United States, and to permit and lease under the mineral leasing laws, upon determination by the Secretary of the Interior, based upon available geologic and other information, that there is no reasonable probability that operations pursuant to entry or location of the particular lands under the mining laws, or pursuant to a permit or lease of the particular lands under the Mineral Leasing Act, will result in the extraction or cause loss or waste of the helium-bearing gas in the lands of such reserves: *Provided*, That the lands shall not become subject to entry, location, permit, or lease until such time as the Secretary designates in an order published in the Federal Register: *And provided further*, That the Secretary may at any time as a condition to continued mineral operations require the entryman, locator, permittee or lessee to take such measures either above or below the surface of the lands as the Secretary deems necessary to prevent loss or waste of the helium-bearing gas.

"Sec. 10. The Atomic Energy Act is hereby amended as follows:

"(a) Section 5 (b) (5) is revised to read:

"(5) Acquisition: The Commission is authorized to the extent it deems necessary to effectuate the provisions of this Act—

"(A) to purchase, take, requisition, condemn, or otherwise acquire supplies of fissionable source materials or any interest in real property containing deposits of fissionable source materials; and

"(B) to purchase, take, requisition, condemn, or otherwise acquire rights to enter upon any real property deemed by it to have possibilities of containing deposits of fissionable source materials and to conduct prospecting and exploratory operations for such deposits.

Any purchase made under this paragraph may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5) upon certification by the Commission that such action is necessary in the interest of the common defense and security, or upon a showing that advertising is not reasonably practicable, and partial and advance payments may be made thereunder. The Commission may establish guaranteed prices for all fissionable source materials delivered to it within a specified time. Just compensation shall be made for any property or interest in property purchased, taken, requisitioned, condemned, or otherwise acquired under this paragraph.

"(b) Section 5 (b) (6) is revised to read:

"(6) Operations on lands belonging to the United States: The Commission is authorized, to the extent it deems necessary to effectuate the provisions of this Act, to issue leases or permits for prospecting for, exploration for, mining, or removal of deposits of fissionable source materials (or for any or all of these purposes) in lands belonging to the United States: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, such leases or permits may be issued for lands administered for national park, monument, and wildlife purposes only when the President, by Executive order, finds and declares that such action is necessary in the interests of national defense.

"(c) Section 5 (b) (7) is revised to read:

"(7) Public lands: No individual, corporation, partnership, or association, which had any part, directly or indirectly, in the development of the atomic energy program, may benefit by any location, entry, or settlement upon the public domain made after such individual, corporation, partnership, or association took part in such program, if such individual, corporation, partnership, or association, by reason of having had such part in the development of the atomic energy program, acquired confidential official information as to the existence of deposits of such uranium, thorium, or other fissionable source materials in the specific lands upon which such location, entry, or settlement is made, and subsequent to the date of the enactment of this Act made such location, entry, or settlement or cause the same to be made for his, or its, or their benefit. In cases where any patent, conveyance, lease, permit, or other authorization has been issued, which reserved to the United States fissionable source materials and the right to enter upon the land and prospect for, mine, and remove the same, the head of the department or agency which issued the patent, conveyance, lease, permit, or other authorization shall, on application of the holder thereof, issue a new or supplemental patent, conveyance, lease, permit, or other authorization without such reservation.

"(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act, and particularly section 5 (b) (7) thereof, prior to its amendment hereby, or the provisions of the Act of August 12, 1953 (67 Stat. 539), and particularly section 3 thereof, any mining claim, heretofore located under the mining laws of the United States, for, or based upon a discovery of a mineral deposit which is a fissionable source material and which, except



for the possible contrary construction of said Atomic Energy Act, would have been locatable under such mining laws, shall, insofar as adversely affected by such possible contrary construction, be valid and effective, in all respects to the same extent as if said mineral deposit were a locatable mineral deposit other than a fissionable source material.

"Sec. 11. As used in this Act 'mineral leasing laws' shall mean the Act of October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741); the Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437); the Act of April 17, 1926 (44 Stat. 301); the Act of February 7, 1927 (44 Stat. 1057); and all Acts heretofore or hereafter enacted which are amendatory of or supplementary to any of the foregoing Acts; 'Leasing Act minerals' shall mean all minerals which, upon the effective date of this Act, are provided in the mineral leasing laws to be disposed of thereunder; 'Leasing Act operations' shall mean operations conducted under a lease, permit, or license issued under the mineral leasing laws in or incidental to prospecting for, drilling for, mining, treating, storing, transporting, or removing Leasing Act minerals; 'mining operations' shall mean operations under any unpatented or patented mining claim or millsite in or incidental to prospecting for, mining, treating, storing, transporting, or removing minerals other than Leasing Act minerals and any other use under any claim of right or title based upon such mining claim or millsite; 'Leasing Act operator' shall mean any party who shall conduct Leasing Act operations; 'mining operator' shall mean any party who shall conduct mining operations; 'Atomic Energy Act' shall mean the Act of August 1, 1946 (60 Stat. 755), as amended; 'Atomic Energy Commission' shall mean the United States Atomic Energy Commission established under the Atomic Energy Act or any amendments thereof; 'fissionable source material' shall mean uranium, thorium, and all other materials referred to in section 5 (b) (1) of the Atomic Energy Act as reserved or to be reserved to the United States; 'uranium lease application' shall mean an application for a uranium lease filed with said Commission with respect to lands which would be open for entry under the mining laws except for their being lands embraced within an offer, application, permit, or lease under the mineral leasing laws or lands known to be valuable for minerals leasable under those laws; 'uranium lease' shall mean a uranium mining lease issued by said Commission with respect to any such lands; and 'person' shall mean any individual, corporation, partnership, or other legal entity.

"Sec. 12. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to waive, amend, or repeal the requirement of any provision of any law for approval of any official of the United States whose approval prior to prospecting, exploring, or mining would be required.

"Sec. 13. If any provision of this Act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances, is held unconstitutional, invalid, or unenforceable, the remainder of this Act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held unconstitutional, invalid, or unenforceable, shall not be affected thereby."

And the House agree to the same.

J. ERNEST WHARTON,  
WESLEY A. D'EWART,  
WILLIAM A. DAWSON,  
CLIFTON YOUNG,  
CLAIR ENGLE,  
WAYNE N. ASPINALL,  
GRACIE PFOST,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,  
ARTHUR V. WATKINS,  
FRANK A. BARRETT,  
JAMES E. MURRAY,  
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3344) to amend the mineral leasing laws to provide for multiple mineral development of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report, namely:

Section 4: This section was given very careful consideration. The House amendment has been reworded to change its negative approach relative to the procedure of placing reservations of leasable minerals in mining claim patents to the positive language adopted by the conferees. Mining claims, whether located in conformity with the provisions of Public Law 250, 83d Congress, or subsequent to the enactment of this legislation, will be subject to reservation of Leasing Act minerals only if such claims are located on public lands to which the mineral leasing acts are applicable at the time the patent issues.

Mining claims located on public lands to which, at time of issuance of patent, the mineral leasing acts are not applicable are exempt from this reservation and full title to all minerals will pass to claimant with the patent.

The time of issuance of a patent, rather than the time of application, was selected because of the possibility of the long time lag between application for, and perfection of, patent. If time of application governed, the effect would be to block development of leasable minerals not only as to the claim involved but possibly as to the area in which the claim was located. This would be contrary to the intent of this legislation which has as its stated purpose the maximum possible development of the public domain, keeping in mind that there is nothing in the act which prohibits the operator from occupying the dual position of being both a locator and a lessee. By making the time of issuance the cutoff for the reservation of leasable minerals, the land is kept open for development of these minerals up to the time patent issues.

Section 7: Certain changes in language suggested by both Senate and House conferees were adopted in the interest of clarification and the further protection of the mining claimant; certain language appearing in the Senate bill, but which was omitted from the House bill, was agreed to.

Section 9: This did not appear in the House bill. The Senate version was reworded and the section was agreed to. This section opens public lands, which have been withdrawn for helium, to entry under the mining laws and to permit and lease under the mineral leasing laws, upon determination by the Secretary of the Interior that such activity will not result in waste of helium-bearing gas. The Secretary is given the authority to require such operations to be conducted so as to prevent loss or waste of the helium-bearing gas.

Section 10: Certain changes in language were made to conform to the Atomic Energy Act. Subsection (6) was amended to exclude specifically national parks, monuments, and wildlife areas from the provisions of this act, except when the President declares by Executive order that issuance of leases or permits under this subsection are necessary to the national defense. Working agreements presently existing are not affected in any way. The amendment will not operate to affect the special use permit between the National Park Service and the Atomic Energy Commission, approved February 1, 1952, by the Department of the Interior; approved February 19, 1952, by the Atomic Energy Commission, with respect to Capitol Reef National Monument, Utah.

Section 12 restates this principle in general terms relative to the mineral development of the public lands generally, and expresses the intent of the bill to limit the changes in the operation of the mining laws and the mineral leasing laws to the specific provisions of the bill.

J. ERNEST WHARTON,  
WESLEY A. D'EWART,  
WILLIAM A. DAWSON,  
CLIFTON YOUNG,  
CLAIR ENGLE,  
WAYNE N. ASPINALL,  
GRACIE PFOST,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### FAMILY HOUSING FOR PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 662 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. 9924) to provide for family quarters for personnel of the military departments of the Department of Defense and their dependents, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, 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. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Michigan to propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is this a privileged resolution from the Rules Committee?

The SPEAKER. It is.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. It deals with the matter of military housing.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no one who is against this rule which provides for 13,613 units of military housing for the personnel in the military services. The purpose, of course, is to provide adequate housing for the military personnel.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of House Resolution 662 which will make in order the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9924) to provide for family quarters for personnel of the military departments of the Department of De-

fense and their dependents, and for other purposes.

House Resolution 662 provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate. I do not know of anyone that is opposed to the adoption of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 9924 would authorize the military departments to provide family housing for personnel of the Armed Forces by the construction of 13,613 units, including replacement of substandard housing, and the rehabilitation of additional units, but at a total cost of not to exceed \$175 million.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has been introduced as a partial answer to the pressing problem of providing adequate family quarters for our military personnel. We all know that in this day and age when the world situation is so uncertain that it is extremely important that our country have an adequately trained and competent corps of military personnel.

The housing arrangements for the military have been so poor in recent years, due to the lack of quarters and the inability of finding outside family quarters, that the reenlistment rates have declined considerably. This, I think all Members of the House will agree, is an extremely dangerous situation.

Since the Armed Forces have been unable in recent years to provide the necessary housing for our military personnel through housing constructed with appropriated funds, the recent alternative has been the granting of a monetary allowance for quarters to be secured individually by the military personnel as best they can.

The drawbacks to this solution of the housing problem are obvious when you consider the usual crowded conditions that exist near any military installation.

While H. R. 9924 would provide for less than 10 percent of the family housing needs of the Armed Forces, even on the present understrength condition of the military forces, still this bill proposes to start solving the problem on a permanent and effective basis. The report stresses the fact that the original investment made by the Government to provide housing for military personnel will be amortized over a period of 14 years due to the fact that no housing allowance will have to be made for each family occupying these housing units.

Mr. Speaker, this problem has to be solved in some way or other and there is no time to be lost in working out the answer. I hope that the House membership will see fit to adopt this rule and that the House will proceed to the consideration of the bill.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman said he knew of no one opposed to the rule. I am very much in opposition to the bill in its present form. I hope it will be recommitted, and I would be very willing to vote against the rule to attain that end.

I would like to have time to explain my point.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There are some people on this side who object to the rule.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I said that I knew of none; now I know differently.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I want to reiterate the statement made by my colleague from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]. I also am opposed to the bill. I trust it will be recommitted. I think it is a very poor method of financing and I would vote against the rule in order to attain that purpose.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am hoping that this rule will be adopted. After the observations that have just been made, the matter can be debated fully after we adopt the rule. It is an open one. All Members will have an opportunity to speak on it. I reiterate that we should adopt the rule, and then the matter will be open for full discussion.

The bill provides for 13,613 units for the military, chiefly for the enlisted personnel. In my opinion, this will stimulate the enlistment of people in the armed services as well as be of great value in connection with reenlistments. I cannot conceive of anything that would retard enlistment and reenlistment in the military more than inadequate housing for those we are striving to get and to keep in the service. I should mention especially that every time there is a voluntary enlistment and reenlistment it means that many less to be drafted. Personally, I believe we should make things as satisfactory as we can for those who want to voluntarily enlist or reenlist, which, as I say, would automatically lessen the necessity for the draft.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. One of the worst things that the Congress has to contend with is this continual demand of the Military Establishment to place additional housing in places where they are not needed. I am afraid from my examination of this bill that is just what it does.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I made a considerable study of this matter after the bill was reported from the Committee on Armed Services and I find that the amount of money involved is not nearly as great as might appear from the bill itself. For instance, when the military personnel is quartered in congested areas they are granted, in some cases, additional monetary consideration to rent quarters. In cities like Detroit and other large areas where there is congestion it is most difficult at times for the enlisted personnel, the sergeants and corporals, to rent quarters. This becomes important when the Government must give them additional money to rent quarters. Where there is adequate housing on the post itself they do not have

to give the personnel this additional monetary consideration.

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

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

Mr. DEVEREUX. The gentleman from Illinois has brought out the question of reenlistments. If we do not make the services attractive reenlistmentwise, insofar as officers are concerned, we will lose all of those skilled people from the military services and in the long run it will cost us millions of dollars more in order to try to make the services more attractive so that the officer personnel will not resign and so that the enlisted personnel, particularly in the first three grades, the very backbone of the military services, will not resign. If we do not make it attractive they will not reenlist. That is exactly the problem we are up against today.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Maryland for his observation.

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

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

Mr. EBERHARTER. May I say that I wholeheartedly agree with the gentleman from Maryland who just spoke. The general has had much experience in connection with the military.

May I call attention to the fact that just last week the Committee on Armed Services of the House brought in a bill which passed scarcely without any objection whatsoever in order to give enlisted military personnel an opportunity to reenlist. The same thing is true of the officer personnel. In all of the services they have been denied too many of the comforts of life because we have been too penurious with them. This is one way of retaining both qualified officer personnel and enlisted personnel. I know myself, Mr. Speaker, in conversations with officers of different branches, in the service and in the reserve, that they are trying to get out as quickly as they can because of living conditions and other matters of that sort. In the long run this bill would save money.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. We had exhaustive hearings before we brought this bill to the floor of the House. The housing conditions for our enlisted men and the junior officers are deplorable. This is only a stopgap piece of legislation that will provide for but 10 percent of the housing requirements in the military service. I certainly hope that the House will give us a chance to prove our case and not shut us off by refusing a rule.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. In every appropriation bill for the military there are items for millions and millions of dollars for quarters allowance that we are going to pay



out. I do not care what anybody on this floor says, we have got to appropriate it, and we have appropriated it under the law. The Committee on Appropriations does it every day. This bill is going to remove the necessity of going off of the bases and looking for housing, which we pay for day in and day out. This is trying to obviate the "skinning" of these people and causing them to pay these very exorbitant prices. This is an orderly approach to stop this spending which we are doing every year and which runs up into the untold millions.

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

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I think, if I may be permitted to say so, that there are certain things about this bill that should be known. First, we need this housing; we cannot get it any other way. That was demonstrated in the testimony before the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services. This bill does not interfere with Wherry housing. This bill does not interfere with private housing. This bill provides that these houses shall be built on or near installations where they do not have and cannot get the proper kind of housing. Also, when you study this bill, you will find in the long run it will save the Government money. It is true that it will require some appropriations, whereas in the housing built under Wherry housing or under private housing, appropriations might not be needed at this time. But, under Wherry housing the Defense Department or the Government through the Defense Department pays the rent through the living quarters allowances to the officers and personnel. Under the Government-owned housing, this money is saved because it is paid right back into the Government and eventually it becomes self-liquidating. The Government owns the housing, whereas under private housing it never does. It just pays the rent. This bill is necessary now for the defense and security of our country and for the morale of our troops.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

I wish to state further, Mr. Speaker, that undoubtedly from what has been mentioned here today this could come under the Wherry Act but I believe that all will admit that when these homes are built on these bases and airfields under these provisions, and built under the supervision of the engineers, they will be much better homes, more permanent-type homes. I believe all will admit that under the Wherry Act, the homes that were built are not of the most permanent kind.

I believe it is important to make this observation, and it has to do with the financial consideration. We have now tens of thousands of young veterans in the service who, when they come back, will have the privilege of going to college under the GI bill of rights. That is a costly proposition. If we can keep those youngsters who are entitled, if they leave the service, to go to college under the GI bill of rights, if we can

make it attractive for them to stay in the service by giving them better housing and other more attractive conditions, it will lessen the cost of the GI bill of rights.

So when we consider the figures, we should consider that factor, along with the factor of having to pay \$80 or \$100 or \$120 for quarters off the base, in congested areas. Taking all those factors into consideration, I would say that the amount involved in this bill is very small.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the majority whip.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, just the other day this House passed a reenlistment bonus bill which had for its purpose keeping trained personnel in the armed services. The Congress has done one thing after another in an effort to keep the right type of individuals in the service. The proposed measure here may be looked upon as just another one of the fringe benefits that we are offering in order to keep the right type of individuals in the various branches of our armed services. In the long run it will cost the Government nothing, but it will be another step in the right direction to take care of the personnel in the armed services. There is no reason why anyone should oppose this bill, as I see it.

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

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, all this is very interesting, but what has been said here has nothing to do with the objections to the bill. If my distinguished friend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] will accept an amendment to this bill, to make it do what he says it does, there would be no objection to it. But when the gentleman stands up and says that this does not interfere with Wherry housing, then I suggest that he read the bill; because in locations where there are vacancies in Wherry housing the contractors were told that they would be permitted to build additional housing.

Why am I interested? Because all this backs up against the Committee on Appropriations and against my subcommittee, because we have to put up the money for the mortgages that are involved in this housing.

If the gentlemen who are urging this bill here today will accept amendments on the floor to make the bill do what they have testified here that it would do, there would be no objection. But the bill as it is does not do those things that they say it does.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Of course, I cannot give the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] any assurance about that. But inasmuch as the gentleman has logic on his side, according to his own best judgment, I hope that he is not going to deny giving the membership of the House the value of his good judgment.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I should like to propound an interrogation to the gentleman from California. Will the gentleman from California assure us that he can guarantee Wherry housing at installations that are not permanent?

Mr. PHILLIPS. You have some in here now that are not permanent.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The gentleman knows that you cannot get Wherry housing on installations that are not permanent. I am asking the gentleman if he can assure that.

Mr. PHILLIPS. We are not interested in that.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. How are we going to get housing for the families in the service if we cannot get private housing, unless the Government builds the housing? That is what this bill does.

Mr. PHILLIPS. We are not even arguing the point; the gentleman is correct. All I am trying to do is to defend the \$1.4 billion that the taxpayers now have invested in Wherry housing, instead of adding it to the national debt.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I beg the gentleman's pardon. The taxpayers have not invested a cent in Wherry housing. If the gentleman says that, he does not understand what Wherry housing is.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I accept the correction; the gentleman is right.

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

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

Mr. DEVEREUX. I have some figures here that might be of interest. First of all, the testimony before our committee indicated that the services were having great difficulty in getting sponsors for Wherry housing. Some people who support Wherry housing think it is a fine thing, and originally it might have been. Actually in 1953 the FHA approved some 55 Wherry housing projects. It is interesting to note that during the first half of that year 52 of those were approved, and during the second half of the year only 3 were approved.

I do not know, but it is also interesting to relate that to Public Law 94 of 1953, which required the sponsor to certify as to his replacement costs, which was the basis upon which the Federal Government guaranteed the mortgages of the Wherry housing. We have not gone into that deeply enough. The other body is going into the question. But I suggest it does have some bearing on the proposition that is before us today. We simply cannot get the sponsors today. There might be an opening for skulduggery, we do not know. I think it is something to consider.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. GAVIN. I call the attention of the gentleman to a letter I received from

Roy Smith, of the First National Bank at Killeen, Tex. This letter appears at page 5497 of the full committee and subcommittee hearings on the bill (H. R. 9463) to provide for family quarters for personnel of the Department of Defense and their dependents and to authorize a program for providing such family quarters, and for other purposes. The letter is as follows:

FIRST NATIONAL BANK,  
Killeen, Tex., June 18, 1954.

Hon. LEON H. GAVIN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GAVIN: I notice in the press that the Defense Department has requested appropriated funds to build military housing in certain areas, one of the areas being Fort Hood, Tex.

I want to urge your favorable consideration of the request made by the Defense Department. Fort Hood now has 568 Wherry units. These units were constructed in 1951-52. The mayor of our town, members of the military affairs committee of our chamber of commerce, and other interested parties worked closely with the personnel at Fort Hood, the Federal Housing Administration, and the Housing and Home Finance Agency in obtaining the 568 Wherry units and in planning the type of construction. At that time Congress would not appropriate funds for the construction of military housing; therefore, Wherry housing was the only answer. The citizens of this area are fully convinced that Wherry housing is not the answer for military housing. It is costly to the taxpayers, does not fulfill the needs of military personnel, and makes available to the sponsor profits from the pockets of the citizens of this country.

Housing constructed with appropriated funds is built by private industry for the Government on competitive bids assuring reasonable cost to the Government, and no individual thereafter receives a lucrative income as is done under Wherry housing. Those who represent to you that Wherry housing is cheaper to the taxpayers have only a selfish personal gain in mind.

Again let me urge that you give favorable consideration to the request of the Defense Department, thereby giving to the military satisfactory housing at a lower cost to the taxpayers of our country.

Yours very truly,

ROY SMITH.

Killeen, Tex., is not in my State, but this letter expresses what the people are thinking about the Wherry housing programs.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in recapitulation and conclusion, I would bring this to the attention of the Members:

First, I think we are all convinced that there is inadequate housing for the military, especially the enlisted men.

Second, it is important that by making the service more attractive you get more enlistments and more reenlistments. This cuts down the drafting of our youth to forced service.

Another factor I think is important is that it will not be necessary to appropriate as much as it appears, for the reason that now tens and tens of thousands in congested areas in the large cities, instead of being quartered on the field or base, are given money to go out and compete with private citizens around that area in getting quarters for themselves and their families.

Another factor which I mentioned, and which I repeat, is in regard to many thousands of young men who are entitled to the benefits of the GI bill of rights. If we make it more attractive for them to remain in the service, they will not be taking advantage of the rights under the GI bill, such as going through colleges, and so forth, and there will be a saving from that standpoint, and we will be keeping those experienced men in the service.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. MULTER. I am in hearty accord with the principles enunciated and with what is sought to be accomplished by the bill. I am very fearful that under this bill we are going to have a worse housing scandal than we already have had under the FHA housing. This is not essential housing which is going to be built because, as is indicated here in St. Albans in New York City, you have a \$16,000 unit. That is not housing which is essential for the military. That is luxury housing. The same thing applies in this other instance; you have 3 units here for \$88,000. That is almost \$30,000 a unit. That is not essential housing for enlisted men—that is luxury housing. This bill is bad.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. May I suggest to the gentleman that after the rule is adopted he can bring out those facts during the general discussion on the bill.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. In connection with the letter which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] read, that is most interesting to me. At Elizabeth City in North Carolina, where there is a Naval Establishment, private citizens desired to build housing which was necessary and the officers of the Naval Establishment insisted on Wherry housing.

This discussion makes one doubt who is making the correct statement here and who is not. I want to see adequate housing for the naval personnel and the armed services personnel, but I do believe where private money is anxious and willing to build adequate housing at a fair price, then the Federal Government and the armed services should not insist otherwise. I have had that experience and I called down here to the gentleman in charge of Wherry housing, and he insisted that Wherry housing should be built there instead of having the housing built by private money adjacent to the base and at assured rentals. Now what is the answer to that kind of a situation?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. May I say to the gentleman that after the adoption of the rule, the rule is an open one and is subject to amendment, and a full discussion can be had on the bill and the gentleman may bring those facts out.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I think it is clear from the question raised and all of the debate we have had on the rule that it is essential that we adopt the

rule in order to discuss these questions. The questions are legitimate and they are involved in the bill. I think we will all agree, at least those who know about the military, whether they be military men or civilians, are greatly concerned about the inability to retain our career personnel. This Congress has recognized that within the past few weeks or days by greatly increasing the reenlistment bonuses. Some time ago Congress recognized the fact that we were losing our career commissioned personnel by placing restrictions upon retirement even after 30 years of service and requiring service on active duty until such time as the person reached the statutory age of retirement. Under that provision, all of the services found it necessary to refuse permission for any regular commissioned personnel to resign their commissions. So we are faced with the absolute necessity of doing something to retain our career personnel, enlisted as well as commissioned.

Also, those who know about the military situation regard housing as one of the primary reasons that you lose your career personnel.

I do not care how badly a man might want to remain in the service, his family will not let him unless they are properly housed, and unless we take steps to discontinue family separation. So long as you have family separation; so long as you have inadequate housing, with your families living under improper circumstances, the families are not going to permit him to reenlist. They are going to continue to urge him to resign.

I feel that this Congress cannot adjourn without doing something about military housing. The military want housing. They need housing. The Defense Department requested of us in the public works bill, which was passed recently, a blank check to build military housing in such amounts and at such places as they desired. That was contrary to our traditional system. Our traditional system has been that we build family quarters with appropriated funds, and the Congress always determined the station at which they would be built and the number to be built in that station. So that we did not give the Defense Department what they asked in that instance. They asked for 25,000 units, and we have allowed only 13,000, or a little over, in this bill. Those are to be built with appropriated funds, it is true. They are to be built by the Corps of Army Engineers, for the Army and the Air Force, and by the Bureau of Yards and Docks for the Navy. They are going to be built under competitive bids. There are not going to be any windfall profits in connection with these houses. Do not forget that, before you vote not to consider this rule. A hearing now going on in the other body involves Wherry as well as FHA housing. This bill contains no windfall profits. This bill requires competitive bids for every one of these units.

You are going to spend the money whether you build these houses or not. Last year what did we pay for quarters allowances to the military personnel of



the United States? One billion, three hundred and four million, four hundred and forty-three thousand dollars. That is statutory. That is a part of their compensation. It is paid as a quarters allowance. So long as you do not give Government quarters to a person entitled to quarters allowance, then you have to pay him in cash. Whenever you furnish him with adequate Government quarters, the Government keeps that quarters allowance. These things can all be discussed on their merits in the committee. Under the Wherry Housing Act, where a sponsor pays \$8,100 for a house the Government does not own the house for a minimum of 32 years. During that 32 years Congress will have appropriated approximately \$50,000 against a housing unit which cost in the first place only \$8,100.

These houses built by appropriated funds will be amortized by the retention of quarters allowances, which is not paid. They will amortize themselves over a period of from 13 to 16 years, and the Government will own them absolutely.

I plead with you to adopt this rule. Do not go home and tell the Armed Forces that Congress is not interested in housing, whereas the Defense Department is; the burden does not belong here.

**THE SPEAKER.** The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

**Mr. SMITH** of Virginia. **Mr. Speaker,** I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [**Mr. BENNETT**].

**Mr. BENNETT** of Florida. **Mr. Speaker,** there have been objections raised to specific line items in this bill as if that were some reason for voting against the rule on the bill. I would like to emphasize that those things can be amended when we get to them. As a member of the committee which sat and heard all the deliberations, let me say we did the very best we could to correct any difficulties that might arise in the line items. There may be a few that need correction but those can be corrected after the rule is granted.

Objection has been made that the housing in specific instances is costly. There are differences in costs depending upon who will occupy these houses. An enlisted man's house runs \$12,850 and the amounts go up to a general officer's house of \$27,000. It is estimated that each type will be amortized on the basis of the particular rental allotment applicable to those who will occupy them. Obviously, the larger rental allotments applicable to general officers could amortize a more expensive type of house than could be amortized from the lower rental allotments applicable to enlisted personnel. The amount of those allotments is determined by existing law, not by the bill before us now.

Let me call attention to another type of opposition which has developed, the opposition of people who are interested in Wherry housing. I would like to emphasize that this very opposition is an indication of the dangers of Wherry housing. When we are appropriating money for only 10 percent of the unmet needs of the peacetime strength of the armed services it seems strange and unreasonable that we should have opposition from

sponsors of Wherry housing units, to the building of housing at bases where there is not any Wherry housing whatsoever.

You can readily see the danger which has been underlined for you; for some of the Wherry sponsors seem to take the position that those sponsors have a legitimate right not only to prevent the Government's building what it needs to build for the service personnel at a base where there may be existing Wherry housing, but also to prevent the construction of any new military housing, even where there is no Wherry housing at the location.

Here today we have a bill which contains scarcely any provision for housing to be established at bases where there are Wherry housing units, yet we have a concerted lobby opposing this legislation.

Every time you build a new housing unit, regardless of how much it is needed at a military base, the Wherry housing people can come in and say that we are depreciating the value of their housing and giving them a more difficult market. They make the point that it is depreciating their property. This can make good sense where there is already Wherry housing, but even there it can also greatly impede, and perhaps even prevent, the construction of needed housing. This debate today underlines dangers created by the Wherry housing concept. I sincerely hope that the House will approve this bill before us today.

During recent years we have heard much about the need for making military service an attractive career but there has not been enough accomplished in this field to achieve that much desired result. A military career at best is a most demanding one and a man who is asked to devote his life to the defense of his country deserves at least equal consideration in those amenities which we call the American way of life as his civilian neighbor. Those of us who are privileged to serve on the Committee on Armed Services are perhaps more keenly aware of this than other Members of Congress.

The American soldier is, we believe, the best trained and best equipped soldier in the world. He should also be the best dressed, the best paid, and the best housed soldier. There is room for improvement in all facets of the morale field. The need for family housing is not the least of these. I am informed that a large majority of men who resign or fail to reenlist cite as a prime reason, the insecurity they feel in the important problem of maintaining normal family life in the transient life that is military service.

I do not minimize the great good done for the cause of military family housing by the Wherry Act. The act has provided sizable quantities of quarters for the average or middle group of our military population. It has not been, however, the complete answer that many of its proponents contend. We have, therefore, continued reports of enlisted men living in virtual squalor or paying rents far beyond their means to obtain decent shelter for their families. Many of these men are technicians, trained by the Government at great expense in the intricacies

of modern warfare. The loss to the Government occasioned by the cost of retraining replacements when such valuable men leave the service is immeasurable. The danger to our military posture in failing to maintain fully trained forces is grave. It is all the more tragic when we recognize that much of this loss of trained manpower is due to our failure to meet our basic commitment to the soldier in the form of decent and adequate housing.

The family housing to be authorized in this bill represents only a small part of the outstanding requirement for family housing in the three services. In the Army, for example, this bill would provide 5,000 houses against a need today of 80,000. Virtually all of these 5,000 houses for the Army will replace existing substandard units on Army stations. The fact that these substandard units are, under the housing policies of the Army, occupied only on a voluntary basis and yet are fully occupied, points up the desperation with which the married soldier seeks a place for his family to live. Unhappily, many of these substandard houses will probably continue to be occupied even after the housing in this bill is provided. The need is too great for all of them to be demolished as they should be. We have given much attention to the matter of slum clearance in our cities and yet we have been unable to raze our military slums.

Aside from the responsibility we bear for insuring that the American military man is allowed a decent place to live, the Congress must recognize that provision of Government quarters is, in the long run, good business. Within a reasonable length of time, approximately 20 to 25 years, the cost of these family quarters will be amortized by the saving in quarters allowances which would otherwise have to be paid the military people who will occupy them. We are appropriating funds for quarters allowances today for personnel to occupy Wherry Act housing and we will continue to do so for 50 years unless the Wherry housing falls down first. For every dollar spent in building Government-owned family housing, two will be spent in payment of quarters allowances to those who occupy Wherry housing if the latter is all that were to be provided. The reason is that payments for quarters allowances to Wherry housing occupants continues long after the cost of the housing is amortized.

The Congress has just completed action on a military public works bill which provides 25,000 permanent barracks and bachelor officers' quarters for the Army, recognizing that these single men deserve a decent place to live. The bill before the House would do the same for the married man. I urge its prompt adoption.

**Mr. GAVIN.** **Mr. Speaker,** will the gentleman yield?

**Mr. BENNETT** of Florida. I yield.

**Mr. GAVIN.** I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that this bill has been considerably changed since it was originally presented. Originally it called for a \$350 million housing program. It has been reduced to \$175

million. The Armed Services Committee carefully considered the proposed legislation, then requested that the Department of Defense reconsider the whole program and present to the committee a program with line items and a policy for developing the whole overall program.

Several weeks later the Department of Defense presented to the committee a proposed program of line items, a program that was given careful consideration by the committee for many weeks, after which a subcommittee was appointed for the purpose of screening of the line items included in the bill. After weeks of study and consideration the subcommittee reported out this bill that is now before us. This bill before us represents only 10 percent of the overall requirements for housing, for the services, Air Force, Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. It represents the very minimum required for the services in way of housing. I therefore sincerely hope the Committee will pass favorably on this rule so we can proceed with this bill.

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

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GREEN. I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, I am in complete support of this rule and in support of the bill. I think that the subcommittee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] has done an outstanding job. This is one of the most needed pieces of legislation, in my opinion, that has come up in this House, and I think it will be a great crime not to do this for the soldiers and officers.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from Illinois prepared to move the previous question?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Yes, I am.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have no further requests for time. We are anxious to have the rule disposed of so we can get along, but I desire to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE] for a consent request.

Mr. DEANE. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

#### AN EVALUATION OF THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, because of the significance of the textile industry in the Nation and in my own State of North Carolina, I have during recent months made an extensive study of this important subject. I have secured significant assistance from the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress and from other reliable sources which will be indicated from time to time in the RECORD.

This evaluation is being made because of my personal interest in the subject of textiles. The study has been brought together with the hope it will bring some food for thought to research groups, promoting agencies at the local and State levels, as well as the textile industry itself. I am primarily interested in local communities so vitally affected

in the sale of an existing plant, the merger of a mill with a great chain, a new mill, not to mention a mill which goes "sour."

First, I want to discuss the following: Location textile employment; growth; growth in North Carolina in relation to other branches of industry; cotton consumption; spindle hours; yarn and hosiery employment; maturity cloth weaving industry; general trends in North Carolina.

#### LOCATION OF TEXTILE EMPLOYMENT

There were 5 Southern States and 5 States in New England in which as many as 10 percent of the people employed in manufacturing worked in textile mills. Nearly half the textile workers in the United States—44 percent—were employed in the south Atlantic region and 1 in 5 was employed in North Carolina. There were almost as many textile workers in North Carolina in 1952 as there were in all of the New England States together.

In order to grasp the geographical impact of textile employment, I submit the following table:

TABLE 1.—Persons employed in textiles and in all manufacturing: 1952, by region and for selected States

[All employees: average number in thousands]

	Total manufacturing	Textile industries	Percentage in textiles
United States.....	15,944.4	1,134.7	7.1
South Atlantic States.....	1,739.4	502.3	28.9
North Carolina.....	418.6	219.0	52.3
South Carolina.....	202.9	132.8	65.4
Georgia.....	294.5	101.4	34.4
Middle Atlantic States.....	4,269.2	255.6	6.0
New England States.....	1,497.0	222.1	14.8
Maine.....	108.3	23.1	21.3
New Hampshire.....	1 (85.4)	1 (22.4)	26.2
Vermont.....	42.2	4.1	9.7
Massachusetts.....	702.7	92.5	13.2
Rhode Island.....	131.7	48.4	36.7
East South Central.....	677.7	91.4	13.5
Alabama.....	213.0	49.3	23.1
Tennessee.....	241.2	33.4	13.8
West South Central.....	667.9	12.3	1.8
East North Central.....	4,705.8	35.0	.7
West North Central.....	931.0	6.8	.7
Mountain States.....	174.6	(?)	.....
Pacific States.....	1,281.8	8.1	.6

<sup>1</sup> Figures for 1951. Data for 1952 textiles not available for New Hampshire.

<sup>2</sup> Not available.

Source: Bureau of the Census, Annual Survey of Manufactures, 1952, Tables 1 (p. 20) and 4 to 12, inclusive (pp. 48-78). See especially table 8, pp. 64-67 for North Carolina and South Atlantic States. Pennsylvania is the only State not shown which has as many as 100,000 employees in textiles: 121,432 in textiles but 1,543,380 in all industries. (Ibid., p. 54.) The following States had more than 30,000 employees in textiles: Connecticut (33,600), New York (77,400), New Jersey (56,700), and Virginia (39,700).

Textile employment is negligible in the States west of the Mississippi. It appears to be decreasing in the Pacific States and Texas, and it may be declining in the West North Central States, but the totals are too small to be important. Figures for the Mountain States are given only in years when there is a complete census of manufactures.

#### GROWTH OF TEXTILE EMPLOYMENT BY REGION

The increase in textile employment in North Carolina from 1951 to 1952, as shown by the census, was unique. Employment held its own from 1951 to 1952 in South Carolina, Virginia, and Tennessee. It declined in Georgia and Ala-

bama, as well as in New England and the Middle Atlantic States.

To illustrate this growth I invite your attention to the following significant data:

TABLE 2.—Employment in textile industries by regions: 1939-52

[Average number in thousands]

Region, State	Production workers <sup>1</sup>		All employees <sup>2</sup>		
	1939	1947	1947	1950 <sup>1</sup>	1952
United States Total.....	1,081.7	1,147.2	1,233.4	1,245.2	1,134.7
New England.....	260.6	260.7	283.0	268.3	222.1
Middle Atlantic.....	275.1	264.7	293.5	306.3	255.6
South Atlantic.....	395.4	461.3	484.3	499.8	502.3
East South Central.....	81.9	92.2	96.9	95.6	91.4
East North Central.....	44.7	40.6	45.3	43.7	35.0
West North Central.....	6.5	7.5	8.4	8.3	6.8
West South Central.....	11.3	11.7	11.8	12.3	12.3
Mountain.....	.5	.6	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.
Pacific.....	6.8	7.8	9.1	8.4	8.1
North Carolina.....	181.2	200.9	210.4	213.4	219.0
South Carolina.....	94.8	119.3	124.6	129.1	132.8
Virginia.....	28.0	31.5	33.9	37.2	39.7
Georgia.....	79.4	98.3	102.5	107.1	101.4
Alabama.....	39.9	49.9	52.1	52.3	49.3
Tennessee.....	33.6	33.9	35.9	34.7	33.4

<sup>1</sup> Census of Manufactures 1947, vol. I, table 6, pp. 54-55, for United States and regional totals; vol. III, table 3 for each State shown—Alabama (p. 69), Georgia (p. 155), North Carolina (p. 452), South Carolina (p. 555), Tennessee (p. 571), Virginia (p. 615).

<sup>2</sup> U. S. Bureau of Census, Annual Survey of Manufactures, 1951 for 1947 and 1950 data. (United States, table I, p. 21), (New England, table III, p. 49), (Middle Atlantic, table IV, p. 53), (East North Central, table V, p. 57), (West North Central, table VI, p. 61), (South Atlantic States, table VII, pp. 65 and 67), (East South Central, table VIII, p. 69), (West South Central, table IX, p. 73), (Pacific, table XI, p. 79). Data for 1952 from Annual Survey, 1952.

<sup>3</sup> 1950 is shown in preference to 1951, as 1950 was generally a year of good employment in textiles, more comparable with 1947 than 1951 would be. This was especially true for New England and the Middle Atlantic States. Either 1950 or 1951 might be used to represent peak textile employment in Georgia and the east south central region. Employment increased from 1950 to 1951 in Virginia and South Carolina and then remained essentially unchanged in 1952. North Carolina grew in each year since 1949. (See table above.)

Let me point out the following interesting trends in textile employment. Generally speaking, the trend of textiles into the South Atlantic States seems to have continued through 1952. Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina were growing relatively more than Georgia. The tendency to growth of textile employment is much less noticeable in the East South Central States, including Alabama and Tennessee, and has not extended to Texas.

Employment in New England and the Middle Atlantic States is continuing to decline. New England held its own from 1939 to 1947, but lost workers from 1947 to 1950, as well as from 1950 to 1952. The Middle Atlantic States and East North Central States each had fewer workers in textiles in 1947 than in 1939. The decline in the Middle Atlantic States was interrupted in 1950, but was resumed at an accelerated rate through 1952. While these two areas lost about 16 or 17 percent of their textile employment between 1939 and 1952—partly because 1952 was a poor year for textiles—the east north central region lost nearly 30 percent of its textile employment.

The evidence of the census suggests that North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia—the old centers of southern textiles—have begun to grow again, whereas the rate of growth in Georgia,



Alabama, and Tennessee has diminished since 1947. It will be noticed that there was no increase in textile employment in Tennessee from 1939 to 1947 and a 10-percent increase in North Carolina and Virginia. On the other hand, there was an increase of approximately 25 percent in South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama.

From 1947 to 1952 textile employment increased 5,800, or 17 percent, in Virginia; 8,600, or 4 percent, in North Carolina; and 8,200, or 7 percent, in South Carolina; while employment in Georgia and Alabama in 1952 was lower than in 1947.

Census data are not available in detail by States since 1947. Therefore, it is impossible from census data to explain these employment trends in terms of specific types of textile production. However, it is known that woolen and worsteds have moved to the South in substantial amount, and that trends favoring the South continue in full-fashioned hosiery and textile finishing plants.

All that seems clear is that there is no evidence in these figures of an overall trend against North Carolina in textile employment.

#### GROWTH OF TEXTILE EMPLOYMENT IN NORTH CAROLINA AS RELATED TO BRANCHES OF THE INDUSTRY IN NORTH CAROLINA

The so-called textile industry is, of course, many industries, rather than one. That is revealed in a study of the following analysis:

TABLE 3.—Employment in the textile industries of North Carolina and the United States, 1947 and 1952

[All employees: Average in thousands]

	1947			1952 United States <sup>2</sup>
	North Carolina <sup>1</sup>	Percent in North Carolina	United States <sup>2</sup>	
Total textiles <sup>3</sup> .....	210.4	17.0	1,233.4	1,134.7
Cotton and rayon broad goods.....	87.1	-----	455.0	420.4
Cotton.....	71.0	19.8	357.4	317.9
Rayon.....	16.1	16.5	97.6	102.5
Yarn and thread (excluding wool).....	57.6	46.6	123.6	110.9
Thread.....	1.3	8.8	14.7	14.8
Knitting.....	49.7	21.6	230.5	236.8
Seamless hosiery.....	26.7	41.2	64.8	61.7
Full-fashioned hosiery.....	16.5	23.6	70.0	65.5
Knit underwear.....	4.2	10.3	40.6	35.6
Knit fabric.....	1.6	11.3	14.2	35.6
Knit outerwear.....	.7	-----	34.8	50.3
Other <sup>4</sup> .....	-----	-----	(6.1)	(6.2)
Woolen and worsted.....	5.8	3.2	180.1	124.7
Finishing (excluding wool).....	5.0	6.4	78.0	83.2
Carpets.....	1.4	2.4	57.2	52.9
Narrow fabrics.....	1.1	3.9	27.7	23.5
Hats (excluding cloth and millinery).....	(9)	-----	21.4	18.6
Miscellaneous.....	2.7	4.5	60.0	63.8

<sup>1</sup> Census of Manufactures 1947, vol. III: North Carolina, table 4, p. 452.

<sup>2</sup> U. S. Bureau of Census, Annual Survey of Manufactures 1952, table 1, pp. 22-23.

<sup>3</sup> Components in North Carolina do not add to total because of omissions to prevent disclosures. The apparent residuals for knit goods have been computed.

<sup>4</sup> Not available.

The distribution of employment by branches has favored the growth of textile employment in North Carolina in two ways:

(a) Percentagewise employment declined less from 1947 to 1952 in those branches on which North Carolina depends—broad goods,—7.5 percent; yarn and thread,—10 percent; and hosiery,—5.6 percent—than it did in some branches which are relatively unimportant in North Carolina—woolens and worsteds,—30.7 percent; narrow fabrics,—15 percent; hats,—13 percent.

(b) The share of North Carolina—and other Southern States—in some branches of the textile industry has been so small that they could gain—as a result of shifts between regions—whether nationwide employment in that branch was rising or falling. This has been the case with woolens and worsteds and with textile finishing.

Textile mill employment in North Carolina is heavily concentrated on broad woven cotton and rayon goods, on cotton yarn production and on hosiery production, both full-fashioned and seamless. On the other hand in 1947, the last year for which census figures are available by States for separate branches of textile industry, a small percentage of the woolen and worsted industries of the United States was located in North Carolina. This was also true of knit outerwear, carpets, narrow fabrics, and of the textile products classified as miscellaneous related products.

#### LINE ON DEMARCATION BETWEEN BRANCHES ARE BECOMING BLURRED

It should be remembered that the lines of demarcation between the several branches are becoming more blurred than they used to be and some have disappeared. Nevertheless there are still limitations on the kinds of fiber and yarn that can be handled with given types of machinery. The end-product markets are subject to different trends and even where equipment can be shifted to produce for a new market, the balance of the equipment within the plant and the overhead cost of changing from one product to another tend to limit the amount of shifting that can be done.

#### STATE EMPLOYMENT TRENDS IN VARIOUS BRANCHES OF THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Unfortunately, as has already been pointed out several times, the number of workers employed by various branches of the textile industry is only available on a State basis through the year 1947. It is unfortunate that Congress has failed to appropriate funds for the United States Census of Manufactures. This should be done. Let me now illustrate what the lack of a complete census of manufactures means to the States that are heavily dependent upon textile employment.

For the United States as a whole we have better information than we used to have, thanks to the inauguration in 1949 by the last administration of the annual survey of manufactures. The annual survey is considerably more economical than the biannual census of manufactures which was begun in 1921. The following table shows the trend of

employment in the various branches of the textile industry in the United States as a whole for the years 1947 to 1952:

TABLE 4.—Employment by branches of the textile industry: 1947-52, United States

[Averages for year: All employees in thousands]

	1952	1951	1950	1949	1947
Total.....	1,134.7	1,195.4	1,245.2	1,169.8	1,233.4
Yarn and thread (excluding wool).....	110.9	119.4	117.6	107.6	123.6
Yarn throwing.....	17.2	17.0	15.9	(1)	14.9
Thread.....	14.8	17.3	15.8	14.3	14.7
Yarn, cotton system.....	77.8	84.1	84.4	78.2	92.3
Cotton and rayon broad-woven.....	420.4	445.7	442.7	424.9	455.0
Cotton fabrics.....	317.9	340.1	345.8	331.2	357.4
Rayon and related fabrics.....	102.5	105.6	96.8	93.6	97.6
Narrow fabric mills.....	23.5	26.8	25.1	27.3	27.7
Knitting mills.....	236.8	242.2	246.2	236.6	230.5
Full-fashioned hosiery.....	65.5	74.8	77.3	73.6	70.0
Seamless hosiery.....	61.7	58.3	61.8	58.4	64.8
Knit underwear.....	35.6	39.0	37.7	(1)	40.6
Knit fabric.....	17.5	16.1	(1)	(1)	14.2
Knit outerwear.....	50.3	(1)	(1)	(1)	34.8
Finishing textiles (excluding wool).....	83.2	81.0	(1)	81.6	78.0
Woolen and worsted manufacturing.....	124.7	138.1	156.7	144.5	180.1
Carpets and rugs.....	52.9	55.8	69.0	58.7	57.2
Hats (excluding cloth and millinery).....	18.6	18.3	19.2	19.1	21.4
Miscellaneous.....	63.8	68.0	(1)	69.6	60.0

<sup>1</sup> Not available.

<sup>2</sup> Includes scouring and combing (6.7 in 1952); wool yarns, excluding carpets (22.3); fabric (90.3).

<sup>3</sup> Includes hard surface floor coverings (10.8); as well as carpet yarn and rugs other than wool.

<sup>4</sup> Fur-felt hats predominate (12.6 in 1952).

<sup>5</sup> Coated fabrics, excluding rubberized (11.3); cordage and twine (14.1); jute (5.0); felt (n. e. s. 4.9); miscellaneous (4.8); lace (8.1 in 1952 and not available in 1951).

Source: Annual Survey of Manufactures, 1952 and 1951 (pp. 22-23).

However, for North Carolina—and all the other major textile producing States from Maine to Alabama—this kind of detailed information stops with 1947. The Annual Survey of Manufactures covers only a sample of the manufacturing establishments of the United States and depends for its validity upon periodic complete censuses of manufacturing establishments. The law provides for taking a census of manufactures every 5 years, though the last complete census of manufactures was taken in 1947.

Therefore, if we want to compare the growth of textile employment in the various textile States, we have to go back to 1939 and 1947 for employment information on the separate branches. By way of illustration the following table compares changes in employment in North Carolina and the United States as a whole by branches of the textile industry in the 2 years 1939 and 1947:

TABLE 5.—Production workers employed by branches of the textile industry: 1939 and 1947, North Carolina and the United States

	North Carolina		United States	
	1939	1947	1939	1947
Cotton and rayon broad woven fabrics.....	84,014	83,423	398,487	433,534
Yarn (excluding thread and wool).....	39,931	45,152	91,166	104,230
Seamless hosiery.....	22,317	25,509	61,852	61,343

TABLE 5.—Production workers employed by branches of the textile industry: 1939 and 1947, North Carolina and the United States—Continued

	North Carolina		United States	
	1939	1947	1939	1947
Full-fashioned hosiery.....	20,347	15,669	97,200	65,148
Knit underwear.....	3,102	3,998	37,478	37,546
Knit fabric.....	391	1,516	5,574	4,955
Wool and worsted.....	3,352	5,398	149,976	166,947
Finishing (executive wool).....	3,416	4,485	60,237	69,035
Carpets.....	712	1,292	38,892	50,883
Thread (excluding wool).....	846	1,226	14,382	13,126
Narrow fabrics.....	508	1,035	24,591	24,917
Miscellaneous related products.....	1,818	2,547	43,572	52,606

Source: U. S. Census of Manufactures 1947, vol. III, North Carolina table 4, pp. 452-453; and vol. I, p. 54.

As can be seen from the above table, more than one-fourth of the textile workers in North Carolina were employed in cotton and rayon cloth mills. There was no increase in this type of employment in North Carolina from 1939 to 1947 although employment for the United States increased about 10 per cent.

Employment in yarn mills—exclusive of thread mills—increased from 39,931 production workers in North Carolina in 1939 to 54,152 in 1947, or 35 percent. During this same period nationwide employment in yarn mills on the cotton system—which spins both cotton and rayon staple fiber—increased from about 62,500 to 88,800, or 42 percent, but employment in yarn throwing and yarn mills on the silk system decreased from about 28,600 to 15,400. Nationwide employment in yarn mills—spinning and throwing, other than woollens and worsteds—therefore increased 14 percent, as compared with 35 in North Carolina mills. Separate figures for the two branches are not available for North Carolina.

Seamless hosiery employment in North Carolina increased 14 percent, while nationwide there was a decline of about 1 percent in employment. Full-fashioned hosiery employment declined from 1939 to 1947 both because of increased efficiency and because raw materials were not available in adequate quantities in 1947. Nationwide the decline was 33 percent. In North Carolina it was 23 percent.

In terms of total employment in hosiery mills of all types, North Carolina held its own from 1939 to 1947; nationwide there was a decline of 20 percent in employment in hosiery mills—almost all of it in full-fashioned hosiery.

Since 1947 the only employment information available on a State basis is for all textile industries in combination. The idea of combination means that it is impossible to separate employment in cotton and rayon cloth mills from employment in woollens and worsteds or in other branches. As can be seen when we look back at the United States table on employment in the separate branches from 1947 to 1952, the trends in the several branches are quite different. We may guess from this table and from other information that some of the increase in textile employment in North Carolina between 1947 and 1952 was

probably due to the growth of rayon production and that some of it may have been due to an increase of wool manufacture in the State, but we do not know how much.

Attention is drawn to the following table on employment in the textile industries for 1939-52. For the period 1939-47 the census reported the number of production workers—latest figures available—whereas for 1947-52 the figures relate to all employees.

TABLE 6.—Employment in textile industries: 1939-52

[Average number in thousands]

	United States	North Carolina	Percentage in North Carolina
All employees:			
1952.....	1,135	219	19.3
1951.....	1,195	215	18.0
1950.....	1,245	213	17.1
1949.....	1,170	198	16.9
1947.....	1,233	210	17.0
Production workers:			
1947.....	1,147	201	17.5
1939.....	1,082	181	16.7

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census. Annual Survey of Manufactures 1952 and 1951 and Census of Manufactures 1947, vol. I, p. 25, and vol. III, p. 452.

It will be clear from the foregoing table that considering all of the textile industries in combination, that is woollen worsteds, cotton, hosiery, and so forth, there was a considerable increase of employment in North Carolina between 1939 and 1952, but employment in the United States as a whole did not quite hold its own. The above table indicates an increase in production workers for the United States as a whole between 1939 and 1947 but it indicates a decrease in total employment between 1947 and 1952 that is somewhat larger than the increase which occurred during World War II.

Certainly the people in the great textile-manufacturing States want to know which of the major branches of the textile industry are growing, which are declining, and how large the changes have been. They want the information to be up to date. This is true of the great northern textile States, such as Massachusetts and Pennsylvania, as it is of North Carolina and the other southern textile-producing States.

#### COTTON-CONSUMPTION FIGURES

The difference in the trends of employment in cotton and rayon mills in various States from 1937 to 1947 is shown in the following table:

TABLE 7.—Employment in cotton and rayon mills: 1937, 1939, and 1947, selected States

[Thousand wage earners on broadwoven goods <sup>1</sup>]

	1937	1939	1947
Total, United States.....	411.7	395.1	433.5
South Carolina.....	81.9	82.0	102.5
Georgia.....	55.6	50.1	66.1
Total.....	137.5	132.1	168.6

<sup>1</sup> Figures for 1947 purport to include wage earners in all rayon and silk broadwoven goods mills, except in the case of Alabama for which data are available only for cotton goods. For 1937 and 1939 employment in silk mills is included in the United States total and the Pennsylvania total. It is not available for the other States.

TABLE 8.—Employment in cotton and rayon mills: 1937, 1939, and 1947, selected States—Continued

	1937	1939	1947
North Carolina.....	77.6	84.0	83.4
Alabama.....	31.7	28.3	33.1
Total.....	109.3	112.3	116.5
Massachusetts.....	43.6	36.2	36.7
Pennsylvania.....	23.5	19.1	18.9
Total.....	67.0	55.3	55.6
Other States.....	97.9	95.4	92.7

<sup>2</sup> Includes only cotton broadwoven goods. Rayon and silk are not available.

Sources: U. S. Census of Manufactures 1937, vol. I, pp. 286-287 and 409-410; Census of Manufactures 1939, vol. II, pt. I, pp. 288-290, 310-312; Census of Manufactures 1947, vol. III, State tables 4; and vol. II, p. 156.

While the figures on employment which end in 1947 for cotton and rayon mills are completely out of date, we can carry the analysis further by looking at the figures for cotton consumption. The cotton-consumption figures for selected years reveals a very interesting trend.

The following table indicates the cotton consumption, including linters, in the United States and North Carolina:

TABLE 9.—Cotton consumed, excluding linters: 1926-54, United States and North Carolina

[Thousands of bales]

Year ending July 31—	United States	North Carolina	Percentage in North Carolina
1954 (annual rate) <sup>1</sup> .....	8,926	2,487	27.8
1953.....	9,432	2,272	24.1
1952.....	9,120	2,483	27.2
1951.....	10,654	2,870	26.9
Annual average:			
1951-54.....	9,533	2,528	26.5
1946-50.....	9,058	2,403	26.5
1936-40.....	6,938	1,795	25.9
1931-45.....	5,466	1,298	23.7
1926-30.....	6,735	1,534	22.8

<sup>1</sup> Actual preliminary figures for 8 months through March 1954 are: United States, 5,951,000; North Carolina, 1,658,000 bales.

Source: U. S. Bureau of Census, Cotton Consumption and Distribution in the United States. 1953 and 1954 from monthly releases. Earlier years computed from U. S. Statistical Abstracts 1953, p. 815; 1950, p. 790; 1948, p. 858; 1941, p. 902; 1940, p. 860; and 1938, p. 801.

The inadequacy today of cotton consumption figures alone is indicated by the following table which contrasts the trends of employment between 1937 and 1947 in mills that are primarily engaged in producing cotton broad-woven fabrics. Rayon consumption was obviously increasing more rapidly than cotton consumption.

TABLE 10.—Wage earners employed in broadwoven goods mills: 1937 and 1947, comparison of North Carolina and United States

	1937	1947	Percentage increase
Cotton broadwoven fabrics:			
North Carolina.....	65.9	68.4	3.8
United States.....	336.1	342.4	1.9
Rayon and silk broadwoven fabrics:			
North Carolina.....	11.7	15.0	28.2
United States.....	75.5	91.2	20.8

<sup>1</sup> Mills are classified by major products on the basis of value of the products sold. Some mills produce both types of cloth and the same mill may appear in one category in 1937 and the other category in 1947.

<sup>2</sup> Silk was not important in North Carolina in 1937. It was not included in the total for 1937 although it is in later years.

Source: U. S. Census of Manufactures, 1937 and 1947. See table 8 for page references.



## TEXTILES AND ALL MANUFACTURING EMPLOYMENT IN NORTH CAROLINA

Textile employment is of overwhelming importance in a number of large manufacturing States. In South Carolina nearly two-thirds of manufacturing wage earners are employed in textiles, while nearly half are employed in textiles in North Carolina and more than one-third of the manufacturing employees in Georgia and Rhode Island are in textile mills.

The growth of manufacturing employment in the various manufacturing industries in North Carolina is shown in the two following tables for 1947 and 1952 and for 1939 and 1947:

TABLE 10.—All employees in manufacturing industries: 1947 and 1952, North Carolina  
[Average number in thousands]

Product	1952	1947
Textile mill products.....	219.9	210.4
Lumber and products (except furniture).....	39.9	(1)
Tobacco manufacture.....	25.7	32.5
Furniture and fixtures.....	28.6	27.9
Food and kindred products.....	17.8	16.7
Apparel and related products.....	17.8	16.7
Chemicals and allied products.....	10.1	9.5
Paper and allied products.....	7.7	7.9
Stone, clay, and glass products.....	(2)	5.6
Printing and publishing.....	(2)	5.3
Electrical machinery.....	(2)	5.0
Machinery (except electrical).....	(2)	4.0
Other.....	(2)	9.0
Total (excluding administrative and auxiliary).....	415.0	381.5
Administrative and auxiliary.....	3.6	(2)
Total (including administrative and auxiliary).....	418.6	(2)

<sup>1</sup> The total for lumber and products in 1947 (31,087) excludes logging and sawmills with production of less than 200,000 board feet.

<sup>2</sup> Not available.

<sup>3</sup> The apparent total for stone, printing, machinery, and all others derived by the difference between the grand total and the subtotal for reported industries is 47,400. This compares with 28,900 in 1947. Unfortunately the 1952 figure (derived by difference) is subject to a major sampling error, and the indicated growth of employment may not have occurred.

Source: U. S. Bureau of Census, Annual Survey of Manufactures, 1952, table 8, pp. 66-67. Data for 1951 (except for apparel and lumber products) available from the same source. Data for 1949 and 1950 available in Annual Survey, 1951. Table 7, pp. 66-67.

TABLE 11.—Production workers in manufacturing industries, North Carolina: 1939 and 1947  
[Average number in thousands]

	1939	1947
Textile mill products.....	181.2	200.9
Lumber and products.....	19.5	29.7
Furniture and fixtures.....	18.4	25.0
Tobacco manufacturers (except stemming).....	16.8	16.9
Apparel and related products.....	6.5	15.7
Food and kindred products.....	6.3	11.6
Chemicals and allied products.....	6.2	7.5
Paper and allied products.....	3.3	6.4
Stone, clay, and glass products.....	3.2	5.1
Printing and publishing.....	2.3	3.4
Machinery (except electrical).....	1.4	3.3
Electrical machinery.....	1.1	3.4
Primary metals.....	1.3	1.7
Fabricated metals.....	1.6	2.3
Transportation equipment.....	1.7	1.1
Leather and products.....	1.0	1.4
Others.....	1.5	1.3
Total (except tobacco stemming).....	269.2	337.6
Tobacco stemming and redrying.....	(2)	12.6
Published totals.....	269.2	350.2

<sup>1</sup> Lumber and products does not include logging or sawmills with an output of less than 200,000 board feet. These are included in annual surveys for later years.

<sup>2</sup> The published figures for tobacco manufacturers in 1947 show 29,482 production workers, of whom 12,578 are in stemming and redrying. The latter total has been deducted in order to secure totals for 1947 that may be compared with those for 1939.

<sup>3</sup> Not available.

Source: Census of Manufactures, 1947, vol. III, North Carolina, tables 3 and 4, pp. 452-454.

Even when it comes to describing the growth of manufacturing employment in North Carolina by major categories we can trace trends only as far as 1947. From 1947 to 1952 it is not possible on the basis of sample data alone to indicate the growth of machinery production or show a number of other major types of manufacturing activity in North Carolina.

## MATURITY OF THE TEXTILE INDUSTRIES

North Carolina still has a growing textile industry. Other types of manufacturing employment have been growing somewhat more rapidly than textile manufacturing. The following table indicates that whereas about two-thirds of the workers in manufacturing industries were employed in textile mills in 1939, only slightly more than one-half were in textile mills in 1952:

TABLE 12.—Total manufacturing and textile employment, North Carolina: 1939-52  
[Average number in thousands]

Year	All manufacturing (adjusted)	Textiles	Others	Percentage in textiles <sup>1</sup>
All employees:				
1939.....	2 415.0	219.0	196.0	52.8
1947.....	2 409.8	215.4	194.4	52.6
1950.....	2 405.6	213.4	192.2	52.6
1949.....	2 366.1	198.4	167.7	54.2
1947.....	2 381.5	210.4	171.1	55.1
Production workers:				
1947.....	2 337.6	200.9	136.7	59.5
1939.....	292.2	181.2	88.0	67.3

<sup>1</sup> The annual surveys for 1949-52 attempt to include employment in logging operations and in sawmills producing less than 200,000 board feet. These were not included in the 1947 census. Since they cannot be excluded from the total in these years, part of the increased employment in "other" manufacturing industries and part of the decrease in the percentage of workers employed in textiles are apparent rather than real.

<sup>2</sup> 1949-52 employment figures as published include the following totals for "administrative and auxiliary" workers in central offices which were not included in the 1947 census: 1949, 2,714; 1950, 2,712; 1951, 2,712; 1952, 3,645. These amounts have been deducted from the published figures to secure a total more nearly comparable to the census total for 1947.

<sup>3</sup> The census of manufactures in 1939 did not include "stemming and redrying tobacco." In 1947 (and later years) it was treated as a manufacturing industry. The published total for production workers in North Carolina in the 1947 census of manufactures (vol. III, p. 452) is 350,200, of whom 12,600 were in tobacco stemming and redrying establishments. This number has been deducted from both the total for manufacturing and for other industries in 1947 to derive totals that may be compared with those for 1939.

Sources: 1939 and 1947: Census of Manufactures, 1947, vol. III, North Carolina, tables 3 and 4, p. 452. 1947-1952: U. S. Bureau of the Census, Annual Survey of Manufactures, 1951 and 1952, table 7, pp. 66-67 (1951), and table 8, p. 66 (1952).

However, the textile industry is one of the oldest in the United States and for the United States as a whole there has been no increase in the total amount of textile employment since 1937. This can be seen from the following table, which traces employment from 1937 to 1952. There was a decrease in the number of production workers between 1937 and 1939, and then an increase between 1939 and 1947, so that textiles as a whole employed about the same number of production workers in 1947 as had been employed in 1937. Between 1947 and 1952 we measure employment changes in terms of all employees rather than in terms of production workers. However, as the table shows, there was about the same amount of employment in 1950 as

there had been in 1947. Both of these were years with a rather high level of textile production. There was less employment in textile mills in 1952 than there had been in 1950, but this was a depressed year for textiles.

TABLE 13.—Manufacturing employment in the United States: 1937-52, all manufacturing industries and textile mill products

	All manufacturing	Textiles	Percent in textiles
All employees:			
1937.....	15,944	1,135	7.1
1950.....	14,770	1,245	8.4
1949.....	13,880	1,170	8.4
1947.....	14,294	1,233	8.6
Production workers:			
1947.....	11,916	1,147	9.6
1939.....	7,806	1,082	13.8
1939 <sup>1</sup> .....	7,887	1,083	13.7
1937.....	8,569	1,138	13.3

<sup>1</sup> The census of manufactures classified manufacturing establishments on a slightly different basis in the census of 1947 and the census of 1939. One of the figures for 1939 is in terms that are comparable to the figures for 1947; the other 1939 figure may be compared with 1937. Because of the change in classification no continuous series can be shown.

Source: U. S. Bureau of Census, Annual Surveys of Manufactures, 1949-52; Census of Manufactures, 1939 and 1947.

In view of the thought expressed here involving areas of declining employment it is my intention within the next few days to prepare a second and final statement on the textile industry. This statement will point out the interconnection between the wide cyclical swings that have plagued the textile industry and the development of stranded communities which have grown up around now-abandoned mills. I am particularly concerned, however, not with further describing the problems of the textile industry but of pointing out the necessity of continuous efforts by all groups concerned to do those things which will bring greater stabilization and more certain growth to the textile communities of the Nation. In the past there has been too much of a tendency for people to be concerned about the textile industry when the country is in the grip of a recession and to forget about the problems of the textile industry when the general business situation begins to improve.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas such time as he may use.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a telegram from the Topeka Board of Real Estate Dealers in Topeka requesting that I introduce an amendment to the bill because there has been deleted from the bill any appropriation for housing at Forbes Air Base. I wish to call the attention of the House to this matter. It is very important. I called the commander of the Forbes Air Base and he informed me that there is the possibility of wrecks and the loss of crews and airplanes because of this deletion. Therefore I intend to offer an amendment asking the House to include in this bill authorization for construction of 25 residential units at an estimated cost of \$337,500.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. 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.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. 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. 9924) to provide for family quarters for personnel of the military departments of the Department of Defense and their dependents, 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. 9924, with Mr. MORANO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, today we are presenting for your consideration H. R. 9924, which will be the last major piece of legislation that the Armed Services Committee will report this year.

We are sorry our great chairman, the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. DEWEY SHORT, is not able to be with us today. Those of us that have worked intimately with him realize the tremendous burden that has been his in this Congress. He has performed wonderfully well. His leadership has been superb. The accomplishments of our committee in this Congress are a reflection of that leadership. Unfortunately he has primary opposition but we all know that his record will cause his constituents to return him to the House of Representatives where he is so badly needed.

We are submitting a housing bill to you authorizing some housing units that are badly needed. This is a very important bill; much more important than its title indicates. Everyone knows what a delicate security problem faces us. Charles Lindbergh that great hero, that fabulous private citizen, who has contributed so much to our defense problems both in peace and in war, recently wrote a short magazine article entitled "Our Best Chance to Survive," in which he placed clearly before us the precarious position in which we find ourselves. He made this comment, which bears on the importance of the serviceman's morale:

Fleets of atomic aircraft, costing billions of dollars, can be operated efficiently only by a skilled, satisfied and experienced personnel; yet thousands of expert airmen leave the service each year to get better jobs in civil life. Economy itself demands that in this complicated electromechanistic age long years of expensive training should be followed by opportunities, pay and conditions which encourage people to remain in the careers they were trained for.

There is nothing that makes for domestic stability and harmony more than pleasant living conditions for young married couples. Most of the houses provided by this bill are for enlisted men or junior officers, perhaps as much as 85 percent of the total units which we propose to build. The total which we have in the bill is 13,620 units of housing

divided as follows: 9,000 for enlisted men, 4,600 for officers.

The estimated cost for this group of houses is more than the amount which we have in the bill as a limitation on the cost of this housing. The limit of expenditure in the bill is \$175 million that may be spent under this authorization. This means that a considerable group of the houses authorized will be screened out by those who have the responsibility of seeing that the houses are built.

I wish to give a brief background of the bill. Originally the Defense Department presented the Armed Services Committee with a program for the construction of military houses at an aggregate cost of \$350 million. The \$350 million was a fund of unexpended appropriations which had come out of various sources of expenditures, all of which were military. The Defense Department witnesses submitted a plan known as a lease-purchase plan to construct these houses. It should be remembered in considering this bill that every officer and most of the enlisted men receive compensation for their services and also what is known as quarters allowances. In other words, the military man receives pay and is furnished quarters, or in lieu thereof, we give them a certain sum each month so he may provide his own quarters. If you will look at page 2 of the report you will notice that for 1954 there was spent over \$1,400,000,000 for quarters' allowances. The total for fiscal 1955 was \$1,254,959,000. The sad thing about those expenditures is that after they are made, nothing is recouped by the Government. The suggested plan of the Defense Department was that, if we built quarters in the traditional manner they have been provided throughout the history of the armed service, we would then reduce the expenditures of the Defense Department by the sum we have been appropriating each year for quarters' allowances. The savings made by not having to appropriate for quarters' allowances would in a few years, perhaps not exceeding 15 years, be an item as large as the total cost of the houses in which the officers and enlisted men live. If the houses were substantially built, it would mean that after that period of time, the only cost to the Government would be upkeep. However, there were so many complications and deviations from the strict plan proposed that we finally determined that we should have a more exhaustive study made of the so-called lease-purchase plan. I might say that I personally am in favor of such a plan and have been for several years. In fact, I introduced a bill containing a plan similar to this in the 81st Congress and was unable to arouse any interest in it, except in the mind of Hon. Robert Lovett, former Secretary of Defense, who thought the plan a good one and emphatically so stated to me. Furthermore, he designated Gen. Grandison Gardner to work with me to develop a bill which would include the plan which I submitted of using allowances to pay for the houses in which the officers and enlisted men lived. The bill was sent to the Air Force where it was delayed and

was only sent back to our committee in the dying days of the Congress in which it was introduced. In other words, the bill was sidetracked because of a lack of interest in the plan, although the United States Air Force profess to be very anxious to get houses for enlisted men and officers and instead put their faith in the so-called Wherry housing.

Consequently, after discussing the matter informally the Armed Services Committee decided that a special committee should be appointed by Chairman SHORT which would provide a method of utilizing \$175 million for the construction of houses as set forth in the line items in the bill which was before us when the Defense Department officials were testifying. The chairman appointed me as chairman of the subcommittee and we held exhaustive hearings for about 10 or 12 days. I must pay my tribute to the men who served on this subcommittee. They were most courteous, helpful, constructive, and patient. We had a difficult job to do and it was not always easy to bring our various ideas into complete agreement, but we worked together in complete harmony and wrote up the bill which is before you today. I would like to have my colleagues in the House remember that no matter what kind of a bill we might bring you any conclusion as to the selection of a group of houses at any station could be challenged on some grounds or other. We did the best we could. We had intelligent witnesses explain the need for each group of houses and we finally agreed upon the bill which is now before you. The main thing that I would like to emphasize again and again is the very bad plight of the young officers and enlisted men, especially those in the grade of sergeant and above. Also, I emphasize again how desperately we need these men. These groups or teams, as you may call them, may be vital to our very existence. Airmen together with the officers that fly the planes must live together in a unit. They must be near their equipment, for you all know, without further elaboration on my part, that these men are on a 24-hour alert. If the call for their services should come, they must be prepared to get into the air within a matter of minutes. We have the same situation in the naval air arm, in the marine air arm, and even in the Army to a limited degree.

Furthermore, we have some very critical types of people who must be on a station and not far away where they may have had to rent a house. I refer to doctors, dentists, nurses, and special type personnel who are required to service and administer to our service men and women. I am sure, if everyone had sat through the hearings, as we did, they would realize that we must do something about this housing problem. In this group of houses we are only providing 10 percent of the need estimated as a requirement for a military force of the present size. You can readily see that it is essential that we take care of this first unit of houses. We are meeting competition for the services of our military personnel in two ways. In the first place, our trained personnel are being drained off by civilian industry because



they pay more money. In the second place, we are being competed against by private enterprise because they can provide better housing and other benefits for their employees. All of you know that an up-to-date industry, when moving into a town to build a new plant, in many instances provides the houses in which their workers will live. It permits the employees to buy them at cost. This morale factor is important in any endeavor, but it is more important in the military field than in any other. The reason is that when the chips are down it is a matter of life or death, and a man who believes in what he is doing, as all of you know who have served, is the best soldier, sailor, airman, and the best leader. The leadership of the junior officers in the company grades and the field officers, and the top sergeants, can furnish more leadership when they have a happy, contented group to command. Ask any man on this floor, and I could mention a half a dozen great war heroes who learned this in the heat and struggle of battle, and they will tell you that my statement is correct.

Perhaps we are overly serious, but I do not believe that we can be too serious in the critical situation in which we find ourselves. I am not here to make reference to any errors made in the past. My committee and my special subcommittee are accepting the situation as we find it; facing the future as we must look at it and taking those steps, that our conviction and our experience dictates to be the right steps.

There are some houses here for senior officers, and if the past is any criterion, I presume we will hear some critical observations about these senior officers, generals, and admirals.

So I implore you to listen carefully to this debate. If you do, I am sure you will authorize the houses asked for in this bill and thereby improve the morale and the living conditions of those who may some day be called upon to save us from disaster. If we retain our present strength and maintain our trained personnel and do something to bolster up their morale that may be the very program that will prevent an atomic war, which we all pray and hope will never come.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Some apprehension has been expressed by people who are in Wherry housing areas. They express the fear that this could reduce the occupancy in Wherry housing units, and thereby defeat the success of the Wherry housing program. Now, is there any danger of that? What is the gentleman's reaction to that?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not think there is any danger, because if you look at the hearings, we determined that we would not install houses where Wherry housing was in operation. There may be one or two isolated cases where that would occur, but on the whole, taking it by its four corners, the bill will not invade any Wherry housing areas.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman does not think, nor does the committee think that there is any real danger in this bill to Wherry housing?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not think there is.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is a controversial question. The gentleman's bill says otherwise.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not think it does. We are prepared to offer an amendment that I have shown to the gentleman that I think will clear up the situation in the event it is in doubt; and I do not think it is.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think that two amendments and a statement from the chairman which should go in the Record may clear up the matter. I hope the gentleman will be good enough to give me some time to discuss this before we are through.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I should like to ask one question of the gentleman. I may say first of all that I am very much in sympathy with this bill as I have both West Point and Stewart Field in my district.

I am fully aware of the necessity of adequate housing for the officers and enlisted men, but I should like to ask the gentleman, if this question has been so carefully screened, why, on page 8, under Outside the Continental United States, there is an appropriation of \$6,683,400; and out of that \$2,366,300 is for naval air activity at Port Lyautey, French Morocco, 175 units.

In view of the fact that it is quite evident to anyone who has been watching the situation abroad in the last few weeks, that the war clouds are certainly gathering over; and as it is also abundantly clear that every time another one of these holding wars is given up by our good allies, who are defeated, that our materiel is lost when the defeated armies move out, I wonder whether or not it would be wise to withhold some of that money in French Morocco at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. They claim it is very badly needed. As the lady knows, we have a complex of airfields and strategic airbases, and also a large naval complement there.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I realize that, but in view of what may happen, I think it ought to be looked into again.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No matter where the men are, they have to have adequate housing; even if it is in Morocco.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. But the men must be housed somewhere now. What is the situation at the present time?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. They are having difficulty there. Some of us were there last year and found that they had very, very poor housing. It is almost shameful the way some of those men live. Furthermore, it is possible

that some of these houses will be built with French money, although we will have to pay a certain amount of rental for the use of the property.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Very briefly; I have very little time left.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman called attention to the fact that thousands of men are leaving the Air Force. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that not only are thousands of men leaving the Air Force, but there are thousands of men who are leaving the ground forces; the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, as well. I think we should understand that this is not legislation that affects specifically only one branch of the Service. It affects all branches of the Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I think it is thoroughly understood by everybody that that is the case.

The main thing I would like to emphasize again and again is the very bad plight of the young enlisted men, especially those in the grades of sergeant and above. I emphasize again how desperately we need these men. These groups of teams, as you may call them, may be vital to our very existence. Airmen, together with the officers who fly the planes, must live as a unit. And they must be near their equipment for all of you know, without any further elaboration on my part, that they are on a 24-hour alert. The same thing applies to the Army and the same thing applies to the Navy, as my colleague mentioned a moment ago; and the same thing applies to the Marines.

I think I have indicated enough so that you can see what a terrible plight we are in and what our dire need is if we are to have reenlistments and save money by having reenlistments, because then we can keep our trained men. If we are to have good morale we must have at least passably decent housing conditions for our men.

I certainly hope the House will pass this bill so that word can go out to the men in all parts of the world that we are doing our level best as Members of the Congress to afford them a decent place in which to live.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRAY. I believe the gentleman misunderstood the question of the gentleman from New York [Mrs. St. George] when she asked about the housing in Morocco. I think the gentleman stated that the housing in Morocco might be built with French money and the United States would rent that housing. Would not that be impossible under this bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. There is no specific authorization, but there is a plan under which that might be done.

Mr. BRAY. I am aware of that plan, but it is not included in this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. There is no authorization in this bill along that line, but there is what is referred to as the French Wherry plan, to let them

build the houses and rent them to our servicemen.

Mr. BRAY. I am aware of that, but I was afraid the Record would show that was included in this bill, and it is not.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is right; it is not.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The authorization for the naval hospital at Bethesda, Md., is 30 units of family housing, \$409,000, which would figure about \$13,000 per unit. Then there is an authorization in the naval district area of 4 units of family housing, \$103,000, or approximately \$27,000 per unit. Why the difference there?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I think one authorization is for housing for the commanding officers, at \$27,000.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Those four houses are for vice-admirals who are stationed here in Washington.

Mr. GROSS. The others are for enlisted men, at \$13,000?

Mr. DEVEREUX. Some of them junior officers and enlisted men.

Mr. GROSS. It is twice as much for the officers as for the enlisted men?

Mr. DEVEREUX. Exactly; twice as much for a vice-admiral as for a sergeant.

Mr. GROSS. That is a good division of the spoils, in the wrong way.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am glad to know that the gentleman from California did specifically state that the portion of the committee report on page 7 which reads that this authorization will not require the appropriation of any new funds is not correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That was made before you people chopped down the amount for military expenditures.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I do not think it is necessary for me to justify the action of cutting that down because I do not believe the gentleman from California feels that the armed services ought to have a \$175-million fund that they can divert from one purpose to another, depending upon what the House may see fit to authorize in the closing days of the session.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is right. All we want to do is get the authority. We think we can make our case before the Appropriations Committee later so they will appropriate the money to build the houses.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That raises the next question that was brought before us by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], when he said he did not want the Congress to be put in the position of not going ahead and authorizing this money. I am wondering what solution the gentleman from California would now offer to the Ap-

propriations Committee where it seems to me that in order to perform our functions properly under an authorization program of this kind we would have to hold probably about 2 weeks of hearings in order to be adequately informed to pass on that kind of appropriation. It seems to me we either have to do that or give a blank check without holding any hearings and say, "Go ahead and start on this program now." That puts us in a pretty bad situation.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. As I see it, it is a question of whether you are going to take the money out of one pocket to pay rental allowances or take it out of the other pocket to pay for these houses.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The people that are in charge of the program of providing these houses and who sought this authority will make the justifications before the gentleman's committee. We do not expect any of these houses to be built until next year.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is the point I wanted to make clear. That is somewhat different from the impression that would be created by the statement of the gentleman from Texas. We are really not in a position to go ahead and promise to these people in the armed services throughout the country that by action on this particular measure they are going to be able to go ahead and start building houses.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. All we want to justify to the armed services is that we got the authorization. They will have to make their justification to you people, which I am sure they can do. I feel then that you will give us the necessary money.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wish to present H. R. 9924 for your special consideration. Your committee has examined into the details of this bill which is now before the House. I have found that a serious situation has grown up in the management of our Military Establishment which, I must say, does not reflect favorably on the past actions of either the executive department or upon the Congress itself. We have found that the country has failed to adjust itself to the present world conditions in that we are attempting to manage and operate our Military Establishment on a wartime basis but using peacetime concepts. At the present time, the factual situation shows that this country has called upon its young men, many of them married with families, to leave their civilian life with all of its attendant benefits, to enter into the service of their country with all of its difficulties. We seriously need these men now in this world of tension so that they may be trained in the use of complex equipment which they may be required to use in the event they are called upon to defend their country in time of war. We all recognize the day has gone when the armed services, and particularly the Air Force, can be manned almost overnight to meet

the enemy. It takes long periods of training, in fact practically all of the first 4 years of enlistment, to train these men in the hard-core skills necessary to man our forces. Remember that we can have all of the best equipment in the world and still fail if the men who fight and maintain this equipment are not highly trained. Few of us, I am afraid, fully appreciate just how long this period of training is that is now required to create a qualified fighting man, and most particularly how much it actually costs the country and our economy when we lose these men after they have received this highly specialized training. I say to you that this bill seeks to correct one of the prime deficiencies that the military departments now have; namely, family housing, the lack of which is making the retention of highly trained personnel almost impossible. We have all heard many, many times of the welfare and morale of the services. The phrase "welfare and morale" has been overworked to the point of becoming a bromide. I wish to explain to you some of the dollar-and-cents results that the nebulous question of morale or lack of morale is costing this country in its Defense Establishment as it relates to housing. The members of the Armed Services Committee and myself have traveled throughout this country and overseas inspecting military installations. I am far from pleased with what I have seen. I am sure you would share with me the shame that I felt and members of my committee felt when we saw some of the hovels that our military personnel are forced to inhabit. They are of various types. Some of them are converted garages, some temporary conversions or makeshift arrangements of barracks, others crowding into small quarters, doubling families, and so forth. Examples are numerous, but they all add up to one thing; namely, Americans do not live that way voluntarily. If the world is to continue its present armed-camp condition, we must of necessity see to it that our forces who are required to stand by and wait for the emergency to break are afforded at least the accommodations that they would normally live in if they were out of the military service. This is not asking too much of this great country of ours.

Sometimes in our consideration of housing, I feel that the Congress and the country have been too miserly for the reason, I suppose, that most of us know something about housing, its expenses, its drawbacks, and what it requires of individuals to become homeowners. None of us will hesitate to provide our services with the necessary implements of war, with airplanes, runways, hangars, and all of the many thousands of items of equipment that it takes to accomplish military security. We find that billions of dollars are being expended for these items and that they are necessary, yet when it comes down to the question of providing living quarters for the personnel who are to man such equipment we become ultraconservative and have adopted a negative approach. This bill, gentlemen, recognizes that there has been a fundamental,



costly mistake in this area. In a small measure, this bill seeks to put the housing in its proper perspective and commence a sensible program of providing this relatively inexpensive necessity to our entire military program.

Remember, gentlemen, that our military people are subject to orders. The civilian can refuse to move and take jobs if housing is not available, but once a man has enlisted in the military service, or has been commissioned, he goes where he is ordered to go and where his country says he is needed without regard to the facilities provided for him and his family. He cannot refuse. It is up to us to recognize that we have not provided the essential housing in order that these men might live as Americans and as we would insist that they should live.

In our travels we have found that because of housing conditions many of the military officers and men when assigned to new locations are forced to buy houses at high prices. When orders come for them to move, they must sell those houses and buy new ones at the new location to which they have been assigned. It might be contended that in the past such personnel have made a profit on the purchase and sale of housing since the real-estate market was generally moving upward until this year. However, the fact indicates that such personnel are not in a position to speculate on whether the prices are going up or down, since all of their savings go into the purchase of such houses, plus the fact that they cannot hold them for a better price when selling because they need the money out of the old house before buying another one at the new duty station. Gentlemen, we all know that if we were personally forced to buy and sell our homes every 2 years, that we could not hope to remain solvent. The saying in the military is that three moves will break you. Your committee believes that this is unfortunately true. I am sure that you will all agree with me that we are not considering the welfare of our people when we continue to force them into this type of situation. I am also sure that you will agree with me that such a condition cannot help but injure morale of the forces and, of course, the efficiency and effectiveness of our military forces.

Industry that operates on the profit motive has found it necessary to provide decent living quarters at a reasonable rent to its people. They have found it pays in the long run for the company itself to provide this housing if not otherwise available, and they have found it is not always otherwise available. As a practical matter, it amounts to money in the stockholders' pockets if by expending a relatively small amount of money for housing, they are able to stabilize their work force. We have expended great amounts of money for our military installations and equipment and very little for housing in order to stabilize our work force. Frankly, it does not make sense. Many examples of industry-built housing are undoubtedly known to each of you. A few outstanding ones that I desire to bring to your attention are such as action

taken by the Hershey Chocolate Co., in Hershey, Pa. There we find a complete community. A current example is the Clarke Thread Co., of Albany, Ga. Here we find that the company has constructed 500 family units to be sold or rented to their employees. Another one is Fairless Works, United States Steel Co. at Morrisville, Pa. The company is developing a new community with all facilities, including 13,000 housing units for sale or rent to employees. These examples may be expanded many, many times. The point I wish to make is that if it pays for private industry to do this, and you know that it does, it certainly will pay us to take the same measures in managing our Military Establishment which has many more problems inherent in it than we find in industry.

Now let me turn to the question of economy. Although we all believe that the betterment of morale among our troops will itself result in economy, since all of us know that happy and contented workers make for better and more efficient operations, I will be the first to admit that such things are intangible and cannot be measured exactly. Therefore, I would like now to discuss those aspects of economy which this bill seeks to remedy, which can be measured. For this purpose, I have selected one of the services, the Air Force, to show you what it means to this very important first line of defense; namely, the Air Force. Your committee has found that the Air Force cannot expand any faster than it can secure trained men in the hard-core skills. In other words, mere numbers of men are not the answer. The Air Force can only expand as fast as it can develop its hard-core skills. We find that the Air Force can secure these trained men in only two ways: First, from industry; or, second, train them itself. It goes without saying that the military cannot get such men from industry, so the second alternative to train them themselves is what is done. However, in the Air Force your committee has found that the training period is so long that not much gain is made during the first enlistment. The training pays off only if the Air Force can keep their men beyond the first enlistment. Unfortunately, unless the Air Force is able to do something to make the career service more attractive, it does not appear that they will be able to get enough enlisted men to reenlist to insure the quality of personnel that the Air Force needs. At the present time, the Air Force is set at a 137-wing program with a manning of 975,000 people. The facts developed in our hearings on this bill indicate that the Air Force must get at least from the beginning of fiscal 1955 through fiscal 1957, a reenlistment rate of 33 percent.

The reenlistment rate of 33 percent is a minimum since the Air Force does not believe, and I agree with them, that without it this country can get sufficient new enlistments to attain the total figure of 975,000.

This bill which we are presenting to you today will help the Air Force attain a higher reenlistment rate. Your committee feels that this is essential to the defense of the Nation.

Let us look at what the chances are of getting a 33 percent reenlistment rate or better, since 33 percent is an absolute minimum. In February of 1954, the Air Force had a 5 percent sample survey made. Of all airmen whose enlistments would expire during fiscal 1955, it appeared that only 26 percent indicated that they were going to reenlist. Thirty percent of the individuals due for separation in fiscal 1955 are airmen who have had more than one enlistment in the Air Force and of this group, 64 percent have indicated that they would reenlist, proving beyond a doubt that the Air Force contention that once a man has got past his first enlistment, there is a good chance of keeping him. The first termers, composed of 70 percent of the group, indicated that only 9½ percent intended to reenlist. In order to get a 33½ percent reenlistment rate, the Air Force must raise the number of reenlistments of these first termers to 20 percent. One of the main reasons given by the men for their unwillingness to reenlist is the lack of adequate family housing accommodations. If the Air Force is able to demonstrate to these people that it is doing everything within its power, with the assistance of the Congress, to make the military career more attractive your committee is sure that it would be enough to tip the scales in the Air Force favor for a large percentage of them. Your committee is further convinced, after studying the problem intimately, that it is practically self-evident that our Government would in the long run be many dollars ahead by permitting the expenditure necessary to build military family housing and other necessary facilities.

I am sure that you have all heard various dollar figures stated as being a loss to the Government when a man does not reenlist. The figures have ranged all the way to \$14,000 for an enlisted man and \$41,000 for an officer. If we disregard the above high figures and consider only the enlisted man, on the most conservative basis possible, your committee has found that the Government will lose at least the cost of training the individual. The provable minimum cost in the Air Force, which does not take into consideration intangible costs, amounts to \$2,500 per man.

As you all know, when an enlisted man leaves the service he receives certain benefits. These benefits include, among other things, mustering-out pay; lump-sum payment for accrued leave; if he is unemployed, he may be entitled to unemployment compensation in the amount of \$26 a week for 26 weeks; and he has all the rights and privileges of the GI bill of rights which includes substantial payments for education. In addition, he may receive a bonus from the State in which he resides. It would, therefore, appear that the incentives that exist are incentives to leave the military service rather than incentives to stay in the military service. Your committee recognizes that as long as we have the draft, these benefits cannot be taken away since they were established to help the serviceman make up for the losses he sustained because he entered the service

of his country. These benefits, from that standpoint, serve a worthwhile purpose, but they are certainly making the job of maintaining adequate service forces difficult. I bring this matter to your specific attention because I am afraid that we have all failed to recognize the serious problems confronting our Military Establishment in retaining personnel that the country has expended thousands of dollars to train.

These benefits that I have mentioned, including the GI bill of rights benefits, are a cost to the United States that the United States would not have to pay if the man did not leave the military service. Therefore, the loss to the United States Government when an enlisted man fails to re-enlist is not only the \$2,500 training cost but was the amount of money the Government is required to pay under these benefits. Forget for the moment all benefits except the benefits for education. We find that approximately 40 percent of all Korean veterans will take some educational benefits and that the average period of education to which they will be entitled is approximately 18 months at an average cost of \$100 per month.

The Air Force provided me with two examples to support this conclusion. During 1953, the 9th Bomb Wing was reassigned from Travis Air Force Base, Calif., to Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho. Mountain Home, Idaho, is approximately 60 miles from Boise, Idaho. Due to the isolated nature of this station and lack of adequate housing facilities, no reenlistments occurred within the organization until physical evidence was presented to the airmen that the housing problem would be solved. Once the Air Force was able to show the airmen that housing was actually going up, reenlistments started to come in. This same situation was characteristic of the movement of the 42d Bomb Wing from Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Tex., to Limestone Air Force Base, Maine. One individual example was at March Air Force, Riverside, Calif. This is a Strategic Air Command key station. At this station, the Air Force has 3,500 families living off the station. Recently an airman reported to his commander that he either had to be assigned quarters on the station, receive an increase in pay, or seek some method of separation from the service. He was forced to occupy a set of quarters in the local community for an approximate rental, including utilities, of \$125 per month. His basic pay is \$107.02 and his quarters allowance is \$77.10. The airman pointed out that he had to give up his automobile, he had been unable to pay for adequate clothes for his youngster, and at the present time they were running out of food and had no money to buy essential food items for the remainder of the month. The commander inspected the set of quarters occupied by the airman and found them clean, quite small and though his wife and the child were spotlessly clean, they were not what you might consider well-dressed, and it was apparent that they were certainly making a definite effort to maintain some dignified standard of

living. All current bills were paid, but the airman could see no solution because each month the same conditions were going to be characteristic of this case. In discussing this case with the station commander, he pointed out that he had no set of quarters that he could assign to this airman on the base, which would have helped to some extent. The only solution that he could offer in this immediate case was an outright grant from the welfare fund of the necessary funds to meet living costs for the balance of that month. Unfortunately, this is not an isolated case. Your committee has found that it is true at many stations throughout the United States. It appears, therefore, that it would be desirable to take some of the savings which might accrue from the increase of reenlistment rate to create the conditions, one of which is housing, which would make the Air Force career more attractive. This not only will save money to the Government as demonstrated above, but will also raise the quality and the morale of our forces.

Now, let us see whether all these benefits to the Government; for example, the increase of quality and the saving of training costs and GI benefits, can result without the expenditure of a large sum of money.

Under current legislation, a soldier or airman with two dependents is authorized a quarters' allowance of \$77.10, regardless of his grade or length of service. An airman with three or more dependents is authorized a quarters' allowance of \$96.90, regardless of grade or length of service. Officers' allowances, under current legislation, are as follows: Second lieutenant, \$85.50; first lieutenant, \$94.20; captain, \$102.60; major, \$119.70; lieutenant colonel, \$136.80; colonel, \$136.80; general officer, \$171. Statistics indicate that the average Air Force family is comprised of 3.1 individuals.

If we make the following assumptions, namely, that one-fourth of the proposed program of housing will be designated to meet officer requirements and three-fourths enlisted requirements, therefore the construction of the proposed program will provide for a reduction in the quarters allowance appropriation of about \$12 million each year. After 14 years the property would be paid for and would continue to return to the Government money at the rate of \$12 million per year. It is estimated that the life of this housing will be 35 years. This means that after the total cost of construction has been returned to the Government the Government will save very large sums each year in addition to money saved through increasing the reenlistment rate.

To state the problem simply and concisely, this country spends many millions of dollars to construct a base and provide plant facilities, additional millions to provide up-to-date mechanical aircraft equipment, and millions to adequately train personnel and then lose the effect of the spending of the many millions by refusing to provide approximately \$5 million in family housing at a base to make the military organization at the

particular base an integrated effective military force.

A B-47 aircraft costs approximately \$2 million, the training of the pilot costs approximately \$210,000, and the training of the balance of the crew and supporting specialists, to keep the aircraft and crew operating, costs approximately \$100,000. For this total outlay of \$2,310,000 per aircraft and crew, it only costs approximately \$50,000 to provide adequate family housing for essential members, thereby assuring that this aircraft and crew will remain an effective instrument of defense.

Your committee is trying to be practical and realistic about our problems relative to family housing—why we need it and where. We know, as you do, that the concepts of war have materially changed since World War II due to the development of long-range aircraft and the atomic and hydrogen bombs. The air bases have become war operational bases, both for offense and defense. All of the modern equipment and training will be of little avail in the initial stages of the next war if the men cannot reach this equipment in time to utilize it to prevent the successful accomplishment of the initial attack, if the very men whom we are relying on to man this equipment are, in too many instances, living so far from their duty post as to be ineffectual during the initial war stages. In other words, they would not be able to reach their planes in time to intercept the enemy. Certainly we do maintain alert crews, but when the chips are down and an all-out attack is launched against our country, the Air Force wants to be able to put into the air a maximum number of fighters and bombers immediately.

Simple economy, good business, and a proper regard for our military people and their defense mission, all dictate favorable consideration of this bill.

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

Mr. RIVERS. I yield the gentleman a half minute.

Mr. SIKES. I could use much more than that time, but I asked the gentleman to yield to pay tribute to him for his zealous service in behalf of the Armed Forces. I do not know of anyone who has labored more diligently to make the military career inviting.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman. I wish I had given him 5 minutes.

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

Mr. RIVERS. I yield, briefly.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I would like to say I think the Department of Defense will be before the Appropriations Committee in the immediate future, because these items are urgent, particularly in the ADC and Strategic Air Commands.

Mr. RIVERS. That is an important thing.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. SAC and ADC officials informed us they need some of these houses on the base as a fireman needs to be in the firehouse ready to slide down the pole when there is a fire.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman.



The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from South Carolina 1 additional minute.

Mr. RIVERS. I have gone into this matter thus at length and earnestly with you because after all the important thing is to keep the serviceman happy, keep him in the service serving his country happily. That is your responsibility, that is my responsibility.

Once I think it was related by the old Duke of Marlborough that one of his soldiers said to him:

God and the soldier were adored  
In time of danger, not before.  
The danger past and all things righted  
God is forgotten, the soldier slighted.

Now, in 1954, while time remains, we at home can reverse that in this day of world tension, waiting, as Syngman Rhee told us yesterday, waiting the call to death. Let not that be charged against us.

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

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I want to say that during the 22 years I have been here I have not heard a matter better presented, or more sound reasoning than the gentleman from South Carolina has just given the membership of this House.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am a strong believer in the Wherry Housing Act. I still favor Wherry housing. We need this bill, however. I will try to tell you why. However, I first want to answer a statement made a while ago of the investment that the taxpayer has in Wherry housing.

Directly, the taxpayer has no investment in Wherry housing, because it costs the taxpayer nothing originally.

The Wherry housing program operates like this: The Department of Defense at a permanent installation needs, we will say, 500 housing units. The sponsor gets a contract and builds those houses. It does not cost the Government a penny. However, the FHA guarantees the mortgage whereby the sponsor gets the money with which to build these houses. FHA guarantees it up to 90 percent. The only way the taxpayer can lose would be for the situation to develop where the rentals are not sufficient to amortize or pay out the mortgage and pay the taxes. In that event FHA has to come in and make up the shortage, but that has not happened so far.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. I think the gentleman should point out that this money is taken out of an insurance fund.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I am coming to that. The point is there is no appropriation required for Wherry housing. To this extent it is very advantageous. However, there is no getting away from

the fact that in the long run Wherry housing costs much more than the housing under this bill. It was pointed out by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] that a Wherry housing unit costs \$8,100 and occupied by the Government for 32 years, the Government has actually paid \$50,000 for the unit.

Under this bill the Government builds the house itself and the cost is amortized through quarters allowance for rental for the use of these units. The money goes into a revolving fund and stays with the Government. So here there is an initial appropriation.

Some mention has been made of Wherry housing abroad, and I want to touch upon that matter briefly. There is no such animal as Wherry housing abroad, but that term has been given to some housing that we have sponsored and accepted overseas. I will give you an example. In one country overseas we needed a number of units, several hundred, for military personnel. A private contractor said: "I will build those houses if you will guarantee 90 percent or 95 percent occupancy for a period of any 10 years." We said, "All right." So again there was no investment, and the only way we can lose is not to have sufficient personnel over there to keep those houses occupied for a period of 10 years. If a portion of them become unoccupied, the contractor can then lease them to private families, and we still only have to make up the difference. It was said in our committee that the only way we can lose under that arrangement is to have permanent peace and bring our troops back home. That is a price we are glad and willing to pay.

I think it should be pointed out also that Wherry housing cannot afford to be built, the sponsors cannot afford to build where there is only a small number of units. I believe the testimony shows the smallest number of units in any one place under the Wherry housing provision is 25 and generally they insist they must have 100 or more. Wherry housing makes money for the sponsors only where they build a large number. They cannot make money by building a few. One of the provisions in this bill provides for small numbers of housing units and installations where we cannot get Wherry housing. That is the only exception, where the housing sponsors will not agree to build them, anyway. Otherwise this bill provides for Government housing only in installations that are not permanent and where they do not have Wherry housing or where it is a permanent installation or where we have Wherry housing and replacements for substandard housing already built are necessary.

Mr. Chairman, strictly as a business proposition this bill represents sound policy. It involves money that one way or another would be an eventual cost of maintaining our Armed Forces. By making a capital investment now we can put some of our normal expense into permanent installations.

There is an aspect of this program which is not entirely dollars and cents. This is its importance to the creation

and maintenance of a hard core of experienced and devoted career soldiers, sailors, and airmen. In separate bills from time to time, this Congress has been dealing with this general problem, and this bill is one further step in developing a program to meet fundamental needs.

A sizeable nucleus of well-trained, continuous-service personnel is essential to each of our armed services—not only to keep the service ready for the unpredictable demands which may arise in this period of tension, but also to lead the relatively untrained individuals who must augment the services in time of emergency. Such a nucleus cannot be maintained without a definite effort to make service life acceptable to the highest type of men as a way of life.

This requirement of a hard core of professionals cannot be filled by personnel without families. Even if this were possible it would not be desirable. To attain a high order of military and technical efficiency these men must serve during the years when most Americans have become heads of families. We need the stability and responsibility that is characteristic of family men.

Some of the burdens which service life imposes cannot be eliminated because they are inherent. But service families in recent years have been under handicaps which may be accepted in wartime, but cannot be endured in the long haul. They have been concentrated in many areas which are already crowded by defense activities. They have been sent to isolated locations in which the civilian facilities do not even remotely meet the needs. And, at the same time, we have concentrated our efforts on building weapons and operational installations rather than the family accommodations which would have been considered normal in prewar years. As a result the individual service family almost as a general rule has had to choose between housing expense far beyond their means, or unsatisfactory housing. Too frequently, the only solution has been separation of the family.

This bill will not fill all of today's needs. It is at best a start, and an indication to service personnel that a measure of relief can be foreseen. It will begin the task of meeting the minimum long-term needs of the Military Establishment.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, this is purely an interim measure. It is going to take care of between 10 and 14 percent of the houses needed. The bill should be passed because, as has been pointed out, there is no question as to the desirability of getting houses at our defense installations and getting them in the shortest possible time.

Someone has raised the point that the Appropriations Committee would need time to examine the matter before it passed on it; but if we get the authorization through it is an indication that the Congress and the people are interested, and the engineering can be done even if

we wait until the next session of the Congress for the appropriation. It is the first step necessary to get this type of housing.

I want to make it very clear that I do not think Wherry housing is bad. The services do not like Wherry housing, but as I sense it, they do not like Wherry housing because they do not exercise the full control over it that they exercise over housing such as this. On the other hand, I am not going to condemn Wherry housing for that alone. I think it has a very definite place in the scheme and I want to make it clear that this subcommittee—I think I was as faithful in attending as anyone—heard very little evidence on the part of the Wherry people. It had no opportunity to give them a chance to meet the arguments made against Wherry housing. So, I am not going to condemn Wherry housing in any sense of the word, but that does not interfere with the necessity for this bill at this time.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I think the gentleman is correct, that the subcommittee heard very little testimony about Wherry housing. But, is it not true that prior to that time the committee heard a lot of testimony about Wherry housing specifically?

Mr. MILLER of California. We did, but I think there are a lot of things we should go into before we abandon a scheme that was set up to try and encourage private money to get into this field.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. We are also going to try to explore the problem a little further. It is part of our instructions to explore the problem further, and I am sure the gentleman will contribute toward that end like he has in the past.

Mr. MILLER of California. That is right. This matter will be explored. We are not closing the door on Wherry or any other kind of housing, but that does not say that this 10 percent, only 10 percent, of the needs is not justified and justified at this time to try to encourage the morale factor in the services.

Let me point out that it costs \$50,000 to train a pilot, and when you lose a pilot you lose that great investment. I just received a letter this morning, and I am only going to read one part of it. It is from the wife of a master sergeant. She says:

From all indications our heart's desire to have a family is going to be held in abeyance for a few more years. Sure, we could endeavor to make a home in one of the 18-foot PHA trailers on the base, which is the only housing facility available on—

I will leave the name of the base out—for families with less than two children. But, would you ask your family to make a home in a tiny trailer that is just big enough to turn around in—the type of vehicle that most people use for vacationing?

Now, how can you expect to hold people under those conditions when the home, the most sacred thing in our American tradition, is an 18-foot trailer in a place where it is not too pleasant to live in trailers?

Mr. Chairman, I again want to further labor the argument made briefly by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] that in the Air Defense Command the men have to be available on the base so that they can scramble and get into the air and not take 20, 30, or 40 minutes to get from their homes to the base. We depend on our Air Defense Command to keep back the bombers of the enemy. We want ADC planes in the air, and warning time is only a matter of an hour or an hour and a half.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I feel somewhat disturbed about the presentations that are being made regarding this bill, based upon the experience and observations that I have been permitted to participate in over a period of years in connection with the military. In other words, we find that under the Republican administration, in order to save money and to permit private business to become a functional factor in our economy, that we gave birth to the Wherry Act. The Wherry Act, insofar as my observations are concerned—and I have been on every one of the projects in continental United States with the exception of Florida—have been very satisfactory if the command reports that were given to me are correct. There were four in which the command reports were adverse, and I do not blame them, because they were cracker boxes that were built under an improper management concept, whether it be Wherry or any other housing.

I further feel that in the last minute the situation presented before the House is somewhat out of keeping with conditions. For example, I was privileged to have a copy of the original project presentations that were made by the military to the Committee on Armed Services. And in that what did I find? I found that in California, in my own congressional district, in a large Air Materiel Command base, there was a request for 154 Wherry housing units at an expenditure of some \$2.5 million or more. I called the command of that post over long-distance telephone for a clarification, because I had been on the post 2 weeks before. Their statement was that they had never made a request for that size of Wherry housing, had no use for it and had no place to put it, and had adequate housing for all other personnel in rented quarters and other housing categories, with the exception of three command houses.

Furthermore, I found in that presentation a request for housing at 29 Palms which is a Marine Corps project again partly in my congressional district and in that of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]. Here is another illustration of the Wherry Act that was acquiesced in by the military and was on its way to a construction contract.

I am just wondering, gentlemen, as I look over the complete list of projects as presented in this bill, how deeply these gentlemen have gone into the authenticity of these requirements on stations that are incorporated in the bill.

In other words, what are these gentlemen attempting to do here? I should like to ask the chairman, if I may, whether it is the concept of his committee, in its wisdom to avoid any further operations under the Wherry Act?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No; distinctly no.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The gentleman has answered my question.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. May I make one additional comment? When the gentleman's time has expired, I shall yield him an additional minute.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. We must naturally assume that the representatives from the Department of Defense are telling us the truth. If there is any such situation as that to which the gentleman has referred on the project in his district, I should like to look into that situation myself.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Let me say this to the gentleman. Somebody on the gentleman's committee looked into it because it was eliminated from the bill that we are presently considering, as compared with the original bill. Anyone who knows anything about these operations knows that these are the facts. What I am getting at is whether the information that is supplied in connection with this bill, as it affects each of these projects falls into the same class of hypothetical assumption as do those two projects to which I have referred or are they based upon fact? If there is anybody on the committee who is prepared to tell me of their own knowledge that it is based upon fact, I should appreciate it if they would.

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

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I represent the First Congressional District in South Carolina. We have a new air base at Charleston. They need 800 units. We gave them 500. They are building a big Marine base at Beaufort, S. C., with which I am sure the gentleman is familiar. You know what they need there; we gave them 50 units. They built a big naval hospital at Beaufort. The gentleman helped me break ground on that. I can tell the gentleman that in my district they need them. I cannot speak for anybody else. The gentleman will have to take the word of those who are representing those other districts.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I thank the gentleman very much. I am sorry that the gentleman cannot assume the responsibility for giving me the same answer concerning the other projects. Let us go a little further into the matter of the requirements of the military. I am as realistic about the requirements of the military as any one man on the



floor of this House. I have lived with their problems for a great many years and I have had deeply implanted in me a sympathy for their difficulties. I know what housing means to those families. I know that we have had families disrupted because there has not been adequate housing. But let me read something to the membership that might be extremely intriguing as to the whys and wherefores of losing so many of the military as we are losing. I should like to quote from an information services letter, the Air Force Information Services Letter dated June 11, 1954, volume VIII, No. 6. I shall quote this specific paragraph:

Referring to a recent informal survey of attitudes of Air Force dependents, the Secretary said it was found that 22 percent of the complaints received were remediable by the base commander, 24 percent remediable by the Department of the Air Force, and 6 percent remediable by Air Force personnel acting informally. Some 33 percent were remediable by legislation, or by governmental authority above the Air Force.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, first I want to call attention to the fact that throughout the history of our Nation we have built family quarters for members of the military with appropriated funds.

Back some years ago when we were having such tremendous difficulty in securing adequate housing for members of the Armed Forces the Wherry Act was adopted. I do not know of any understanding at that time that it had become the fixed policy of the Government that in the future all family quarters would be built under the Wherry Act. In any event, we did build many projects under the Wherry Act and they have been most helpful. It is true that they have filled a very great need. It is also true that under the Wherry Act all bases cannot be taken care of. In the first place, you cannot take care of temporary bases, and in addition you could not possibly build a Wherry project for items such as we have in this bill or for such a small number, from 4 up to 50, and things of that kind, that would not be justified under the Wherry Act.

It is true that about 3 years ago under the previous Democratic administration the President placed an arbitrary ceiling on the military budget. When we considered the public works bill on that occasion with the necessity of coming within the arbitrary budget fixed by the Democratic administration we found it absolutely essential to remove from the public works bill all family quarters to be built with appropriated funds. We at that time stated that they should be built under the Wherry Act. Again, we did not formulate any permanent policy of the Government that we would not again build with appropriated funds.

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

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How many of the projects that are delineated in the bill are in the category of the permanency declaration?

Mr. KILDAY. I will have to ask the members of the subcommittee to give me the information as to how many permanent and how many temporary stations there will be.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I understand they were all permanent, those that were designated. That is what the different departments told us, that they were permanent stations. Later I will place into the debate the specific facts.

Mr. KILDAY. In this bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes.

Mr. KILDAY. The point of that is that this represents a very small number of houses relatively. It represents only approximately 13,000, and the original request from the Department was for 25,000, making it perfectly clear that that was not nearly all that was needed.

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

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. If I understand the gentleman, this is only a down payment; \$175 million is only a down payment on a total request for \$1,750,000,000 if this is only 10 percent of what is needed.

Mr. KILDAY. I did not use the figure of 10 percent. Someone else ahead of me did.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I beg the gentleman's pardon; I thought he did. What percentage does the gentleman think it would be of the total?

Mr. KILDAY. I do not know. They told us they wanted 50,000 units ultimately. They asked for 25,000, and we have given them 13,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman's response as to permanency was that they were all permanent?

Mr. KILDAY. That is the way I understand it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If they are all permanent, there is no reason why Wherry housing could not be built insofar as the GI requirements are concerned, and a specific amount of houses for officers compatible with that decision. Is that correct or incorrect?

Mr. KILDAY. I assume it is the chairman of the subcommittee stated that that was the fact. I was not on the subcommittee. I assume the gentleman is correct in his statement.

We are bringing in here line items. The question about building Wherry housing that cannot be filled has nothing to do with this situation. We have authorized here a small number of stations out of a much larger number requested by the Department. The subcommittee took the departmental request, examined into the number of Wherry units available at those stations, the number available in the community from private housing, and the number that could be built by private industry in that area. They determined that these were houses that would not be built under any other program. You are not going to have a situation of Wherry housing projects being built that cannot be occupied. If these gentlemen from the Committee on Appropriations do what I know they are going to do in appro-

priating funds for these houses, you are not going to have that situation because they are again going to require that each one of those line items be justified to them. The gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] who preceded me and the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] who expressed himself while we had the rule under consideration are all members of the Committee on Appropriations and even though this authorization bill is passed, the Department will still have to go to the Committee on Appropriations and again justify by line item on each one of the items contained in this bill.

I mentioned in debate under the rule the fact that this will liquidate itself. From time immemorial, we have compensated our military personnel on the basis of pay and allowances. We have always had a quarters allowance and a ration allowance in addition to pay. The quarters allowance is fantastic in the amount of money which is involved.

I know you are in receipt of telegrams from sponsors of Wherry housing projects pointing to the fact that they are renting Wherry housing projects for less than the quarters allowance. That would indicate that there is a saving of the Government because of the fact that some of these houses are rented for less than the quarters allowance. That is not a saving to the Government. The Government must still pay out the full quarters allowance. It goes into the hands and the pockets of the military personnel. They receive it and they pay a smaller amount of rent. That is no saving to the Government. The obligation of the Government is a fixed obligation and the quarters allowance must be paid unless the Government supplies the personnel with Government quarters. This provides Government quarters. They will liquidate themselves in anywhere from 13 to 16 years. The Government will own them from the beginning. They are going to be built under competitive bids. They are not going to be built by negotiation and they are not going to be built pursuant to the approval of a project by FHA or any other agency. This does not involve the Government guaranteeing a loan where the builder would get a great deal more money than is required to build the project and consider the balance as a profit. That is a matter which is under consideration now by a committee in the other body as to these housing projects which were granted without competitive bids or by negotiation with the departments or by approval of a project submitted by one of the sponsors. These will be built by the Corps of Army Engineers for the Army and the Air Force and by the Bureau of Yards and Docks for the Navy. They must be procured under the uniform procurement act which requires competitive bids.

They are going to be built as military construction of this type is always built so that they will last practically forever. I know that many of us at times feel they build them too substantially. I know in my own district there are quarters which

were built in the early 1870's, officers' quarters, which are now the preferred quarters on the post because they were built in the early days to last forever. This is in accordance with our traditional system. It takes care of an emergency situation and one which goes very deeply to the question of our ability of maintaining our professional personnel. This is something we must do before this Congress adjourns. We have difficulty in retaining this personnel. The personnel knows that the final say so as to whether there will be housing rests with this Congress. The Department of Defense has announced through many press releases a program of housing which it has requested of the Congress. Are we going to adjourn and let the word go out to members of the military personnel that, although the Defense Department did all that they could to get housing, the Congress of the United States would not let them have it? I say at the very minimum this should be done for the welfare of our military personnel.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, no one will question the fact that additional family housing is needed for the armed services. It is true, however, the armed services were very late in making their needs known to the committee, and it is also true that the service representatives did not seem to have a proper understanding of the exact needs of the respective installations when they appeared before the committee.

I do not intend to be especially critical of the items in this bill, but I do want to point out that the Armed Forces have certainly been careless of the taxpayers' money in the abandoning and building of installations throughout the United States. There are scores of camps, forts, and other types of installations which the armed services argue are greatly needed. We later find that they have abandoned these installations and then clamor for money to build more and different installations. Throughout this country these abandoned posts are monuments to careless use of the taxpayers' money.

A good example of the abandonment of one Army installation in order to utilize another is the transfer of troops from Camp Atterbury, Ind., to Camp Carson, Colo. I do not care to go into the details of the intricate maneuvering in accomplishing this change. But I do want to point out that when the 31st Division was moved from Camp Atterbury to Camp Carson, Army officials stated they had ample barracks at Camp Carson and would not need additional funds. I was surprised a few months ago when, contrary to its previous statement, the Army in hearings on H. R. 8726, asked for \$7 million for additional barracks at Camp Carson.

This is merely one example of the careless manner in which the Army is spending the taxpayers' money in building new installations in this country at

the same time they are abandoning others.

I want to especially bring to the attention of the Committee the fact that in many instances the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy work at cross purposes and certainly do not work as members of the same team. Although the services cannot find any use for some of their installations they are extremely reluctant to allow others, especially another service branch, to make use of the installation. I have made some effort to get a list of the various abandoned, unused military and naval installations in the country and I have asked each service which of these installations they would be willing to allow one of the other services to use. They admit that they have no use for such installations, but they refuse to allow another branch to use it without a recapture clause.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that this recapture clause, as used between the services, is costing the American taxpayer millions of dollars. In effect this recapture clause means if this service wants to use this installation again they can immediately take it away from the service to which they have loaned it. For example: If there is an Army base that cost \$50 million of the taxpayers' money and the Army has abandoned it, and if, for example, the Air Force wants to use these facilities, construct runways, and use it as an airbase, the Air Force does so at its own peril, for the Army retains the right to "recapture" this base for its own use. Naturally the Air Force will not take over this base under such an agreement for then the 12 or 15 million dollars the Air Force would spend on runways and modifications would be lost when the Army demands recapture of the installation.

I believe the Secretary of Defense is doing a fine job. He has brought about many economies and has greatly improved the Armed Services. But I do want to point out that this field of making proper utilization of abandoned military bases is most important, and a proper control of the matter and the prevention of one service from being a "dog in a manger" in keeping another service from using an abandoned base should command the careful attention of the Defense Department. I have brought this matter informally to the attention of various members of the Defense Department, and I intend to bring it to their attention more forcefully in the future.

I want to also call attention to a resolution introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DRES], which would require an inventory of all Government property, the amount of money which such property originally cost the Government, and its present value. I believe such an inventory should be made, and its facts would be of great interest to this body, and might also influence the armed services policies in regard to unwanted and unused installations.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to correct a misstatement which I gave to the gentle-

man from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], when he asked me if these bases were all permanent. I find that the Army units provided here are permanent and the Navy units provided here are permanent. But all of the United States Air Force, especially the AEC stations, are not permanent. They are temporary stations, and they are a very small fraction of the total amount. This is a more specific answer to the question by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILPATRICK] and the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

I would like to pay my compliments to the members of the subcommittee who served with me. We had a very difficult job. Our views sometimes differed. Everybody was congenial, cooperative, and generous. In all the decisions we made, although we started out with different viewpoints, we finally arrived at a unanimous decision. We had a very difficult and complicated situation before us. We were pressed for time, because the Congress was coming to a close. It was a great pleasure to work with all these men, and I want them to know how much I appreciate their cooperation.

Mr. Chairman, in this matter we must remember that the people to whom we are most anxious to furnish houses are the sergeants and junior officers, the first and second lieutenants. They are the ones who fly the planes. They are the ones who do much to furnish leadership in the Navy and Army, and build morale in the lower echelon of command. If their morale is good, then the morale will be good all the way up. You must have good morale at every level, but the ones in the lower units, the enlisted men, the company officers, and field officers are the ones who come in contact with the enemy. They are the ones who liquidate the enemy. They are the ones who really win the wars. Of course, we include the field officers and all the way up to the top, but we must always keep in mind that the ones who win the wars are the ones who meet the enemy and liquidate the enemy. We cannot come out second place in a war if we are to survive. We must win if we are to survive.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Where in the bill is the limitation on the personnel to whom this housing is going? You say it is for first and second lieutenants and the enlisted men. Where do we find that in the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Well, it was testified in the hearings. I cannot go into the details, but they told us just what they were for in each item in the bill. Nine thousand, specifically, of the thirteen thousand were for enlisted men. Of the others a great proportion goes to the junior officers, and a smaller proportion to the field officers.

Mr. GROSS. There is nothing in the bill to prevent a major or a colonel or a lieutenant colonel from taking over quarters assigned previously to a first or second lieutenant?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is an administrative problem. There is nothing to stop that. But what we are



trying to do in this bill is to bolster the morale and retain the services of these officers personally who really win the war.

I do hope that the House will look with favor on this bill. As has been pointed out by myself and others, this takes care of only 10 percent of the projected need for housing. We are not going into the question of projected need; we are looking at the situation as we see it today and in the future, maybe a decade at least; and we are trying to provide the security that the country demands and needs by doing something for those who may have to win the war for us.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield. Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to ask why you have done nothing for Massachusetts with the exception of the Air Force installation at Otis?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I cannot answer that. We did not do anything by States. We are taking the projects that we were told were considered as being most seriously in need of housing.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Was there any recommendation for the air field at Bedford?

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield. Mr. DEVEREUX. I would like to say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that the committee did not specify the sites of these projects that were presented to us. The various services came before us and said these were the most critical places where such housing was needed right now to start this whole project going.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Most critical?

Mr. DEVEREUX. Most critical, yes. Mr. COON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield. Mr. COON. I notice that the airport at Beal was recommended for 236 units. I was told the other day by a gentleman who visited the Pentagon that the Pentagon was undecided as to whether it was going to keep Beal as a permanent installation or nonpermanent. Can the gentleman answer as to why this project was allowed for Beal?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The answer is that we were informed there was this need for housing there and that it was a permanent base.

Mr. COON. They did state it was a permanent base?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired, under the rule all time has expired.

The Clerk will read.  
The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.—*

#### TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army is authorized further to develop military installations and facilities by providing family housing for personnel of the military departments and their dependents by the construction or installation of public works, which

include site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, equipment, and the acquisition of land, as follows:

#### Continental United States

##### (Third Army area)

Fort Campbell, Ky.: 325 units of family housing, \$4,906,000.

##### (Fourth Army area)

Fort Bliss, Tex.: 272 units of family housing, \$3,845,000.

Fort Hood, Tex.: 639 units of family housing, \$9,548,000.

##### (Fifth Army area)

Camp Carson, Colo.: 1,447 units of family housing, \$21,508,000.

Camp Crowder, Mo.: 74 units of family housing, \$1,106,000.

##### (Sixth Army area)

Fort Lewis, Wash.: 1,110 units of family housing, \$16,450,000.

Camp Cooke (U. S. Disciplinary Barracks), Calif.: 50 units of family housing, \$737,000.

Yuma Test Station, Ariz.: 20 units of family housing, \$297,000.

##### (Quartermaster Corps)

Belle Mead General Depot, N. J.: 10 units of family housing, \$178,000.

##### (Chemical Corps)

Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: 30 units of family housing, \$499,000.

##### (Signal Corps)

Fort Huachuca, Ariz.: 208 units of family housing, \$3,102,000.

Department of the Army Transmitting Station, Virginia: 10 units of family housing, \$168,000.

##### (Corps of Engineers)

Fort Belvoir, Va.: 306 units of family housing, \$4,460,000.

##### (Transportation Corps)

Fort Eustis, Va.: 271 units of family housing, \$4,065,000.

Wilmington Ammunition Terminal, North Carolina: 4 units of family housing, \$77,000.

##### (Army Security Agency)

Two Rock Ranch Station, Calif.: 10 units of family housing, \$178,000.

##### (Armed Forces special weapons project)

Sandia Base, N. Mex.: 3 units of family housing, \$88,000.

Killeen Base, Tex.: 5 units of family housing, \$110,000.

##### (Tactical sites)

Various locations: 300 units of family housing, \$4,433,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of California (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment which comes at page 3, line 9. I am going to combine what I might say on the bill as a whole, with what I have to say on that amendment, and it would be appreciated if I could get an opportunity to offer that so I could discuss the bill before everybody else on the floor has had a chance to offer amendments and discuss the bill; so I am constrained to object, unless that can be understood.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is a matter entirely within the hands of the Chair.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Then, Mr. Chairman, I object.

(The Clerk continued the reading.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and two Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will the Chair recognize Members who have amendments or those who have pro forma amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize members of the committee to offer amendments.

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

Mr. Chairman, undoubtedly the need for housing has been one of the most serious factors affecting the personnel of the Nation's Armed Forces. I feel that this committee should be commended for its effort toward alleviating this very serious problem. It is a situation which has dealt particularly adversely with the younger officers of the armed services and with the enlisted personnel. So I think the Nation generally will welcome the efforts that are being made here to correct in part—and this is only a beginning—that serious problem.

I take this time primarily to ask for more information about the proposal which is brought here by the Committee on Armed Services of the House and, if I might have the attention of my distinguished friend, the gentleman from California, who is chairman of the subcommittee, I would like to ask him at this time who will build the housing proposed in this bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It will be under the regular procurement system. There will be competitive bidding, the bidder must qualify substantially by putting up a bond and so forth.

Mr. SIKES. Then all bidders who are qualified will be eligible to compete and presumably the award will be made to the lowest responsible bidder in each case?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is my understanding.

Mr. SIKES. Will the gentleman tell me who will operate this housing after it is built? Will it be the persons who build the houses or will it be the Government?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It will be the Government, the particular branch of the service that the particular station involves.

Mr. SIKES. After the houses are built and occupied, who will own the houses?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The United States Government will own the houses, just like it does on all permanent stations like the Presidio of San Francisco, for instance.

Mr. SIKES. Then this is a return, as I understand it, to the old type of military housing which was constructed on military bases prior to World War II in which the Government built the houses through competitive bids, operated the housing for the benefit of military personnel, and owned the housing units.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is correct. This is the traditional way that we built houses for the military from the inception of the Republic up to the Second World War.

Mr. SIKES. Undoubtedly there are areas where many people will welcome a return to that policy. This, then, has no relation to the Wherry Act which has been used for a number of years in order to provide housing for military personnel?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It has not. In my opinion, this does not affect or injure the Wherry housing program.

Mr. SIKES. There is an additional question I would like to ask the gentleman, and I appreciate his courtesy in answering these questions. A number of communities have felt that they are qualified to provide sufficient housing to provide for military personnel through FHA, and that it is not necessary in those communities for the Government to build, operate, and own housing. Has the gentleman's committee gone thoroughly into the possibility of having needed housing for military personnel constructed by private builders through FHA?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. We did not go into that, but in every project submitted to us it was preceded by an investigation of the particular military branch involved as to the available rental houses in nearby communities that could be used by the servicemen.

Mr. SIKES. Then is the gentleman telling me that the availability of FHA housing and other private housing has been carefully screened and that this measure is intended only to relieve the most acute housing problems now existing where there is not sufficient existing housing in nearby communities?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is correct.

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

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I wish to say that the subcommittee was charged with two jobs: One was to get a bill out for emergency housing, which is this bill. Then it has a further study to work on in the future on the overall policy, to wit, everything the gentleman from Florida has inquired about, and make recommendations as to a permanent policy or plan. That is work to be done next year. This is an interim bill, an interim piece of legislation, to take care of emergency needs right now.

Mr. SIKES. I have been told repeatedly that the number of houses that are provided in this measure will take care only of a part of present emergency needs.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Ten percent of the peacetime requirements and only 50 percent of what the military authorities now declare to be essential. They asked

for \$350 million, and it has been reduced to \$175 million.

Mr. SIKES. In the event that additional privately owned housing is made available through FHA or through other means in the communities adjacent to the military bases which are affected by this bill, will there be a corresponding reduction of the housing units carried in this program for those bases?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. So far as possible, yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. In the event that private owners or FHA build houses in cities adjacent to bases, we are not going to abandon the houses on the bases and have the military rent houses in the cities away from the bases.

Mr. SIKES. That was not the purpose of my inquiry. My inquiry was, if there should be houses available, will you still build the military houses provided in this bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No. That is what I said. The availability of houses was presented in every single instance, and we considered that, before we made a specific authorization of each group in this bill.

Mr. SIKES. You have taken that into consideration in drafting the bill. But, will you continue to take it into consideration until the contracts actually are let for this housing so that private builders will be encouraged to provide housing where possible?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I understand it will be continued.

Mr. SIKES. That information will be helpful to communities throughout the country.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise briefly in opposition to pro forma amendment in order to make a comment in connection with the questions raised by the gentleman from Florida. One of the things that has been insisted upon, I might say to the gentleman, in connection with this question of supply of houses has been that there be an accurate determination as to the availability of private rental housing in the surrounding community. There have been times when I have felt that information submitted was not entirely accurate or complete; but insofar as the committee was able to secure that information and insofar as the military are able to provide it, the requirements for family housing on specific installations was reduced by the amount of satisfactory rental units available within commuting distance of the post. We are concerned with total housing availability, including publicly owned quarters, Wherry projects, and privately owned accommodations.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS: On page 3, strike out lines 1, 2, and 3.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, the reason that I did what I did not like to do, a minute ago when I objected to the unanimous consent request—and I hope my friends on the committee are not offended—is that I thought I could save time by talking on this amendment and

talking on the general subject of the bill at the same time.

I think there is a misunderstanding about the bill. There is some misunderstanding, perhaps, on both sides. I think it can be cleared up. I think the record that is being made today will go a long distance toward clearing up some of the points I believe are at issue.

First of all, frankly, I do not see any urgency in this bill. I do not see the necessity of having this bill here today. I think it might have waited in the committee until January and then come out, after having had more study given to it.

I should like to make clear my own personal interest in it. I am the chairman of the committee that puts up the money for the Housing and Home Finance Agency. I see my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] over here, and other members of my subcommittee. Our committee has the money for FNMA. We are seriously concerned with the effect of this bill, as it is presented, upon the integrity of mortgages which have been issued, to the extent of \$1,400,000,000.

How did this come about? During the years when we needed all the money that we could get for defense, for the actual war, it was decided that if private industry would build these houses, we would take advantage of that. That was the Wherry Act, so called. The contractors went out and built these houses. They have their money invested in them. By a slip of the tongue, in colloquy with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], I said that the taxpayers had their money in it. What I meant was that the taxpayers would otherwise have had their money in it. It would have gone beyond the debt limit. Actually, this would have thrown us beyond the debt limit, if that had been possible. Therefore, this bill is extremely important. The taxpayers have, however, guaranteed the \$1½ billion, through FNMA.

The first draft of this bill contained a long list of projects, as the gentlemen from the committee have indicated today. I was personally familiar with some of those projects. There was one project across the river in Arizona, which I was familiar with personally. On that project, the commanding officer said, less than a year ago, that he did not need additional houses. I see that that project was stricken out of the revised bill.

There was one to which my colleague from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] referred, that is mostly in his district, and some of the land is over in my district. There was \$1 million that was to be spent for housing at that place, but it was pointed out to the committee that they had already let contracts on which there were 5 contractors bidding, and that they had already let contracts under the Wherry Act to build there. So the committee struck that out.

Then there was a case at the Norton Air Base, that my friend from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] also mentioned. A telephone call to the commanding officer at that base brought out the fact that he had not asked for any houses. That was stricken out. Then there was one at Pittsburgh where a great many houses



were available in the city. There are 50 or more houses in this bill. There were houses provided for that base and some of them were left in.

In other words, there has not been the detail work on this subject, for this bill, that it should have.

There was one case up in Utah. My knowledge of that is personal. I had to go down, with the contractors, to the HHFA authorities and get permission to delay the first payments so that they could use their own money to remodel the houses, in order that they might be occupied, from the plans originally given them by the Chemical Corps.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chair—will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. The gentleman is referring to the Dugway project?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. It is my understanding that there were 400 units of Wherry housing constructed at Dugway originally.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I understand so.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Of that number, it is my understanding that for at least a year there were over 200 vacancies.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Because of the original plans of the Chemical Corp. Those were corrected. Those were remodeled at the expense of the contractors. There are still 17 vacancies. I am told the contractors are willing to build more if necessary. The point is, if we build a lot of \$15,000 and \$20,000 houses, there will be a suction that will take people out of the Wherry-plan houses.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PHILLIPS was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. PHILLIPS. I would like to get the situation before you, because I think there are solutions that can be adopted here today.

Dugway is a good example. There was a project put up with private money which I am very sure will have the FNMA mortgages jeopardized and the investments jeopardized if this bill goes through. My amendment strikes out lines 1, 2, and 3 on page 3 to meet that issue.

Let us see about the other objections. First of all, let us take up the Appropriations Committee's objection. I think that has been pretty well cleared up. I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, will accept the statement that it is not intended to bypass the Appropriations Committee, although the report on page 7 indicates that that was the earlier intention. I take it that is cleared up, so we pass that.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That was before the cuts were made by the Appropriations Committee. As of the date we wrote the report, that was the correct statement. We concede that it does not pertain now.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I take the gentleman's word that it is the intention that

the authorization shall go to the Appropriations Committee and the Appropriations Committee shall appropriate the money.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is correct.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is the routine process. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Then let us take a look at this matter of whether these houses are for generals or for privates. My friend from California [Mr. JOHNSON] says we have to do something for the enlisted men. There is not a particle of objection to that part of the conversation. We have to have houses for enlisted men; we have to have more houses, and the military has to build a lot of them. There is no controversy on that point. The point at issue here is whether we shall take the taxpayers' money to pay for housing which could be built by private money, and, second, whether we shall jeopardize the money already invested by contractors, and make FNMA pick up the money, which throws it back on the taxpayers.

Here is one unit at Barstow, which is in the district of my friend here; \$27,000 for that house. Ten units at Oakland, in the city of Oakland. Why do we build houses in the city of Oakland at \$15,200 apiece? Two units at Coronado, at \$23,650 apiece. Are those for privates? No, they are for generals. Go ahead and build houses for generals.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. What is the gentleman's interpretation from the presentations that have been made today as to how many GI's will be benefited by this housing as compared with noncommissioned officers and officers, under this authority?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I do not know. This calls for 13,000 houses. I do not think we have that many generals and admirals ready to move in, but if it is so, let them move in, but let us build them where we really need them for the enlisted men.

Here is the startling thing, and I am glad the gentleman brought that up. It is now said this bill covers only 10 percent of what is needed, which means we are really talking about a need for a billion dollars to be spent out of the taxpayers' money, when it could probably be spent out of the money of private builders.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. The gentleman raised the question about Oakland. I want to point out that there is a naval hospital at Oakland, Calif., 10 units for \$152,000. That is \$15,200 a unit, and that is the company-grade officer type of unit. These are for the doctors at Oak Knoll Hospital, and if the gentleman is familiar with the location in Oakland, Calif., of the Oak Knoll Hospital, he knows it is located in an area of very high residential values. These are the young doctors, the lieu-

tenants who have to be on the job and do the ward work at the hospital 24 hours a day.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I have no objection to these doctors having nice houses, but I still think we do not want to jeopardize the Wherry investment. Do not forget we put an \$8,000 limit on what the Wherry contractors can build. We say they can build a house for \$8,100, but then we say you have to have houses costing \$16,000. If you will strike out this project, which I happen to know about, if you can do that—and there may be others that other people know about—then I may not have to go down myself to the HHFA, and straighten out what otherwise would be a severe financial loss to the Treasury of the United States. Secondly, if the committee will offer an amendment, which I understand is at the desk, which clears up this matter of whether or not we are going to be in competition with Wherry projects, and put these houses where there are Wherry houses available, and in that way again jeopardize the Government's investment and throw it back on the Treasury; and third, I am willing to accept the statement of the gentleman from California, and other Members, that this will go under routine procedure through the Committee on Appropriations, then it seems to me we have wiped out a great deal of the argument here today, although I still think the proper place for the bill is back in the committee for more study.

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

Mr. Chairman, of course, we are going to have a great deal of opposition from the Wherry housing people on any building of quarters anywhere. As a matter of fact, they have gone to quite an extreme. I received a letter the other day, which I would like to quote in part:

We do state and represent to you and call to your attention the fact that this procedure "which is the time-honored traditional way of providing housing," which could only be inspired by Communist thinking—

Now, when the Wherry housing people go to that extreme, I wonder why they do it?

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

Mr. DEVEREUX. I would like to complete my statement, please.

Mr. GAVIN. Would the gentleman tell us who wrote the letter—what firm wrote the letter?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I do not care to do that.

Mr. Chairman, let us find out why we do not favor more Wherry housing. As I said, when we were talking on the rule, actually we cannot get sponsors for Wherry housing in many places. Strangely enough, when Wherry housing started in 1949 we had 12 projects approved. In 1950, we had 65. In 1951, we had 83, and in 1952 we had 64. In 1953, we had 55 projects approved. Strangely enough, however, in the first half of that year, we had 52 projects approved. But in the second half of the year, only 3 projects were approved. I

wonder why we did not have more sponsors for projects. In the middle of 1953, we passed Public Law 94, which required a cost certification upon which we would base the Federal Government's guaranty of the mortgages. I do not know whether that had anything to do with it or not, but so far in this half of 1954, we have only gotten 12 units approved. I would like to direct my remarks to the Dugway Proving Ground. The suggestion has been made that we have not, as a subcommittee, gone into this proposition very thoroughly. The objectors to having any additional building there are the people from the Wherry housing projects, where we have 400 units. We have taken into consideration Wherry housing, title IX, FHA insured, and rentals other than title IX, and the Lanham Act housing. We know we will have a peacetime need for a certain number of units, and we subtract the number of Wherry housing units available and we come up with a deficit of 544 units that are absolutely needed for the peacetime number of officers and men that we will have stationed at Dugway.

I cannot for the life of me see why the Wherry housing people are objecting to this traditional type of financing of our Government housing. It has been brought out time and again that actually we are going to save money, and when we amortize these houses through the traditional way of doing it, Uncle Sam will have something he can put his finger on. Under the Wherry plan, we get title to them in some cases after 50 years and in some 75 years. I wonder what type of housing we will have at the end of that time.

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

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

Mr. THOMAS. There is no question about it, the military forces need far more housing than they now have. I have looked over your report and I fail to find it in there. Is there a limitation on the cost of any of the types of houses to be constructed under this bill?

Mr. DEVEREUX. Yes. We have a limitation.

Mr. THOMAS. Will you give it to us, please?

Mr. DEVEREUX. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. THOMAS, Mr. DEVEREUX was granted 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. DEVEREUX. I thank the gentleman.

For enlisted men we have a limit of \$12,850 per unit.

Mr. THOMAS. How many bedrooms is that?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I am informed 2 or 3 bedrooms, although I do not have definite information.

Mr. THOMAS. A 2-bedroom house built on Government property at \$12,850?

Mr. DEVEREUX. That is right.

Mr. THOMAS. That is pretty expensive housing. That does not include the

cost of the land, because you assume the Government already owns it. That is approximately \$15,000 for 2 bedrooms.

Mr. DEVEREUX. For company grade officers it is \$15,000; for field grade, \$20,250; and for general grade \$27,000.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. Page 404 of the act, it says "Not to exceed 250 of these family units shall have a net floor area not to exceed 2,100 square feet." It is the number of square feet that we put into this housing that determines whether they are company grade or field grade. So that this limitation on the number of square feet that go into the houses will determine the limitation.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. DEVEREUX. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad the gentleman from Texas asked that question. I have been trying to do it for an hour or so. That does not tell us how much these units will cost, built on Government property.

Mr. DEVEREUX. What is the value of the land on Government property. That would have to be considered. There apparently seems to be some objection to a general officer having a house that costs \$27,000. A general officer has quarters allowance of \$171 a month. At that rate it is normal to expect that the housing would be amortized in around 20 years.

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

Mr. DEVEREUX. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. First of all, I do not think anybody is going to object to general officers having suitable houses, but what we are talking about is units for enlisted men.

The gentleman said the Wherry contractors would not build any more houses. I am under the impression that they have not been asked to, and I know the members of the committee did not give the Wherry people a chance to be heard on the bill as it is now before us. On the original bill they expressed themselves, and deletions resulted, but on the consideration of the bill the second time there was, if the gentleman remembers, a quorum call of the House and the subcommittee never did get back to the hearing again. So the people involved have not had a chance to express themselves on the present bill.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I will agree to that but I am sure the gentleman from California will agree that in this particular case where there is a demonstrated need for 544 houses and only 30 are to be built, certainly that is not going to impair the integrity of the Government's guaranty.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am sorry, but I do feel just that. As a matter of fact there are 17 vacancies right now. If you build 30 houses now at Dugway it will be like a vacuum. The tenants will be sucked out, not from the cities, but out of existing units on the project.

Mr. DEVEREUX. The gentleman does not have the figures that we have. At the present time we have 58 officers, 575 enlisted men, and 990 civilians, a total of 1,623. But shortly we will have a peacetime complement of 139 officers, 673 enlisted men, and the same number of civilians. Therefore the people who are saying that their investment might be jeopardized do not have the facts and figures. We do have the facts and figures as presented to this committee.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Did not the committee say to the contractors you would let them build additional houses?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the Dugway situation. Reference to page 5589 of the hearings will show that at the time the bill was first read there were 60 units in the bill. The gentleman from Iowa and I got into a colloquy and we agreed to halve it, so we came up with 30 units.

I would like to say to my colleague from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] that I do not think he has to worry very much about building 30 units at Dugway or that it will have a great deal of effect on the situation at Dugway because, as the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX], has said, the need out there is far greater than can be filled. I therefore agree with him that this is one of the best places for additional housing and that we should do something.

There are some 17 or 20 vacancies at Dugway and at some place in the hearings it was brought out that these were in the 3-bedroom units, that when the project was built it was the military that guessed wrong as to the number and type of units that should be put in. The sponsor has told me that he is willing to make those large three-room units into smaller units by subdividing them if the military will agree to it. So I cannot hang any bouquets on the Army as far as Dugway is concerned.

While I am not going to vote for the amendment I say that I think the situation now will cause the thing to be looked into.

I would like to say to my friend, my good friend from southern California that I think when he introduced ancillary things into this such as the housing at Oakland he was not himself too well posted, because this is in the heart of a big city, and \$15,000 for a company officer type home in a big city would not produce a gorgeous creation. These are for the doctors, the young lieutenants, and lieutenants junior grade who have to be on hand 24 hours a day to meet the emergencies.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I will say that I did not know that they were for doctors. If they are for the doctors, it is all right. They are not the type of housing for enlisted men which the committee is talking about?



Mr. MILLER of California. No. At this installation, just as at other hospital installations, you will find nearly all of them are for doctors and wherever they are for doctors they are company officer type houses.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. In the survey here I thought there were 10 units for the naval supply center?

Mr. MILLER of California. There are. I was talking about the 10 units at the Oakland hospital.

Mr. YOUNGER. And there are also 10 units for the naval supply center?

Mr. MILLER of California. If the gentleman wants to go into that, if he is familiar with the location of the naval supply center, he knows it is removed at one end of Oakland where you have to go through a great industrial district and if he will look at the request it is for \$152,000, which is \$15,200 apiece, for the lower-grade company officers, the lower officers who have to be on the base to best serve the base. These are not for commanders, lieutenant commanders, or admirals. These are for the working officers on the base.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Can the gentleman tell us how far it is from downtown Oakland to the hospital?

Mr. MILLER of California. It is so far from downtown Oakland that when the Government was going to abandon it at one time and we thought we could get it for a veterans' hospital, the doctors who serve as consultants at the veterans' hospital in Oakland told us that it is so far out they would not be interested in going out to this hospital because they lost too much time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. MILLER of California was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WILSON of California. There seems to be some misunderstanding of this problem of whether the housing is for enlisted men or officers. It has been brought out previously that it is for both. I think we should probably be interested in the figures. Approximately 8,993 of these units are for enlisted men and approximately 4,612 are for officers. Many of these line items in the bill admittedly are for commanding officers' quarters on various posts. I do not see anything wrong with providing satisfactory quarters for the key officers, the commanding officers, and the executive officers, at the various permanent installations that we have. Certainly these units are going to be amortized by the housing allowance that will not be paid to the officers if they occupy

these houses. I certainly do not want to get into a hassle here over enlisted men and officers.

Mr. MILLER of California. If you will read section 404 you will see that only 10 percent of them are in excess of 2,000 square feet, which are for the top officers' quarters. Most of them are under 1,200 square feet.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of California as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS:

"SEC. 406. Notwithstanding the authority granted in titles I, II, and III of this act, no family house units shall be constructed at any installation at which there is a housing project constructed pursuant to title VIII of the National Housing Act, or at any installation where the Federal Housing Administration has issued a commitment for the construction of such project: *Provided, however,* That the limitation contained in this section shall not apply with respect to those family units which constitute a replacement of existing substandard housing units, nor to those projects involving not more than five units at an installation.

"Nothing in this section shall be construed to preclude the construction of housing under title VIII of the National Housing Act."

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, this may not be a substitute amendment, and perhaps it should appear at the end of the bill. We are doing nothing to hamper or injure Wherry housing. The gentleman from California indicated that if this amendment was adopted, he would withdraw his amendment.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that was not what I understood, but maybe we might do that. I understood the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] to say that he would accept this amendment; then that could be voted on, and then he would offer his amendment, which, in my opinion, goes a long way toward settling all of the discussion we have had today. If the gentleman from California will simply indicate his willingness to accept the amendment that I put in at the top of page 3 and then offer his, I think we will have practically concluded all of the discussion today. Is the gentleman from California willing to do that?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is what I tried to do.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] withdraw his amendment for the time being and vote on the Phillips amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is that the correct thing to do?

The CHAIRMAN. That would be the proper procedure.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I thought the bill was open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. That was objected to.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be withdrawn.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to insert some figures to add to the ones the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON] gave a short time ago.

In this bill there are 8,993 units for enlisted men; for company-grade officers, 3,053 units; for field-grade officers, 830 units, making a total of 12,876 out of the 13,613 that the bill provides for by the justifications made for each department. It, also, specifically provides that there shall be not to exceed 250 houses for general officers—section 404.

I would also like to have the RECORD show that the cost per unit of these houses is as follows: For enlisted men, \$12,850; for company-grade officers, \$15,200; for field-grade officers, \$20,250; and for general officers, \$27,000.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARDY: On page 3, line 14, change the period to a colon and insert the following: "*Provided,* That before any of the units at this installation are constructed the Secretary of Defense shall determine the extent to which the public housing designated as project VA44061 (Ferguson Park) will satisfy the housing requirement herein provided for, and this authorization shall be reduced accordingly."

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I am in thorough sympathy with this bill. We need to provide additional houses.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment and I have prepared a considerable amount of information in connection with it which I will not put in the RECORD unless it becomes necessary. This amendment is offered because I do not believe that in this particular situation the Army took into consideration some of the available housing in that general community. Within about 15 miles of Fort Eustis there is located a housing project built with Laham Act funds by the Navy in World War II. That project has a large number of vacancies. I am told it is in good condition. It has a number of one- and two-bedroom units in it. It is not located on Fort Eustis proper. It is about 15 miles distant. But it is at the intersection of 2 major United States highways which connect with Fort Eustis.

The statement was made that in considering the housing available in the community, housing within 30 minutes commuting distance was considered.

Apparently this particular housing was not considered. At the present time there are 419 vacancies on this project. One hundred and seventy-six military families live on the project now, most of whom come from Fort Eustis.

My contention is that with 419 vacancies, the need for housing at Fort Eustis

to house enlisted men who are eligible for occupancy of these quarters cannot be very great.

I have proposed by this amendment that the Secretary of Defense make a finding as to the extent to which the housing in this particular unit meets the requirement for housing at Fort Eustis and to the extent that the Secretary of Defense finds that vacant housing does meet the requirement for housing provided in this bill then this authorization shall be reduced.

In a situation of this kind I think positive action should be taken by the Secretary of Defense and if there is satisfactory housing available within 15 miles we ought not to duplicate it by building new housing on the post.

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

Mr. HARDY. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do I understand the gentleman's amendment to be specifically addressed to Fort Eustis, without reference to other projects in the bill?

Mr. HARDY. It addresses itself only to Fort Eustis because it relates specifically to one Lanham Act project of which I have some personal knowledge.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I say to the gentleman, if it is good in this particular instance, because inaccurate information was given the committee, or an incomplete survey was made, why would not this action apply equally well to other situations in the same or similar condition?

Mr. HARDY. I think there may be other situations similar to this. However, there were a great many of these Lanham Act projects which are very substandard and which are not suitable for occupancy by families of our enlisted men. I would not want to suggest that housing of such nature be taken to replace housing proposed to be constructed under this bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think the gentleman is right with this reservation. It need not necessarily apply only to Lanham Act housing. It could apply to any other construction which, taking into account its usability, might be considered.

Mr. HARDY. I think the gentleman is really repeating in his suggestion, the proposition that he discussed a little earlier, is he not?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is right. It is a question of available housing.

Mr. HARDY. That is taken into account. In this particular situation this housing is 15 miles from the post. Apparently it was not considered because it is slightly beyond, or somebody thought it was slightly beyond the 30-minute commuting distance. That is the key to it. If I understand the position of the gentleman from California, it is that all available housing should be included in the surveys and that there should be no duplication by construction on military reservations.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is my point.

Mr. HARDY. That is supposed to be done now. I believe the military are making conscientious efforts to do that, within a 30-minute commuting area.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I dislike to oppose this amendment for I think a lot of the gentleman who has offered it. However, this would make a pattern we cannot afford to set. Further, I think the rules now in effect with reference to the housing he is talking about would prohibit what he wants to do.

The gentleman was kind enough to tell me he was going to offer this amendment, so I looked into the matter and obtained some information about it which I am going to read into the Record, relating to the project the gentleman mentioned.

This is a typical war housing project known as Ferguson Park, which contains 1,186 units of temporary construction, one-half 1-bedroom units with 523 square feet of gross space, and one-half 2-bedroom units with 620 square feet of gross space. They rent for \$45 and \$51 per month, respectively, exclusive of heating oil which adds approximately \$100 per year to the rent.

Under PHA rules, no Army personnel may occupy this housing above the grade of corporal.

Our law provides largely for sergeants and junior officers.

During peak traffic periods, it requires approximately 45 minutes to cover the 16 miles distance between the project and Fort Eustis in a private automobile. Travel by commercial means requires a longer period of time.

The apartments are generally the same standard as other war housing. The kitchen is so small the refrigerator must be placed in the dining space. There is not room in the dining space to accommodate a table and four chairs. Storage space in the kitchen consists of a cabinet below the sink and one 10-inch by 30-inch cabinet above the sink.

Information received from the mayor of Warwick, Va., indicates that the city would like to have this housing destroyed. In accordance with PHA policy for Lanham Act housing, this substandard housing was constructed for war workers for the emergency period and was to be demolished, inactivated, or sold to private interests at the earliest practicable date.

You can see from the foregoing that the Department of the Army cannot consider such housing as assets for its permanent requirements at Fort Eustis.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. I must say to the gentleman from California that he evidently has secured his information from the Army, while I secured mine from the Housing Administration, because they certainly do not tally at all. I can produce a full plan of the project if the gentleman would be interested. I am advised that this housing is not in the kind of condition the gentleman from California has indicated, but even if it is, the amendment I have offered could not possibly do any harm because it simply requires that the Secretary of Defense make a finding with respect to the extent to which it would be suitable to replace the housing provided for in this bill. There certainly cannot be any objection to that.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Others would want to do the same thing and we would have this so hopelessly tied up we could not do anything.

Mr. HARDY. If there are other conditions where there is housing which is suitable to replace the housing proposed in this bill, then the bill ought to be amended.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not think these are suitable houses for enlisted men.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a good deal this afternoon about the necessity for this housing, and perhaps some housing is needed from the standpoint of the career military service.

Let me say that housing is not the only thing that enters into whether a man stays in the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps. I can recall a case or two, and well after the Korean war started, when fliers were compelled to fly bombers in Korea with obsolete equipment. Those fliers got out of the service after they got out of Korea.

Also I know of a case where a boy enlisted in the Air Force. He was a nationally known athlete, with two degrees from a university of this country. He took the officer-candidate examination and passed, but he was denied admittance and, as far as I know, still is denied admittance to the officer-candidate school, and he will not be in the service beyond his enlistment because he was an inch short of the minimum height for an officer. That is a regulation and an unbelievable one. He was tall enough to enlist in the Air Force and tall enough to be accepted for service in the ranks, but he was not tall enough to be an officer in the United States Air Force. Now do not tell me that the career service hinges entirely on housing. As to the permanency of some of these bases, they are just about as permanent as a change of mind and a decision to abandon a base. We have in the State of Iowa, and my colleague from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] well knows that we have a base in our State where the buildings are of permanent brick construction, which today is completely idle. Yet it is proposed here to build new homes for officers for \$27,000 or more.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman for the remarks he has made. He is referring, of course, to the Fort Des Moines Army base, is he not?

Mr. GROSS. No; I am referring to the base at Ottumwa, Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thought the gentleman was referring to the Fort Des Moines Army base. But I will take the base at Ottumwa. I, too, wish these



people could be quartered. But unfortunately to use the houses or buildings there for the quartering of officers would not be of any value to our military services because they are not needed there.

Mr. GROSS. Not needed where?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. At Ottumwa, Iowa, because there is no base activated there today.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure they are needed at the Truman Airport at Grandview, Mo.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I am quite sure they are but for a different reason.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; for quite a different reason. That is what I am trying to say: We are doing a lot of political building in this defense setup, and I am opposed to it.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The base to which the gentleman is referring is not in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. I am aware of that but I expect it will be in a similar bill in the future.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I was going to make the remark that according to the qualifications for officers in the United States Army, General Funston and Napoleon and King Pepin would not be able to qualify.

Mr. GROSS. I will let the gentleman answer that question.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I deny that statement.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the committee ought to write into this bill a provision that the quarters proposed to be constructed for enlisted men and officers be delineated, that is, set forth in language that anyone can understand, in the law, the number of units to be occupied by each category. I am unwilling to leave it to administrative officers. Why do you not put a provision in the bill to spell it out and say that is what is to be done?

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I would agree with such a provision myself if it would do any good. But it will not do any good because the gentleman knows from time immemorial, officers and even enlisted men and noncommissioned officers have quarters allowances. They get that money if there is no housing provided for them, they can take it and go into town and rent anything they want to. But they get the money anyway. The gentleman's point is a good point, but it would not mean anything if it was put in the bill. It would not accomplish anything because this goes on a quarters allowance basis. The Government furnishes the quarters when it has the buildings to do so. If the Government does not have the buildings, the men get the money.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, but the point I am trying to make to my colleague is that there should be clear language in the law that is proposed to be enacted by this bill that the housing units that are constructed for enlisted men be occupied by enlisted men. I in-

sist that a mere differentiation in floor space, as set forth in this bill, is not enough. I want the housing units which you say you are going to construct for enlisted men absolutely earmarked for these men and their families.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk reread the amendment for the information of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARDY) there were—ayes 42, noes 20.

So the amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time for no other purpose than to issue a warning to the Members on both sides. I have no amendment to offer to this legislation, and I do not want anything I say to lead anyone to believe that I am opposed to the building of these family units.

I happen to have been chairman of your special subcommittee charged with providing housing in impacted school districts along about the time this first Wherry idea of building houses on federally owned bases came along.

In the first year of the operation of our federally impacted school legislation, nearly a billion dollars of contracts were authorized under the Wherry housing plan. I am sure everybody understands thoroughly what we mean by the Wherry housing plan.

In reading this legislation, I can see you are proceeding to build these units under the provisions of the original Wherry Act, Public Law 245. The Federal Government owned the land, of course, on which these units were built. It was the first time it had ever gone into the proposition of renting to private individuals Government-owned land for the purpose of building housing units, and letting them out on a 50-year or a 99-year lease basis. They are exempt from taxation, to start with; and in setting up these rental charges, they make provision for taking care of everything, the cost of constructing the streets, the sidewalks, fire protection, the water system, garbage removal, and they forgot all about the children.

In these bases I look over in this bill only a few bases presently provide for any school facilities at all. When you talk about building millions of dollars of housing, there naturally follows school children to be educated, and you are making no more provision than they made in the original Wherry Act.

What I am saying to you is to put you on guard that you are creating another situation in handling these impacted school district propositions. You have a small base where you are going to build 50 or 75 or 100 units. There is no federally owned school building on that base. You will impact every school district that touches that base. Those children have to go to school. What pro-

vision are you making for educating those children? You take care of everything and forget about the boys and girls. I would like both the majority and minority members of this Committee to express themselves.

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

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I do not feel that this is any part of this bill. I am very much in favor with the gentlemen's views so far as impacted areas are concerned. As the gentleman from West Virginia knows, I have gone along with him repeatedly in taking care of those things.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not want anything I might have said today to create the impression to the other members of the committee that I am opposed to building these housing units; it is perfectly all right. I am just calling your attention to a problem you are going to set up for the Congress to take care of with no provision to meet it in this bill, these additionally impacted children. I am simply pointing out that situation. I was not talking to you about not building these units but simply telling you about the headache you are going to have.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill may be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

(The remainder of the bill reads as follows:)

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army is authorized further to develop military installations and facilities by providing family housing for personnel of the military departments and their dependents by the rehabilitation of public works, which include appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in a total amount of \$13,254,000.

#### TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized further to develop naval installations and facilities by providing family housing for personnel of the military departments and their dependents by the construction or installation of public works, which include site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, equipment and the acquisition of land as follows:

#### Continental United States

##### (1st Naval District)

Naval hospital, Newport, R. I.: 10 units of family housing, \$152,000.

##### (3d Naval District)

Naval hospital, St. Albans, N. Y.: 10 units of family housing, \$151,900.

##### (4th Naval District)

Naval shipyard, Philadelphia, Pa.: 25 units of family housing, \$321,300.

Naval hospital, Philadelphia, Pa.: 10 units of family housing, \$152,000.

##### (5th Naval District)

Naval hospital, Camp Lejeune, N. C.: 50 units of family housing, \$642,500.

Marine Corps air facility, New River, N. C.: 35 units of family housing, \$473,300.

Naval hospital, Portsmouth, Va.: 10 units of family housing, \$152,000.

Naval mine depot, Yorktown, Va. (Skiffes Creek Annex): 5 units of family housing, \$91,200.

(6th Naval District)

Naval air station, Cecil Field, Fla.: 95 units of family housing, \$1,272,900.

Naval hospital, Jacksonville, Fla.: 30 units of family housing, \$397,300.

Naval air station, Key West, Fla.: 20 units of family housing, \$273,900.

Naval station, Key West, Fla.: 83 units of family housing, \$1,085,400.

Naval mine countermeasures station, Panama City, Fla.: 25 units of family housing, \$343,100.

Naval hospital, Pensacola, Fla.: 25 units of family housing, \$321,300.

Naval supply corps school, Athens, Ga.: 30 units of family housing, \$456,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Glynnco, Ga.: 83 units of family housing, \$1,115,900.

Naval construction battalion center, Gulfport, Miss.: 7 units of family housing, \$102,100.

Marine Corps auxiliary air station, Beaufort, S. C.: 185 units of family housing, \$2,546,900.

Naval hospital, Beaufort, S. C.: 50 units of family housing, \$654,300.

(8th Naval District)

Naval auxiliary air station, Chase Field, Tex.: 80 units of family housing, \$1,096,900.

(11th Naval District)

Naval amphibious base, Coronado, Calif.: Two units of family housing, \$47,300.

Naval air station, Miramar, Calif.: Fifteen units of family housing, \$204,500.

Naval hospital, San Diego, Calif.: Ten units of family housing, \$152,000.

(Twelfth Naval District)

Naval hospital, Oakland, Calif.: 10 units of family housing, \$152,000.

Naval supply center, Oakland, Calif.: 10 units of family housing, \$152,000.

Naval communication station, Skaggs Island, Calif.: 50 units of family housing, \$666,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Fallon, Nev.: 60 units of family housing, \$787,500.

(Potomac River Naval Command)

Naval hospital, Bethesda, Md.: 30 units of family housing, \$409,000.

Naval district area: 4 units of family housing, \$108,000.

*Marine Corps facilities*

Marine Corps depot of supplies, Albany, Ga.: 119 units of family housing, \$1,595,700.

Marine Corps supply annex, Barstow, Calif.: 1 unit of family housing, \$27,000.

Marine Corps recruit depot, San Diego, Calif.: 12 units of family housing, \$173,400.

Marine Corps school, Quantico, Va.: 332 units of family housing, \$4,730,300.

*Outside Continental United States*

(Atlantic Ocean area)

Naval station, Argentia, Newfoundland: 45 units of family housing, \$595,100.

Naval base, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: 100 units of family housing, \$1,379,000.

Naval air activities, Port Lyautey, French Morocco: 175 units of family housing, \$2,366,300.

(Pacific Ocean area)

Naval station, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands: 175 units of family housing, \$2,312,600.

Marine Corps barracks, Pearl Harbor, Territory of Hawaii: 2 units of family housing, \$30,400.

Sec. 202. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized further to develop naval installations and facilities by providing family housing for personnel of the military departments and their dependents by the rehabilitation of public works, which include appur-

tenances, utilities, and equipment, in a total amount of \$1,218,300.

TITLE III

Sec. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized further to develop Air Force installations and facilities by providing family housing for personnel of the military departments and their dependents by the construction or installation of public works, which include site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, equipment, and the acquisition of land as follows:

*Continental United States*

(Strategic Air Command)

Sedalia Air Force Base, Mo.: 418 units of family housing, \$6,042,450.

Altus Air Force Base, Okla.: 370 units of family housing, \$5,340,950.

Lincoln Air Force Base, Nebr.: 443 units of family housing, \$6,397,300.

Smoky Hill Air Force Base, Kans.: 293 units of family housing, \$4,230,850.

Dow Air Force Base, Maine: 305 units of family housing, \$1,401,850.

Lake Charles Air Force Base, La.: 253 units of family housing, \$3,651,650.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Ariz.: 5 units of family housing, \$108,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Wash.: 5 units of family housing, \$108,000.

Great Falls Air Force Base, Mont.: 4 units of family housing, \$87,750.

Hunter Air Force Base, Ga.: 5 units of family housing, \$108,000.

Larson Air Force Base, Wash.: 5 units of family housing, \$108,000.

Limestone Air Force Base, Maine: 4 units of family housing, \$87,750.

Lockbourne Air Force Base, Ohio: 4 units of family housing, \$87,750.

Mather Air Force Base, Calif.: 4 units of family housing, \$87,750.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho: 4 units of family housing, \$81,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Nev.: 5 units of family housing, \$108,000.

Travis Air Force Base, Calif.: 6 units of family housing, \$128,250.

(Air Defense Command)

Suffolk County Air Force Base, N. Y.: 111 units of family housing, \$1,602,450.

Otis Air Force Base, Mass.: 230 units of family housing, \$3,324,850.

Newcastle County Airport, Del.: 108 units of family housing, \$1,559,200.

Truax Air Force Base, Wis.: 111 units of family housing, \$1,602,450.

Kinross Air Force Base, Mich.: 94 units of family housing, \$1,355,100.

Paine Air Force Base, Wash.: 74 units of family housing, \$1,069,200.

Oxnard Air Force Base, Calif.: 74 units of family housing, \$1,069,200.

Ent Air Force Base, Colo.: 100 units of family housing, \$1,444,300.

Youngstown Municipal Airport, Ohio: 57 units of family housing, \$824,200.

Greater Pittsburgh Airport, Pa.: 57 units of family housing, \$824,200.

Niagara Municipal Airport, N. Y.: 57 units of family housing, \$824,200.

Minneapolis-St. Paul Airport, Minn.: 74 units of family housing, \$1,069,200.

Duluth Municipal Airport, Minn.: 111 units of family housing, \$1,602,450.

Geiger Field, Wash.: 57 units of family housing, \$824,200.

Sioux City Municipal Airport, Iowa: 57 units of family housing, \$824,200.

Presque Isle Air Force Base, Maine: 53 units of family housing, \$763,050.

McGee-Tyson Airport, Tenn.: 57 units of family housing, \$824,200.

Portland International Airport, Oreg.: 63 units of family housing, \$906,000.

Minot area, North Dakota: 71 units of family housing, \$1,028,300.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Mich.: 51 units of family housing, \$735,000.

(Tactical Air Command)

Clovis Air Force Base, N. Mex.: 185 units of family housing, \$2,671,650.

Hurlburt Air Force Base, Fla.: 295 units of family housing, \$4,259,900.

Foster Air Force Base, Tex.: 222 units of family housing, \$3,202,550.

McGuire Air Force Base, N. J.: 5 units of family housing, \$108,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, S. C.: 5 units of family housing, \$108,000.

(Air Training Command)

Luke Air Force Base, Ariz.: 133 units of family housing, \$1,921,450.

Laredo Air Force Base, Tex.: 112 units of family housing, \$1,615,300.

Gary Air Force Base, Tex.: 112 units of family housing, \$1,615,300.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Tex.: 166 units of family housing, \$2,398,600.

Greenville Air Force Base, Miss.: 129 units of family housing, \$1,860,300.

Moody Air Force Base, Ga.: 148 units of family housing, \$2,138,400.

Stead Air Force Base, Nev.: 92 units of family housing, \$1,329,400.

McConnell Air Force Base, Kans.: 166 units of family housing, \$2,398,600.

Webb Air Force Base, Tex.: 92 units of family housing, \$1,329,400.

Parks Air Force Base, Calif.: 92 units of family housing, \$1,329,400.

(Military Air Transport Service)

Charleston Air Force Base, S. C.: 504 units of family housing, \$7,285,000.

(Continental Air Command)

Beale Air Force Base, Calif.: 236 units of family housing, \$3,406,650.

(Research and Development Command)

Kirtland Air Force Base, N. Mex.: 5 units of family housing, \$108,000.

Sec. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized further to develop Air Force installations and facilities by providing family housing for personnel of the military departments and their dependents by the rehabilitation of public works, which include appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in a total amount of \$4,250,000.

TITLE IV

Sec. 401. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are respectively authorized to proceed with the further development of military, naval, and Air Force installations and facilities as authorized by titles I, II, and III of this act without regard to the provisions of sections 1136, 3648, and 3734, as respectively amended, of the Revised Statutes, and prior to approval of title to underlying land, as provided by section 355, as amended, of the Revised Statutes. The authority to provide family housing by the construction or installation of public works shall include authority to acquire lands and rights and interests thereto or therein, including the temporary use thereof, by donation, purchase, exchange of Government-owned lands, or otherwise.

Sec. 402. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$175 million to carry out the purposes of titles I, II, and III of this act.

Sec. 403. Any of the approximate costs enumerated in titles I, II, and III of this act may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be varied upward by 10 percent, but the total of all costs shall not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated by this act.

Sec. 404. Not to exceed 250 of the units of family quarters constructed under the authority of titles I, II, and III of this act shall have a net floor area of not to exceed 2,100 square feet. None of the other family



quarters authorized to be constructed by this act shall have a net floor area in excess of 1,250 square feet, and the average net floor area of all of such other family quarters shall not exceed 1,080 square feet.

Sec. 405. Appropriation made to carry out the purpose of this act shall be available for expenses incident to construction or rehabilitation work authorized by this act, including administration, overhead, planning, and supervision.

Sec. 406. Whenever—

(a) the President determines that compliance with the requirements of Public Law 245, 82d Congress, in the case of contracts made pursuant to this act with respect to the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of the provisions of this act; and

(b) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods for conducting an adequate audit of such contracts, the President is authorized to exempt such contracts from the requirements of Public Law 245, 82d Congress.

Mr. DONOHUE. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I feel it a duty to speak in support and urge unanimous approval of this measure to provide for family quarters for military personnel and their dependents.

The testimony on this measure is clear and conclusive. The failure in recent years to provide adequate housing for military personnel and their dependents has not only created a serious morale problem; it has also necessitated the appropriation of large sums of money for quarters allowances which over a period of relatively few years amounts to more than the original cost of public quarters for the personnel receiving the allowances and the cost of maintaining and operating the public quarters and also the interest cost to the Government on its original investment.

From the facts presented it is obvious there exists the compelling need for family housing for military personnel that can be alleviated at this time only through the authorization on an emergency basis of the construction of a limited number of units.

The highest Government sources, including the President himself, have expressed grave concern over the many and increasing signs of sagging morale among our present and potential military personnel.

In my considered judgment, it is axiomatic that a military unit is no better than the spirit existing among its members and the morale of their families behind them, despite what powerful war weapons that may be possessed.

Certainly it is reasonable to feel that assurances to military personnel and their dependents that attempts are being made to provide adequate housing facilities for them is a major factor in the maintenance of a high spirit and morale. We should also take into consideration that a vital need exists to

encourage the enrollment of career servicemen in all branches of the military. The Defense Department reports an alarming drop of reenlistments throughout the services which is attributed to dissatisfaction over pay and the retrenchment of so-called fringe benefits that have been traditional among our military people. Technically trained persons are essential to modern atomic warfare and every effort should be made to keep them in a military career status.

This authorization bill gives encouragement to our military men and their families to remain in the service and is a wise investment for national security especially during this period of ever threatening Communist aggression.

I believe it merits and earnestly hope it will have unanimous approval of the House.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McDONOUGH: Page 14, line 22, after the period insert "Provided, That none of this appropriation may be used to construct family quarters on any military base where existing family quarters are sufficient to meet the needs of such military base or can be constructed under title 8 of the National Housing Act."

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is the gentleman's amendment identical to the one I presented to the Clerk a while ago?

Mr. McDONOUGH. This is in order now, as the gentleman's amendment has not been read.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It was read.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Then if the chairman has an amendment I ask that mine be considered as a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. There is nothing pending before the Committee, except the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Then I stand on my amendment as submitted as an amendment to the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. If the gentleman knows whether or not his amendment is identical with mine I would not object to his.

Mr. McDONOUGH. No; I cannot go so far as that, for the reason that the gentleman's amendment does not contain the provision in the last sentence of my amendment that no housing shall be constructed where title 8 of the National Housing Act housing can be constructed. The gentleman does not provide that in his amendment, as I understand.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a clarification?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. In other words, Wherry housing would have priority over any other housing under the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Where there is sufficient family quarters on a base, of course, no housing would be needed. But where Wherry housing can be constructed on the base then my amend-

ment would provide that Wherry housing should be considered first.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Considered and take precedence over any traditional method of furnishing housing.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Yes.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I just wanted to get the matter clear.

Mr. McDONOUGH. It would have to be certified that Wherry housing could not be constructed on the base; there must be a certificate that Wherry housing is not eligible for construction.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Basically it gives preference to Wherry housing.

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

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman's amendment proposes that in a situation such as we will suppose might exist at Quantico Marine Base down here at Triangle, should they decide to build 300 units of housing, it could not be proceeded with under this bill until the Secretary of Defense certified that it was not possible to construct Wherry housing at the Quantico project.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Where it can be constructed. My amendment states, "where it can be constructed under title 8 of the National Housing Act." If it is not certified that Wherry housing cannot be constructed there, then construction could not proceed under this act. But where it can be constructed the act says it should be.

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

Mr. McDONOUGH. I cannot yield further. I have not said a word about my amendment yet.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is merely to assure that there is not a blank check given to the Defense Department to build military housing as the \$175 million proposed in the bill would provide, and that where Wherry housing can be constructed on a base it should be constructed, and, of course, where it is not certified it will not be constructed.

There have been some 78,000 Wherry housing units constructed on various military bases throughout the country at a much less cost than if those same 78,000 units had been constructed under the proposal that this bill would outline. In other words, I have figures to show that if 78,000 Wherry units now on bases across the country had been constructed under the same terms as the present bill provides, it would have cost \$1,140,000,000 to build. The cost of the 78,000 units that were built was assumed by private investment and by mortgages. There are in California, for instance, some 12,000 units of Wherry housing on military bases that have an obligation of some \$98 million in mortgages. There is undoubtedly evidence in this bill that some of the bases on which those Wherry housing units are now built will have other units built in surplus of the units that now exist, and will jeopardize that investment.

I think that the people who have assumed the obligation of building military units under the Wherry Act in the

past ought to be given some consideration and that this bill should provide that their investment shall not be seriously affected by the additional units that this bill will provide.

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

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I know the gentleman wants to be fair. Will he point out to the committee in what specific place we have jeopardized the investment of the Wherry housing people?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I cannot do that because you have not built any houses yet. I do not know what you are going to do with the \$175 million you are asking for.

Mr. DEVEREUX. It is right in the bill.

Mr. McDONOUGH. You mention item by item the units you propose to build and insofar as an analysis of every one of those units is concerned, I can show you where there are places where you propose to build where Wherry units now exist.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Granted, but that will not necessarily jeopardize the Wherry units.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I want to make certain of it, and if the committee wants to be fair it will accept the amendment.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. Chairman, we are coming down to the question of whether or not we are going to go back to our traditional way of building houses or whether we are going on and giving to the Wherry housing people a complete monopoly over any housing that may be constructed in the vicinity of or on a base. For the life of me I cannot understand why the people do not realize on what dangerous ground we might be embarking. Perhaps it was necessary some years ago. I was not a Member here and I know nothing about the motivating facts except as brought out, that they did not want to provide for housing in the traditional way for fear we would go above our debt limit. But if you people will listen to some of the things that are going on in the other body and realize what has happened insofar as FHA is concerned, and then encourage that sort of practice, it is beyond me to understand.

The gentleman has suggested that the Wherry housing projects would be jeopardized. The other gentleman from California was able to put through an amendment for the Dugway Base to pull these projects out for fear that the 30 units we propose to construct there will jeopardize the Wherry housing project that is there now when we have a demonstrated need for 544 houses.

I ask you please to consider this very thoroughly before you vote on it.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WILSON of California. In the testimony that was offered, did not the people who testified indicate that the Wherry housing was not considered when there was 50 percent of the demonstrated need in a given area, that that was part of the criteria that decided whether Wherry housing was needed or not?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I believe that is correct.

Mr. WILSON of California. If there is more than 50 percent taken care of, no additional Wherry units could be built at any given post. I do not believe that 50 percent is enough to take care of the demonstrated need. We should go beyond the amount allowed under the current provisions.

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

Mr. DEVEREUX. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In order to be certain that there is no surplus housing on the bases, can the gentleman inform me, from the information he has, in regard to this? With 1,200 units on Fort Campbell, Ky., you are asking for 325 additional units. Does the gentleman know whether the 1,200 units are fully occupied or how many vacancies there are on this base?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I would like to inform the gentleman that 312 of those units are replacements of substandard housing.

Mr. McDONOUGH. At Clovis, N. Mex., you have 760 units and you are asking for an additional 185 units. Does the gentleman know how many of these 760 units are vacant, or are they all filled?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I will get that information for the gentleman. At Clovis Air Force Base 185 are replacements for substandard housing. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. McDONOUGH. So far as replacement is concerned. The gentleman means inadequate housing now on the base?

Mr. DEVEREUX. Substandard housing now on the base.

Mr. McDONOUGH. How many of the remainder are vacant, if any?

Mr. DEVEREUX. At Clovis we will replace Lanham Housing Act housing. The deficit, for instance, at Clovis is now 749.

Mr. McDONOUGH. What does the gentleman mean by deficit? I am asking how many of these 760 units are vacant.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I do not have any figure indicating any of them being vacant.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Are they all occupied?

Mr. DEVEREUX. Unless some of the substandard quarters have been declared inadequate. I can visualize that.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In other words, the gentleman cannot tell me how many of these 760 are occupied or vacant?

Mr. DEVEREUX. Well, they are either all occupied, assigned quarters, or they are so substandard that they were not considered adequate quarters.

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

Mr. Chairman, as I stated before, there has never been a commitment made that we were adopting the Wherry Act as the permanent policy of the Government for the construction of family quarters on military bases. The bill now before us does nothing to repeal the Wherry Act nor does it do anything to militate against the Wherry Act or Wherry Act projects. I believe that that is proper. Just the same, I believe that it is highly improper in this bill to do anything to give the Wherry Act a monopoly in the construction of family quarters.

A hasty reading of the amendment indicates that that is what it does. The first impression is that it says you cannot build any of these quarters if there are adequate quarters presently existing on the base. Then it says you cannot build any of these quarters if they can be built under title 8 of the Housing Act. That being true, if that is exactly what it means, then the Wherry Act has a monopoly in the construction of military family quarters. But, if you read the amendment carefully, it is far worse than that. The amendment which was read at the desk a moment ago, proposed by the gentleman from California—we had not as yet reached that point in the bill and he can offer it immediately after this—would take care of the situation in an orderly and proper manner. But the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH] is in such form that it would completely cripple this bill. It would practically say that under no circumstances can you build any quarters provided in this bill, because here is the language:

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I should like to concur in what the gentleman has just said.

Mr. KILDAY—

*Provided, That none of this appropriation may be used to construct family quarters on any military base where existing family quarters are sufficient to meet the needs on such military base or can be constructed under title VIII of the National Housing Act.*

It does not say who is going to determine whether the quarters are adequate. It does not provide whether you are going to have to go into court with an injunction to prevent the building of these houses or whether it would be impossible to go into court to do it. It does not provide that the Secretary must find that existing quarters are inadequate. It produces a situation which is administratively impossible to handle. That is the question of determining the adequacy of the quarters. Let us go to the Wherry Act provisions of the amendment: "or can be constructed under title VIII of the National Housing Act."

I take it that Wherry Act housing can be constructed on any base designated as permanent. But I do not think it will be built unless you get a sponsor, unless the sponsor's plan is approved and unless the project is requested, so that no matter what you may think as to



whether you should give the Wherry Act builders a monopoly, you cannot possibly adopt this amendment.

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

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from California so that he may tell me what his amendment does.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman has referred to my amendment as having to do with the question of adequacy of quarters on the base. The amendment does not say that. It says "sufficient." So far as the question of sufficiency is concerned that is certainly easy to determine. If everyone who requires family quarters on the base has family quarters, then they do not need any more. If you need any additional Wherry housing it can be built on the base, so what is the need of providing any other program?

Mr. KILDAY. I think the gentleman has missed my point entirely.

Mr. McDONOUGH. No; I have not.

Mr. KILDAY. I would like to know who is going to determine whether the housing on the base is sufficient. If you attempt to build houses under this bill with funds appropriated by the Congress under this bill, would that still be subject to an injunction on the ground that there are already sufficient quarters on that base? Or is that going to be something that the Secretary of the particular service concerned is going to have to certify; that the available housing is insufficient; or is the Secretary of Defense going to certify that it is insufficient? I point out that this is not administratively possible. It cannot be administered.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. KILDAY was permitted to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Do I understand the gentleman to mean that he wants to build surplus houses on bases where there are already sufficient quarters? Anyone who has any knowledge of sufficiency of quarters can see whether or not families are properly quartered.

Mr. KILDAY. I cannot yield further at this time. Certainly I do not want to build any unnecessary quarters. We have so many places where quarters are desperately needed. I want every one of these houses to go where it is needed. I doubt that there are many people who think that the quarters are sufficient, existing quarters. Even the general on the base probably thinks that he can use better quarters.

I am pointing out that never before have I seen an amendment, in the Congress of the United States, which attempts to put the availability of quarters or anything else on the basis of sufficiency, without saying who is going to determine whether they are sufficient. I say also as to the Wherry Act where the gentleman's amendment says "or can be constructed under title VIII of the

National Housing Act" that it has been provided that at no permanent base can you build any quarters under this bill, because Wherry Act housing can be built on any permanent base. But it will not be built unless the project is requested, unless there is a sponsor who submits a plan which is accepted and commitment is made by FHA to go ahead. So no matter what the gentleman from California may be attempting to accomplish by this amendment, he might just as well provide that none of the quarters provided in this bill shall at any time be built.

The amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of California: On page 16, following line 3, add the following new section:

"SEC. 407. Notwithstanding the authority granted in titles I, II and III of this act, no family house units shall be constructed at any installation at which there is a housing project constructed pursuant to title VIII of the National Housing Act, or at any installation where the Federal Housing Administration has issued a commitment for the construction of such project. *Provided, however,* That the limitation contained in this section shall not apply with respect to those family units which constitute a replacement of existing substandard housing units, nor to those projects involving not more than 5 units at an installation.

"Nothing in this section shall be construed to preclude the construction of housing under title VIII of the National Housing Act."

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment is self-evident. I think it is a very good amendment.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I must say it is not self-evident to me. I would like to ask my chairman if he would be kind enough to explain it a little bit further. Does he mean that on a base where we have a Wherry housing project now existing we cannot build any of the housing provided in this bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is not my understanding of the amendment. It simply is that we are doing nothing to impede installation of Wherry housing in the event they go through the procedure they are required to go through to build.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, but that is not my understanding of the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is my understanding of it.

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

Mr. Chairman, we can make our decision right now whether or not we are going to have Wherry veto the will of this Congress. It is because we abdicated our responsibility in the first instance that we got Wherry housing in this country.

Had the Congress attended to its business and done the thing it is charged to do in the Constitution, to provide an adequate military, we would never have 78,000 Wherry housing projects in this country now. Nobody sitting in any seat in this Congress now knows whether there were windfalls in the construction of these Wherry houses. It has been said by some Members of the other body, I think Senator CAPEHART, that there have been windfalls in these Wherry housing projects. How do you know? Who are you, or who am I to say that Wherry should veto the will of this Congress?

The amendment was not cleared by us. You can go ahead and say, if you want to, as to Quantico, the only school the Marine Corps has, that if we got a Wherry housing project at Quantico you could not build one single, solitary project at Quantico. I am not going to sit here and have the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] veto this bill and approve or disapprove of the things we are doing. You can do as you please, but RIVERS will not follow you. I am not going to sit here and have the Wherry association say we are Communist inspired as some one wrote to the distinguished marine hero, JIM DEVEREUX.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am with the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. The idea of trying to tell us, that we who wrote this bill were inspired by Communists or that this bill was inspired by Communists. Why we are trying to provide for your flesh and blood. If you want this bill vetoed by the Wherry association, that is up to you. I am not going to be a party to it consciously. I am not going to be a party to gutting this bill on which we have spent days and days and days in order to provide for our military the minimum of what they need.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman advise us whether or not this amendment is a committee amendment?

Mr. RIVERS. No, it is not a committee amendment. I am not going to be a party to it. This bill is the minimum of what we need for 3 million people in the military. We need 150,000 units and we are here with 15,000 units, and the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is approving and disapproving every single solitary thing that we are doing and I just ain't no longer going to take it.

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

Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, this amendment merely draws a line on whether we shall have Wherry units only or some other units built with appropriated funds. As I understand the amendment, and I think I understand it, if I can understand the English language, there is a small naval installation right now under construction in my district where it is proposed to build 33 Wherry housing units. There are at the present time no housing units in that project. This will be one of the smallest of the Wherry units, and as I understand

the language in that amendment, not a single housing unit could be built with appropriated funds. I mean, that is, if we adopt that as a policy.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is not my understanding. My understanding is that the bill provides for houses by appropriated funds. But we want to make it clear that if they want to build some houses under the Wherry plan and comply with the requirements, which they must comply with, we want to make certain that our bill does not stand in the way.

Mr. HARDY. May I say to the gentleman from California, I cannot help but agree with his intent, but he certainly has not properly read and does not understand his amendment. The amendment does not do what the gentleman from California says he plans to do.

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

Mr. HARDY. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. I want to point out that under title A, they would have to be at the mercy of the FHA down there. This thing will hamstring and gut and destroy the whole concept of this bill.

Mr. HARDY. Of course it will. We embarked upon a program of building housing under the Wherry proposal, and we have built a great many. I do not want to do anything to jeopardize those that we have already built.

Mr. RIVERS. Of course we do not.

Mr. HARDY. I am not in favor of continuing a policy of providing housing for the military which is going to cost twice as much as it ought to cost, which is what we are doing under the Wherry Act.

Mr. RIVERS. And it takes you 50 years—50 years for the Government to even have an opportunity to own these houses.

Mr. HARDY. I do not want to jeopardize the existing projects. I certainly do not want the sponsors of existing projects to suffer because of the building of houses with appropriated funds. At the same time I am not willing for a sponsor of a Wherry act housing project to say, "No, you still need some over there, but we are not going to let you build them because there might be one vacant in our project."

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

Mr. HARDY. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Only for this reason, I read this for the first time a few moments ago, and it reads to me like the same thing the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia is trying to do, which requires somebody to make sure the houses are needed. That is all it refers to.

Mr. HARDY. I do not understand it that way at all.

Mr. PHILLIPS. It says further that they can build housing projects only with appropriated funds.

Mr. HARDY. I cannot agree with the gentleman's interpretation of the amendment.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I think we ought to understand one thing very definitely. While we are talking about Wherry housing, that is probably the most expensive housing that we could get into anywhere at all.

Mr. HARDY. Of course, it is.

Mr. DEVEREUX. It costs much more to the Government. So simply in the interest of the Federal Government and in the interest of the taxpayers of this country, we ought to abandon Wherry housing, as I see the picture today. Let us not make any mistake about that.

Mr. HARDY. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct, and I think the time is right now to go back to the procedure of building these houses with appropriated funds because it is the cheapest way to do it.

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

Mr. HARDY. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. This bill has been carefully considered by the full committee for many months. It was carefully screened by a subcommittee on programs and policies. It still has to go before the Appropriations Committee, and it is my opinion that the bill should be left just as it was reported from the committee, without any amendment that might muddy up the whole structure.

Mr. HARDY. Certainly this amendment ought to be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to make the observation that my understanding of this bill is completely in line with the very pertinent, forceful, and timely observation made by my good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

I followed this bill in committee. When the recommendations first came up to the committee, it was recognized that the Department had to act hastily and to meet an emergency situation that exists. It is a real emergency, because involved is the question of reenlistment and the keeping in service of career men. We know the tremendous expense to the taxpayers when reenlistments drop off. When this bill came up, it was hastily prepared. That is no reflection on the Department. I think it is safe to say that the bill in its original form did not have much chance of passing. I was kept informed of the progress of the consideration of the bill by members of the committee. This bill is the result of careful consideration and hard work, primarily on the part of members of the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, to which the whole matter was referred. This bill comes before us very carefully screened; screened by men on both sides, both Republicans and Democrats, whom we all respect; men who constituted the subcommittee. They went into it very, very carefully. It came out of the full committee, men whom we all respect.

I am fearful, knowing my friend from California as I do, and his wholesome state of mind—I am fearful that the gentleman's amendment, if adopted, will

disturb the effective work done by the subcommittee. Certainly we can all support this bill. If the amendment is adopted, I am doubtful if I could support the bill. I think the amendment will put a limitation upon what the subcommittee intended and what the full committee intended, and what we intend, and what is necessary to insure the effective carrying out of this bill.

I understand the situation among our officers and enlisted men is terrible, in some respects, in relation to housing. They are given a certain allowance and they cannot get quarters. They live outside, and the cost is so much that it has resulted in the separation of families, the wife and children in many families going home to live with their folks, and the husband, the enlisted man or the officer, remaining at his station. Those are all matters that have an effect upon men who love the service, feeling, because of the economic angle, that they cannot afford to reenlist.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. There are thousands of young men who might make the service their career, in the Air Force, the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, but they are not staying in the service because of the housing conditions that prevail. This bill has been screened carefully, to the point where there is only 10 percent of the required necessary housing units to be built, a very small number. Certainly it would be encouraging to these men who intend to make the service their career, that the Congress has awakened to the fact that this housing situation is a serious one, and they are going to support this program and then give very careful consideration to the overall program which is to follow. This bill should pass as it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. McCORMACK was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I wonder whether there is any assurance in this bill that there will be one unit built for an enlisted man? It is my understanding that there is not any such assurance.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield that I may reply?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I believe section 404 of the bill sets up the criteria.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. If the gentleman will yield further, nothing therein provides that it shall be for enlisted men; it can be used by officers.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is quite true, Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Do you have an amendment that maybe will correct that?

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.



Mr. HARDY. The report gives the basis on which the committee made its decision, gives the breakdown figures which have already been given which will assure that.

Mr. McCORMACK. I assume, I may say to the gentleman from Minnesota, that the committee has received a breakdown just like the Appropriations Committee when they grant a lump-sum appropriation for the construction of a certain project; they have a breakdown as to what the money is going to be used for.

As I understand, the greater part of these housing units is for enlisted personnel.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. But there is no assurance of that.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that any military installation housing is divided on a percentage basis among enlisted personnel and commissioned personnel. This bill applies to both enlisted and commissioned personnel.

Mr. McCORMACK. That was the basis of my answer to the gentleman's question.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. These figures were put in the RECORD some time ago by the chairman. There are to be 8,993 units for enlisted men, 3,000 for company-grade officers, 830 for field-grade officers, and 78 for generals and commanding officers.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Cannot an officer and his wife live in 1,250 square feet of space? That is the only restriction contained in this bill.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. My very good friend, whom I greatly admire, honestly—

Mr. McCORMACK. I think he is really satisfied.

Mr. GAVIN. He asked for one unit. The one unit I was interested in, the greater Pittsburgh air base, 33 of the 57 units are for enlisted men, the others for officers; but I emphasize the fact that 33 out of 57 are for ground force men.

Mr. GROSS. But that is a breakdown proposition. Again, the officer there can assign the quarters.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the committee has looked into all of those aspects. It is not written in the bill, but we know that in the course of ordinary consideration the committee has been advised. If they did not live up to the provisions of the bill the committee would quickly subject them to appropriate treatment.

Mr. DEVEREUX. If the gentleman will yield, I think I can satisfy the gentleman from Iowa. For instance, picking at random from the backup mate-

rial, I have an item of a Navy base in Florida which specifically states: "25 units for enlisted men, 5 units for company-grade officers." That is just in the backup material.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no doubt that the subcommittee has done a remarkable job and that there has been very careful screening of the projects to be undertaken. We have the necessity. I was very glad to note the other day that the second proposed cut in the Army in the fiscal year 1956 is not going to take place. I have vigorously opposed any reduction in the Army with the world situation as it exists today, with the world killers, the Communists, trying to overrun the world. So there is more need for the construction of these units, and, as I said, I am very glad to see that the proposed reduction in the Army in the fiscal year 1956 is not going to take place.

I am fearful that the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be harmful to the bill—not intentionally so, of course. A rejection of the amendment would be no reflection on the gentleman because he is offering it personally and I observe from questions asked that he has probably some doubt himself.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I thank the gentleman for the complimentary remarks he has made.

Mr. McCORMACK. I mean it, too, because the gentleman and I have worked on other matters. We have conspired constructively together.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. There is not any doubt in my mind about the clarity of the amendment. It will not muddy the waters, in my opinion, and I do not believe many people will be confused.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am confused and plenty of others are confused. It would be more pleasant to us if the gentleman would withdraw the amendment. If he does not do that, I urge that the amendment be defeated in order to protect the bill. Defeat of the amendment would be no reflection on the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. ST. GEORGE: On page 8, strike out lines 7, 8, and 9.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I wish again to reiterate the fact that I am entirely in favor of this legislation. I have both West Point and Stewart Field in my district and I am aware of the necessity, in fact of the crying need, for quarters for enlisted men and officer personnel.

My amendment would simply cut out \$2,366,300 for 175 units of family housing at Port Lyautey, French Morocco.

Mr. Chairman, I am fully aware of the fact that since the committee held hearings a great deal of water has gone under the bridge. We have seen the collapse of the French in Indochina; we have seen the fall of Vietnam. It is rather obvious that a great deal of our materiel was left there and has been seized by the Communists. Now the war clouds are gathering over North Africa and it is just as well we face the fact instead of assuming our usual attitude of always expecting the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow.

There is going to be trouble in North Africa. For that reason, first of all, I question the advisability of sending families to North Africa at this time. I do not think it is a suitable place for families to live. The war is cold at the present time. It is going to get increasingly hot.

Another thing, if you construct \$2 million worth of housing there, you will run a very good risk of having it also seized by the Communists or by the enemy in North Africa. For that reason it seems to me reasonable and not exaggerated to ask that the amendment be adopted; that this matter be kept in abeyance for, say, 6 months or a year until we can see exactly what is going to happen in the world. After that, perhaps, we may be fortunate enough to see peace ahead and be able to send the families to North Africa and to construct these 175 units.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the committee to accept this amendment for that reason. It is not offered in any criticism of the work of the committee or in criticism of the bill. It simply is postponing for a little while until we have an opportunity to look into the situation and to become fully cognizant of what is going to happen. We have lost a great deal already, and for that reason I would rather see that we do not lose any more.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Does the gentleman's amendment refer to the situation in French Morocco?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. No, Mr. Chairman, it only refers to Port Lyautey, French Morocco. The other housing projects outside of the continental limits I think are very vital and I would not interfere with them.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Does the gentleman realize that Port Lyautey is a very vital part of our military defense in the Mediterranean?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I have absolutely no doubt about it. I am not interfering with that in any way, may I say to the gentleman.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Does she not know that many of the families are there already?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I presume they are living somewhere.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yes, and they are living off of the base, out in the community of Port Lyautey.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I think the quarters should be very temporary, I will say, because I think it is very likely that they will have to evacuate those quarters. I do not think it will hurt to wait a year before we go all out with a full-fledged plan and build this huge encampment.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Well, these quarters cannot possibly be constructed within a year and a half.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I know. But why start them now and have them seized before they are finished? I do not want to see that, either. It may be a gloomy point of view, but we have been bitten quite often, and the burnt child fears the fire, although that is not the usual attitude for this House to adopt.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from New York has expired.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield further, here is what I wanted to point out. There will be very little done on this project for at least 6 months and perhaps considerably longer. If the gentlewoman only wanted it to stay in abeyance, I suggest she wait and then next spring go to the Committee on Appropriations. All these items have to be presented to the Committee on Appropriations, and at that time maybe we will have a clearer idea as to what the situation is going to be. The plea for these projects, without going into the details, was very convincing to every one of us. I think they are essential at the present time.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. If it is a question of going in 6 months or a year from now and asking the Committee on Appropriations to do something about it, why could not the distinguished members of this committee do that and not pass on it now in such a hurry?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. We want to get the authorization, and then she would have a chance to go up there and object and indicate to them some of the things she has told us today. Maybe she would be able to convince them.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I think the bill is so good that I want to perfect it, and I think this amendment would be a step in that direction.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It may be that if we took this out we would have a hard time to put it back in again.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I doubt that. After a year from now if there is peace in the world, which we all pray for, I think it would be a simple matter to restore this small amount. After all, it is a small amount. It is just the principle of the thing, may I say to the gentleman, which is very bad.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Should the gentlewoman's amendment be accepted, could that then be interpreted that we are going to move out of North Africa?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Certainly not. It does not mean that you are going to move out of the frontline trenches simply because you are not sending the women and children in there, I hope.

Mr. DEVEREUX. As a matter of fact, if we could have them on the base, they would be much safer in the event of any disturbance over there.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Well, I do not think that they should be there at all. May I say to the gentleman when I was in Korea—and I do not think the situation in Korea at the present time is very much more serious than in North Africa—I was told by General Taylor that none of the wives or children are going to be under his command for some time.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, Port Lyautey is a very important factor in the military function of this country in the Mediterranean area. It is primarily a Navy installation. The mission of this Navy installation is to support aircraft and for that reason requires highly skilled officers and enlisted men to operate and maintain such planes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Does not this station tie in not only with our efforts in Morocco but also with our efforts in the Mediterranean where we have the 6th Fleet?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I am coming to that. The type of officer or enlisted man who is stationed at Port Lyautey is generally in the grade of those who can take their family with them. Many of the officers and men stationed there today have their families, some living in quarters on the station and others living in quarters off the station.

In addition to the naval air station at Lyautey, there is also a communications station that is very important in the communications system of the military of our Government. The Port Lyautey naval air station and communications center, as the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] has mentioned, supports the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean, and without it the 6th Fleet would not be as effective as it is today.

Therefore, the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Certainly reserving the right to examine into the details of this item at a later date by our subcommittee, let me say that we have already gone into French Morocco on such a scale and have made such commitments there that I should think it would be a mistake to draw the line on an item of this kind.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Definitely.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think the authorization should remain in the bill

for the time being and we can make decisions later on.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Certainly. The Committee on Appropriations will have the opportunity to review this later on. Port Lyautey is not up against the front door of Casablanca. Port Lyautey is one of several installations of the United States military in northern Morocco, and each have security arrangements to protect the base, equipment, and American military personnel stationed there.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Would the gentleman tell me when this bill was marked up, or when final hearings on it were held?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. As I recall it, it was early this year.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. It is true, probably, is it not, that the bill was marked up before the Geneva conference. Would not the gentleman agree to that?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yes.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Does not the gentleman think, in all fairness, that our thinking on a great many subjects should have changed since that conference took place? If we are just to close our eyes to everything that has happened and go on our merry way, that is one thing, but I do not think that is the way to legislate at this time. I think conditions are a little too serious for that.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. In reply to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] may I say that if the planning of our military must be altered every time a conference is held somewhere in the world involving the Communists our military will have no plans when an emergency occurs.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. We have not had any conferences like the conference at Geneva; and I certainly hope that we do not have any more. After all, that conference changed a great many things, and certainly the gentleman will agree that it was a triumph for the Communist cause. Therefore, we have got to look at the situation again, we have got to reappraise our whole policy.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. In my opinion, we have had too many conferences already. I think the amendment should be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mrs. ST. GEORGE) there were—ayes 21, noes 53.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Kansas: On page 9, after line 15, insert the following:

"Forbes Air Force Base, Kans.: 25 units of family housing, \$337,500."

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I understand there are just two amendments remaining to be considered. The bill has been considered as read. I wonder if



we might agree that all debate on these two amendments be closed in 15 minutes, so that we could finish up the bill at that time. I submit that as a unanimous-consent request, Mr. Chairman.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I wish to read to you a telegram I received yesterday from the real-estate board at Topeka, Kans. As we all know, the real-estate people have been against Federal housing in every form, and they were against this, but they have changed their mind in one instance. This is their wire:

The officers of the Topeka Real Estate Board urge you to do all in your power to see that at least 25 housing units be put back in the bill, which the House Armed Services Committee deleted, for permanent housing at Forbes Air Base at Topeka, Kans., for essential key personnel.

Not knowing how the commander at the airbase would feel about this, I called up Forbes Air Base at 10 o'clock this morning and talked with the general in command. I asked him whether it would be all right with him if I monitored our conversation and reported to this body verbatim what he would say to me. These are his words:

We have no quarters on the base for a number of our key personnel. We need them for squadron commanders, wing commanders, and other key personnel who are needed on the post. What the air base had planned on originally was 157 units which were deleted from the bill. What I am hoping to get now is enough housing for key officers whose jobs require them to be right here at the station. Right now I could easily justify 25 housing units for key officers at Forbes. I believe one of the reasons you were asked by the Real Estate Board of Topeka to try to get the 25 additional housing units was that the real estate people had taken a stand against us. At my request they have taken a new look at the problem and have agreed that they were wrong in the beginning and wanted to come out with this new statement. I have some \$2½ million planes flying, and often quick decisions are needed. Officers living on the post could be reached immediately, whereas if they were living in the city of Topeka it might be hard to locate them. In certain instances it could mean the life or death of the crew or the saving of an airplane. It is a wise investment and it makes sense.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Was the general to whom the gentleman refers the general at the airport or a general here in Washington?

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. It was the general at the airport.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. He would have to clear with the Defense Department before he could make a request like that. That is contrary to their rules. They have to clear at the top here, at least with the chief of the Air Force.

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

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. The general did not make the request, the Congressman called the general there asking for an expression of his opinion as to whether or not these 25 units could be used.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The point is before he can get any more houses he has to clear that with somebody higher up. You cannot go directly to Congress and say you want more.

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

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think my friend the gentleman from California, in all good faith, misunderstands the situation. This good general has not asked for 25 housing units. He has told the fine gentleman, who is making a fine fight—and I hope the chamber of commerce remembers you next fall—he has simply told this fine gentleman, and this fine gentleman is simply telling us what he told him. So I do not think the general should get in any trouble in any way for what he did or what he said.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Anybody could justify the need for 25 more units, but that is not the way to get results, in my opinion, by the military bringing the matter to the attention of a Congressman and asking him to offer an amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. He did not ask him to do that.

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

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Of course, there are many places where housing is needed. This is an example. But they are not needed as much there as at other places. All we are trying to do is to furnish the most critically needed housing.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. In answer to the gentleman, I would say that it is just a matter of whether we want to take the word of the commanding general of the Forbes Air Base, where we have spent \$45 million in airplane facilities.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. WILSON of California. This subcommittee is going to be engaged in the interim period looking into the various units that are needed, and I think the subject that the gentleman has brought up would be one that would call for an on-the-spot investigation. I am sure it is the intention of the subcommittee to look into a situation such as the gentleman has called to our attention to see if housing is needed and bring the facts before the Congress next year.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. In answer to that, I would say the same argument would apply to every authorization that you have offered here today.

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

I wish to say to the gentleman from Kansas that under ordinary circumstances, I would support his amendment. However, when this bill was considered in committee, many committee members would have liked to have put in amendments for projects in their own States or districts. Had that been permitted and those projects put in, then

the number of housing units as provided in the bill presented to us by the Department of Defense as being necessary for the services, would have had to be reduced because there is an overall limitation of \$175 million in the bill. If we were to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas, then the housing units will have to suffer at other bases and installations where the testimony shows they are needed more today than they are at the base in Kansas.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. What the gentleman says about many members of the committee is correct. As a matter of fact, when the bill came over from the Department it contained units in my own district, all of which were eliminated by the subcommittee. That is true of many Members of the House, and it is not possible to start putting each of those back or we will be back where we were before the subcommittee did its job in reducing the units to be built.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. And we would not have any bill at all.

Mr. KILDAY. That is right.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I think this is a comparatively mild one. It is for only 25 units.

I know the committee has made every effort it could to keep this legislation in line with the requests. I know, too, this committee is more familiar with the entire problem than I am.

The reason I feel these units are necessary is because of the statement of the commanding officer of the base. Incidentally this is one of the large bases in the country and is just barely outside the district I represent.

The thing that gives importance to this proposal is because this is a strategic base. The commanding officer, who should know, says the units are required for the reason a few key officers must reside immediately in the area for the reason they may be called on a few moments notice.

The gentleman from California criticized the Member for quoting the commanding officer. The Member called the commandant and asked for the facts. The officer gave the facts as he knew them. I see nothing wrong with that.

I think credence should be given the request of the Real Estate Board of Topeka, who said in substance they had examined the situation and, in the opinion of the board, the request should be approved. If the request were many units, the situation would be different. I really think, for a big strategic airbase, the request is modest. I want it understood I am not in favor of going out and overloading airbases with Government-built homes.

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

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to a distinguished member of this committee and a former most distinguished member of the Armed Forces. I know he wants to be fair. He is really a great man.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I hope to be fair about it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. My only interest in this matter is that I believe this amendment to be right.

Mr. DEVEREUX. First of all, I want to point out that there are no projects in the district of the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is right. I appreciate that.

Mr. DEVEREUX. There was an inference that perhaps that influenced my judgment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. No; I am sure of that. I apologize if there seemed to be such inference.

Mr. DEVEREUX. If the gentleman will read the bill thoroughly, he will find that in many cases we have allowed as low as five units.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And I think the one ahead of this one is for 433 units.

Mr. DEVEREUX. That is correct. But, for instance, at the fighter bases we have more. We have the fighter interceptors and so on.

Mr. REES of Kansas. This is a strategic base, is it not?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I believe that is correct.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And it is a bigger base, I believe, than the one named just ahead of it on the list, where more than 400 units are authorized. I know the judgment of the gentleman from Maryland is good. I would not dispute it, but it seems on the face of things, the amendment is reasonable.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MILLER of Kansas), there were—ayes 45, noes 62.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: On page 15, line 11, after the period, insert "Provided, That not less than 60 percent of all units provided herein shall be constructed for family units for enlisted family quarters."

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment in complete good faith and in light of what I have observed myself at some of these bases and particularly in light of the debate which has taken place here on this bill and the fact that there are no specific provisions in this legislation for enlisted men's quarters.

There has been no question that there is no specification in this bill as to how many units for enlisted men will be built or whether there will be one. Personally, I am not at all against building these officer units; in many cases they are highly necessary. But on the other hand I do get considerably irked at the attitude of the services as to the needs of the family enlisted man's requirements and what they should have.

We heard the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina and others complain about the lack of enlistments because the enlisted men were short of quarters. I do not care what the so-called justifications are that come here and are given before the committee. I know what is going to happen if this bill passes as it is and if appropriations are handled in the same general language: The great bulk of this is going for officers' quarters. I recall rather distinctly when we had a pay bill here one time involving the question of consideration for enlisted personnel and particularly married enlisted personnel and their dependents, and that the enlisted men got the business. I think that was unfortunate.

No wonder these men leave the service; I do not blame them a bit. I just want to be sure that when we pass this legislation we write into it language which will guarantee that the enlisted personnel shall receive not less than 60 percent and I hope it is as much as 75 percent. I think we better have it written into the bill and not just take somebody else's word for it that may not mean anything when it comes to the actual building under any administration of this law. That is why I urge the adoption of this amendment to meet the present situation. Then we shall know that the enlisted personnel will get consideration and there will be no question about it.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. What is wrong with the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Not a thing.

Mr. RIVERS. I do not think so either.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I hope the gentleman agrees with me.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not think there is anything wrong with the gentleman's amendment either. Seventy percent appears in the justifications. We will be glad to accept the amendment.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. There is nothing spelled out in the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I will accept the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I just want to say that I approve the gentleman's amendment. It makes certain that the bill does what the committee intends. I congratulate him.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MORANO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Commit-

tee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9924) to provide for family quarters for personnel of the military departments of the Department of Defense and their dependents, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 662, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there anyone who is absolutely opposed to the bill? If not, the Clerk will report the motion offered by the gentleman from California.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHEPPARD moves to recommit the bill, H. R. 9924, to the Committee on Armed Services for further study.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

The motion to recommit was rejected.

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

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Ast, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had—

Ordered, That the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate the message announcing the agreement of the Senate to the amendments of the House to the bill S. 3137, entitled "An act to make the provisions of the act of August 28, 1937, relating to the conservation of water resources in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States, applicable to the entire United States, and to increase and revise the limitation on aid available under the provisions of the said act, and for other purposes."

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

H. R. 8152. An act to extend to June 30, 1955, the direct home and farmhouse loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to make additional funds available therefor, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing



votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2346) entitled "An act to amend certain provisions of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, and the Investment Company Act of 1940."

#### CONSERVATION OF WATER RESOURCES IN THE ARID AND SEMI-ARID AREAS OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read:

*Ordered*, That the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate the message announcing the agreement of the Senate to the amendments of the House to the bill, S. 3137, entitled "An act to make the provisions of the act of August 28, 1937, relating to the conservation of water resources in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States, applicable to the entire United States, and to increase and revise the limitation on aid available under the provisions of the said act, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request of the Senate will be granted.

There was no objection.

#### MODERNIZATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF CERTAIN MERCHANT-TYPE VESSELS

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3546) to provide an immediate program for the modernization and improvement of such merchant-type vessels in the reserve fleet as are necessary for national defense.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and of course I will not object to the present bill, but, in order that I might address an inquiry to the majority leader. I wish to ask the majority leader if and when H. R. 7840, an amendment to the Railroad Retirement Act, is to be called before the House for consideration? I have had innumerable inquiries made by Members from both sides of the aisle who are greatly interested in this piece of legislation. It laid awaiting action before the Committee on Rules for approximately 1 month. I was unable to penetrate the iron curtain that surrounds the proceedings of the Rules Committee to ascertain why it was not acted upon.

I was pleased that a week ago consideration was given to this measure. Favorable action was taken within a few minutes of the application being heard. From that time until the present the bill has slumbered—I would not say peacefully, but it has slumbered with indecision as to when it would be brought before the House. I have tried and Members of this House have tried to ascertain when it would come before the House. There has been no definite word given as yet except that it might be

brought up tomorrow or it might be brought up next Monday, I assume, in case we do not adjourn sine die. For that reason, I would like to know, in order that I may answer questions, as to when this bill will be brought up. There is much that I could say that I will not say. I am asking the question in the interest of procedure in this House. I want it to be known that if I do not get a definite answer, then there is left to me only one course to pursue, and that will be to object to every unanimous-consent request that is made for the transaction of business with the exception of those consents that are asked for the introduction of personal remarks in the RECORD; that is, until I get a definite answer as to when this bill will be brought up.

Now, this is not based upon impatience. I would have the membership of the House know that there is no one in this House that has shown greater patience with respect to this matter than I, but there comes a time when patience ceases to be a virtue. And, I assure you it is not a pleasant situation for me to be placed in, to take this position before the House, and I only do it in the way in which I am doing it in order that the House may know, in the event that it is necessary for objections to be made as I have indicated, the reason for it.

This piece of legislation, in my opinion, would pass this House practically unanimously if it was given an opportunity, and I am determined, if the power lies within one individual or more to stop it from coming up, then I am hopeful that maybe a course of action, such as I have indicated, by one Member of the House can bring it to a vote in this House for the benefit of those who are anxious to vote upon this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection unless someone wishes to answer my question.

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

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. It might have been a little better if the gentleman had discussed the matter with me.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I have done so several times.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say this to the gentleman?

Mr. WOLVERTON. How many times do I have to discuss it? I do not want to say everything at this time that I could say.

Mr. HALLECK. Neither do I.

Mr. WOLVERTON. But I have said what I meant, anyway. Are you willing to give us any time when this will be brought up, when we will be recognized?

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

Mr. WOLVERTON. Certainly.

Mr. HALLECK. I have in my hand a list of measures on which rules have been granted.

Mr. WOLVERTON. That is right—

Mr. HALLECK. A rule was granted on your bill to which you refer on July 22.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Last Friday.

Mr. HALLECK. Now, we have had before the House of Representatives, I might say to the gentleman—may I say, first, that I certainly shall try to evidence for him a respect here that he has not quite accorded me in this attack on me. I assume it was on me.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I have not mentioned any names. I purposely withheld doing that.

Mr. HALLECK. Let us not equivocate about it.

Mr. WOLVERTON. That is not at all equivocating. Let us get right down to it. Will the bill come up and, if so, when?

Mr. HALLECK. Let me say to the gentleman that we have been working on a program here of legislation that had to be accomplished as a part of the program before us. The work that has gone on in the House of Representatives has dealt with the essential parts of the program that we have all recognized had to be passed. We have disposed of the matter of increasing the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation which was part of that program; likewise the bill to provide housing for military personnel, which was a part of that program. There are 4 or 5 bills from the gentleman's committee on this list that I hold in my hand with which we hope to deal.

Certainly I had no intention at any time of not putting the gentleman's bill on.

He speaks of how he may object to any unanimous-consent request that is made here. May I remind the gentleman that the rule on his bill was reported on July 22. If the gentleman doubts my good faith with respect to programing it, certainly he must know the rules well enough to know that any member of the Rules Committee, after a rule has been out 7 days, may call up the rule.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I am counting those days.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say to the gentleman that certainly it would not have been within my power to have blocked consideration of the rule had I wished to do so. And may I say further to the gentleman, who is my longtime friend, that I am sorry he has taken this action here on the floor of the House of Representatives because I have sought to promote and to forward the measures that have come from his committee as I have from all other committees. I have sought to expedite the work of the House of Representatives and I shall continue to do so.

The gentleman has seen fit to raise the question. I may say to him that we propose to deal next with the bill which the gentleman from Illinois is about to call providing for additional Secretaries. We still have the Capitol Police force bill that we started to discuss the other day.

As far as I am concerned, I do not care what comes on after that. There is a whole list of measures, 4 or 5 of them from the gentleman's committee, and there are committee members pressing for all sorts of legislation before us.

All I have attempted to do is to bring orderly progress to the accomplishment of the program and to try to keep first things first.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON]?

Mr. WOLVERTON. Still reserving the right to object, I do so in order that I may apologize to the gentleman who is the majority leader if I have offended him by assuming an interest in a piece of legislation in which the great majority of the House are interested. I have not said all I could say. If I did, you could understand why I have shown some of the feeling that I have shown. And it is not personal in any sense whatsoever. But when a piece of legislation has been requested by 23 railroad brotherhoods and has passed the committee unanimously and was finally reported out of the Rules Committee, and I am not able to find out when it will be brought up, it is certainly proper to inquire. And I have not found out yet. I think it is perfectly in order that as chairman of the committee I should make inquiry in order that I may make reply to those who address their inquiries to me. I regret that it is necessary. I have been here for 28 years, and I have never taken such a step as this before. And I would not have done it today if I did not think it was necessary to bring attention to this particular piece of legislation. I am still hopeful for the benefit of Members who find it necessary to leave and some of whom have told me that if they do leave they will have to come back in order to vote on this important piece of legislation, that some definite word be spoken other than that it might be tomorrow or it might be Monday when this legislation will come up.

Referring to any other bills that have come from my committee, there is not one on that list that takes precedence in time to the one to which I have directed attention.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Emergency Ship Repair Act of 1954."*

#### STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this act in the interests of national defense to provide for the immediate improvement and modernization of needed merchant-type vessels in the reserve fleet under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce, and thereby to provide a much needed stimulus to the shipbuilding and ship-repair industries of the Nation.

#### RESERVE FLEET MODERNIZATION AND REPAIR PROGRAM

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Commerce shall, after consulting the Secretary of Defense, formulate and carry out to the extent authorized under the provisions of this act a program of repairing, modernizing, or converting such merchant-type vessels in the national defense reserve under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce as may be necessary to provide for the purpose of national defense an adequate and ready reserve fleet of merchant and auxiliary vessels.

#### CONTRACTING AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 4. The Secretary of Commerce shall, within 12 months after the date of the enactment of this act, enter into such contracts for the repair, modernization, and conversion of vessels as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. Such contracts (1) may provide for the expenditure by the United States of not more than \$45 million, (2) shall be with private shipbuilding or ship-repair yards on the Atlantic, Pacific, and gulf coasts of the United States, and on the Great Lakes or other inland waterways, (3) shall be entered into in accordance with applicable provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, and (4) in entering into such contracts the Secretary of Commerce shall not alter the present Maritime Administration policy of inviting split bids for drydock and nondrydock work. Bids on any such contract shall include any towage and insurance costs involved.

#### AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums not in excess of \$45 million as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 14, strike out "twelve" and insert "twenty-four."

Page 2, line 20, strike out "\$45,000,000" and insert "\$25,000,000."

Page 2, line 22, strike out "and on the Great Lakes or other inland waterways."

Page 2, line 25, after "and" strike out "(4) in entering into such contracts the Secretary of Commerce shall not alter the present Maritime Administration policy of inviting split bids for drydock and nondrydock work. Bids on any such contract shall include any towage and insurance costs involved" and insert "(4) may be negotiated without competitive bidding whenever such action is determined by the Secretary of Commerce to be necessary to carry out the purpose of this act."

Page 3, line 10, strike out "\$45,000,000" and insert "\$25,000,000."

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

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Is this the so-called ship repair bill?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Yes, it is.

Mr. BOGGS. Does the bill provide as the other bill does for split bidding?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. It does not specifically.

Mr. BOGGS. It does not prohibit it?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. No, it does not. As a matter of fact, we have the assurance of the administration that there will be split bidding.

Mr. BOGGS. In addition, this bill will go to conference and the matter will be discussed in conference?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. That is right.

Mr. BOGGS. I hope the gentleman can arrange to write a split-bidding provision in conference.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. What is split bidding?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. In the repair of a ship there is bottom repair work and topside repair work. Yards without drydocks cannot bid on the bottom type.

Mr. BOGGS. If the gentleman will yield further, may I bring up one further point in that connection. The Maritime Administration has used the procedure?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. That is right, and they will continue to use it.

Mr. BOGGS. It has also been their observation and experience that it has been a money-saving device?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. That is correct.

Mr. BOGGS. Also it has been helpful in connection with small ship repairs?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. That is correct.

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

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. With reference to the split-bidding provision, it was discussed in the committee and it was brought out in the hearings that the Maritime Administration had been indulging in this practice and had the authority to make contracts of a split-bid nature. Therefore, in the House committee it was not even necessary to write it into the bill. That was thoroughly understood.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, we had a definite understanding with the Administrator of the Maritime Administration that that would be carried out in the administration of the act.

Mr. BONNER. There would be no change in the procedure.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### COMPACT RELATING TO HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE NEW ENGLAND STATES

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 9712) granting the consent of Congress to certain New England States to enter into a compact relating to higher education in the New England States and establishing the New England Board of Higher Education.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BAILEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, will the distinguished chairman of the committee explain to the House the object of this legislation?

Mr. McCONNELL. The object of this proposed legislation, which was reported unanimously, and I know of no objection to it, is to give the consent of Congress to the New England States to get together in an educational compact whereby they could provide for a school of medicine, a school of dentistry, and so on, which the compact States could use for the attendance of their pupils, rather than each State having the expense of erecting various professional institutions within its borders.



Mr. BAILEY. It is true, is it not, that we have compacts of that kind already authorized by the Congress, one of them, I believe, in a series of Southern States and another in a series of Western States?

Mr. McCONNELL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BAILEY. Is it not true at the present time in the 8 or 9 Western States, several of those sparsely populated States have no medical school of their own and that under this compact, they could arrange, let us say, the State of Arizona could arrange with the State of Utah which has an excellent medical school to care for the Arizona students in the Utah Medical School. That is the way the matter would work, is it not?

Mr. McCONNELL. The gentleman has stated exactly the purpose of the bill and the way it will work, if it is enacted by the Congress.

Mr. BAILEY. There is no objection to the legislation from the minority side.

Mr. McCONNELL. There is no objection that I know of.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the consent of Congress is hereby given to any two or more of the States of Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont to enter into the following compact and agreement relative to higher education and creating the New England Board of Higher Education.

The compact reads as follows:

#### ARTICLE I

The purposes of the New England Higher Education Compact shall be to provide greater educational opportunities and services through the establishment and maintenance of a coordinated educational program for the persons residing in the several States of New England parties to this compact, with the aim of furthering higher education in the fields of medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine, public health, and in professional, technical, scientific, literary, and other fields.

#### ARTICLE II

There is hereby created and established a New England board of higher education, hereinafter known as the board, which shall be an agency of each State party to the compact. The board shall be a body corporate and politic, having the powers, duties, and jurisdiction herein enumerated, and such other and additional powers as shall be conferred upon it by the concurrent act or acts of the compacting States. The board shall consist of three resident members from each compacting State, chosen in the manner and for the terms provided by law of the several States parties to this compact.

#### ARTICLE III

This compact shall become operative immediately as to those States executing it whenever any two or more of the States of Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut have executed it in the form which is in accordance with the laws of the respective compacting States.

#### ARTICLE IV

The board shall annually elect from its members a chairman and vice chairman and shall appoint and at its pleasure remove or discharge said officers. It may appoint and employ an executive secretary and may em-

ploy such stenographic, clerical, technical, or legal personnel as shall be necessary, and at its pleasure remove or discharge such personnel. It shall adopt a seal and suitable bylaws and shall promulgate any and all rules and regulations which may be necessary for the conduct of its business. It may maintain an office or offices within the territory of the compacting States and may meet at any time or place. Meetings shall be held at least twice each year. A majority of the members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, but no action of the board imposing an obligation on any compacting State shall be binding unless a majority of the members from such compacting State shall have voted in favor thereof. Where meetings are planned to discuss matters relevant to problems of education affecting only certain of the compacting States, the board may vote to authorize special meetings of the board members of such States. The board shall keep accurate accounts of all receipts and disbursements and shall make an annual report to the Governor and the legislature of each compacting State, setting forth in detail the operations and transactions conducted by it pursuant to this compact, and shall make recommendations for any legislative action deemed by it advisable, including amendments to the statutes of the compacting States which may be necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of this compact. The board shall not pledge the credit of any compacting State without the consent of the legislature thereof given pursuant to the constitutional processes of said State. The board may meet any of its obligations in whole or in part with funds available to it under article VII of this compact: *Provided*, That the board take specific action setting aside such funds prior to the incurring of any obligation to be met in whole or in part in this manner. Except where the board makes use of funds available to it under article VII hereof, the board shall not incur any obligations for salaries, office, administrative, traveling, or other expenses prior to the allotment of funds by the compacting States adequate to meet the same. Each compacting State reserves the right to provide hereafter by law for the examination and audit of the accounts of the board. The board shall appoint a treasurer who may be a member of the board, and disbursements by the board shall be valid only when authorized by the board and when vouchers therefor have been signed by the executive secretary and countersigned by the treasurer. The executive secretary shall be custodian of the records of the board with authority to attest to and certify such records or copies thereof.

#### ARTICLE V

The board shall have the power to: (1) collect, correlate, and evaluate data in the fields of its interest under this compact; to publish reports, bulletins, and other documents making available the results of its research; and, in its discretion to charge fees for said reports, bulletins, and documents; (2) enter into such contractual agreements or arrangements with any of the compacting States or agencies thereof and with educational institutions and agencies as may be required in the judgment of the board to provide adequate services and facilities in educational fields covered by this compact; provided, that it shall be the policy of the board in the negotiation of its agreements to serve increased numbers of students from the compacting States through arrangements with then existing institutions, whenever in the judgment of the board adequate service can be so secured in the New England region. Each of the compacting States shall contribute funds to carry out the contracts of the board on the basis of the number of students from such State for whom the board may contract. Contri-

butions shall be at the rate determined by the board in each educational field. Except in those instances where the board by specific action allocates funds available to it under Article VII hereof, the board's authority to enter into such contracts shall be only upon appropriation of funds by the compacting States. Any contract entered into shall be in accordance with rules and regulations promulgated by the board and in accordance with the laws of the compacting States.

#### ARTICLE VI

Each State agrees that, when authorized by the legislature pursuant to the constitutional processes, it will from time to time make available to the board such funds as may be required for the expenses of the board as authorized under the terms of this compact. The contribution of each State for this purpose shall be in the proportion that its population bears to the total combined population of the States who are parties hereto as shown from time to time by the most recent official published report of the Bureau of the Census of the United States of America, unless the board shall adopt another basis in making its recommendation for appropriation to the compacting States.

#### ARTICLE VII

The board for the purposes of this compact is hereby empowered to receive grants, devises, gifts, and bequests which the board may agree to accept and administer. The board shall administer property held in accordance with special trusts, grants, and bequests, and shall also administer grants and devises of land and gifts or bequests of personal property made to the board for special uses, and shall execute said trusts, investing the proceeds thereof in notes or bonds secured by sufficient mortgage or other securities.

#### ARTICLE VIII

The provisions of this compact shall be severable, and if any phrase, clause, sentence, or provision of this compact is declared to be contrary to the constitution of any compacting State or of the United States the validity of the remainder of this compact and the applicability thereof to any government, agency, person, or circumstance shall not be affected thereby; provided, that if this compact is held to be contrary to the constitution of any compacting State the compact shall remain in full force and effect as to all other compacting States.

#### ARTICLE IX

This compact shall continue in force and remain binding upon a compacting State until the legislature or the governor of such State, as the laws of such State shall provide, takes action to withdraw therefrom. Such action shall not be effective until 2 years after notice thereof has been sent by the governor of the State desiring to withdraw to the governors of all other States then parties to the compact. Such withdrawal shall not relieve the withdrawing State from its obligations accruing hereunder prior to the effective date of withdrawal. Any State so withdrawing, unless reinstated, shall cease to have any claim to or ownership of any of the property held by or vested in the board or to any of the funds of the board held under the terms of the compact. Thereafter, the withdrawing State may be reinstated by application after appropriate legislation is enacted by such State, upon approval by a majority vote of the board.

#### ARTICLE X

If any compacting State shall at any time default in the performance of any of its obligations assumed or imposed in accordance with the provisions of this compact, all rights and privileges and benefits conferred by this compact or agreement hereunder shall be suspended from the effective

date of such default as fixed by the board. Unless such default shall be remedied within a period of 2 years following the effective date of such default, this compact may be terminated with respect to such defaulting State by affirmative vote of three-fourths of the member States. Any such defaulting State may be reinstated by (a) performing all acts and obligations upon which it has heretofore defaulted, and (b) application to and approval by a majority vote of the board.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENDING CERTAIN BENEFITS TO CIVILIAN INTERNEES AND AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR DURING HOSTILITIES IN KOREA

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 9390) to extend certain civilian-internee and prisoner-of-war benefits under the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to civilian internees and American prisoners of war captured and held during the hostilities in Korea.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That (a) section 5 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended (50 App. U. S. C., sec. 2004), is hereby amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(g) (1) As used in this subsection, the term 'civilian American citizen' means any person who, being then a citizen of the United States, was captured in Korea on or after June 25, 1950, by any hostile force with which the Armed Forces of the United States were actually engaged in armed conflict subsequent to such date and prior to the date of enactment of this subsection, or who went into hiding in Korea in order to avoid capture or internment by any such hostile force; except (A) a person who at any time voluntarily and knowingly gave aid to, collaborated with, or in any manner served any such hostile force, or (B) a regularly appointed, enrolled, enlisted, or inducted member of the Armed Forces of the United States.

"(2) The Commission is authorized to receive and to determine, according to law, the amount and validity, and provide for the payment of any claim filed by, or on behalf of, any civilian American citizen for detention benefits for any period of time subsequent to June 25, 1950, and prior to the date of enactment of this subsection, during which he was held by any such hostile force as a prisoner, internee, hostage, or in any other capacity, or remained in hiding to avoid being captured or interned by any such hostile force.

"(3) The detention benefit allowed to any person under the provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection shall be at the rate of \$60 for each calendar month during which such person was at least 18 years of age and at the rate of \$25 per month for each calendar month during which such person was less than 18 years of age.

"(4) The detention benefits allowed under paragraph (2) of this subsection shall be allowed to the person entitled thereto, or,

in the event of his death, only to the following persons:

"(A) widow or dependent husband if there is no child or children of the deceased;

"(B) widow or dependent husband and child or children of the deceased, one-half to the widow or dependent husband and the other half to the child or children in equal shares;

"(C) child or children of the deceased (in equal shares) if there is no widow or dependent husband.

"(5) Any claim allowed by the Commission under this subsection shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of funds appropriated pursuant to this subsection, and shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to the person entitled thereto, except that where any person entitled to payment under this subsection is under any legal disability, payment may be made in accordance with the provisions of subsection (e) of this section.

"(6) Claims for benefits under this subsection must be filed with the Commission within 6 months from the date of enactment of this subsection, and the Commission shall complete its determinations with respect to the claims authorized by this subsection at the earliest practicable date but in no event later than 1 year after the expiration of the time for filing such claims.

"(7) (A) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection, including necessary administrative expenses.

"(B) The Commission shall determine, from time to time, the share of its administrative expenses attributable to the performance of its functions under this subsection and make the appropriate adjustments in its accounts, and determinations and adjustments made pursuant to this subparagraph shall be final and conclusive."

(b) Subsection (a) of such section 5 is hereby amended by inserting after the words "As used in" the following: "subsections (b) and (f) of".

(c) Subsection (e) of such section 5 is hereby amended by inserting after the words "under this section" the following: "(except under subsection (g))".

SEC. 2. (a) The subsection (d) of section 6 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended (50 App. U. S. C., sec. 2005), which was added to such section by Public Law 304, 82d Congress, is hereby redesignated as subsection (f).

(b) Such section 6 is hereby amended by inserting immediately after the subsection (d) which was added to such section by Public Law 303, 82d Congress, the following new subsection:

"(e) (1) As used in this subsection the term 'prisoner of war' means any regularly appointed, enrolled, enlisted, or inducted member of the Armed Forces of the United States who was held as a prisoner of war for any period of time subsequent to June 25, 1950, by any hostile force with which the Armed Forces of the United States were actually engaged in armed conflict subsequent to such date and prior to the date of enactment of this subsection, except any such member who, at any time, voluntarily and knowingly gave aid to, collaborated with, or in any manner served any such hostile force.

"(2) The Commission is authorized to receive and to determine, according to law, the amount and validity, and provide for the payment of any claim filed by any prisoner of war for compensation for the failure of the hostile force by which he was held as a prisoner of war, or its agents, to furnish him the quantity or quality of food prescribed for prisoners of war under the terms of the Geneva Convention of July 27, 1929. The compensation allowed to any prisoner of war under the provisions of this paragraph shall

be at the rate of \$1 for each day prior to the date of enactment of this subsection on which he was held as a prisoner of war and on which such hostile force, or its agents, failed to furnish him such quantity or quality of food.

"(3) The Commission is authorized to receive and to determine, according to law, the amount and validity and provide for the payment of any claim filed by any prisoner of war for compensation—

"(A) for the failure of the hostile force by which he was held as a prisoner of war, or its agents, to meet the conditions and requirements prescribed under title III, section III, of the Geneva Convention of July 27, 1929, relating to labor of prisoners of war; or

"(B) for inhumane treatment by the hostile force by which he was held, or its agents. The term 'inhumane treatment' as used herein shall include, but not be limited to, failure of such hostile force, or its agents, to meet the conditions and requirements of one or more of the provisions of articles 2, 3, 7, 10, 12, 13, 21, 22, 54, 56, or 57 of the Geneva Convention of July 27, 1929.

Compensation shall be allowed to any prisoner of war under this paragraph at the rate of \$1.50 per day for each day prior to the date of enactment of this subsection on which he was held as a prisoner of war and with respect to which he alleges and proves in a manner acceptable to the Commission the failure to meet the conditions and requirements described in subparagraph (A) or the inhumane treatment described in subparagraph (B). In no event shall the compensation allowed to any prisoner of war under this paragraph exceed the sum of \$1.50 with respect to any one day.

"(4) Any claim allowed by the Commission under this subsection shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of funds appropriated pursuant to this subsection and shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to the person entitled thereto, and shall, in case of death of the persons who are entitled, be paid only to or for the benefit of the persons specified, and in the order established, by paragraph (4) of subsection (d) of this section.

"(5) Claims for compensation under this subsection must be filed with the Commission within 6 months from the date of enactment of this subsection, and the Commission shall complete its determinations with respect to the claims authorized by this subsection at the earliest practicable date but in no event later than 1 year after the expiration of the time for filing such claims.

"(6) Any claim allowed under the provisions of this subsection shall be paid from funds appropriated pursuant to paragraph (7) of this subsection.

"(7) (A) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection, including necessary administrative expenses.

"(B) The Commission shall determine, from time to time, the share of its administrative expenses attributable to the performance of its functions under this subsection and make the appropriate adjustments in its accounts, and determinations and adjustments made pursuant to this subparagraph shall be final and conclusive."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That (a) section 5 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended (50 App. U. S. C., sec. 2004), is hereby amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof.

"(g) (1) As used in this subsection, the term 'civilian American citizens' means any person who, being then a citizen of the United States, was captured in Korea on or



after June 25, 1950, by any hostile force with which the Armed Forces of the United States were actually engaged in armed conflict subsequent to such date and prior to the date of enactment of this subsection, or who went into hiding in Korea in order to avoid capture or internment by any such hostile force; except (A) a person who at any time voluntarily, knowingly, and without duress, gave aid to or collaborated with or in any manner served any such hostile force, or (B) a regularly appointed, enrolled, enlisted, or inducted member of the Armed Forces of the United States.

"(2) The Commission is authorized to receive and to determine, according to law, the amount and validity, and provide for the payment of any claim filed by, or on behalf of, any civilian American citizen for detention benefits for any period of time subsequent to June 25, 1950, during which he was held by any such hostile force as a prisoner, internee, hostage, or in any other capacity, or remained in hiding to avoid being captured or interned by any such hostile force.

"(3) The detention benefit allowed to any person under the provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection shall be at the rate of \$60 for each calendar month during which such person was at least 18 years of age and at the rate of \$25 per month for each calendar month during which such person was less than 18 years of age.

"(4) The detention benefits allowed under paragraph (2) of this subsection shall be allowed to the person entitled thereto, or, in the event of his death, only to the following persons:

"(A) widow or husband if there is no child or children of the deceased;

"(B) widow or dependent husband and child or children of the deceased, one-half to the widow or dependent husband and the other half to the child or children in equal shares;

"(C) child or children of the deceased (in equal shares) if there is no widow or dependent husband.

"(5) Any claim allowed by the Commission under this subsection shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of funds appropriated pursuant to this subsection, and shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to the person entitled thereto, except that where any person entitled to payment under this subsection is under any legal disability, payment may be made in accordance with the provisions of subsection (e) of this section.

"(6) Each claim filed under this subsection must be filed not later than 1 year from whichever of the following dates last occurs:

"(A) The date of enactment of this subsection;

"(B) The date the civilian American citizen by whom the claim is filed returned to the jurisdiction of the United States; or

"(C) The date upon which the Commission, at the request of a potentially eligible survivor, makes a determination that the civilian American citizen has actually died or may be presumed to be dead, in the case of any civilian American citizen who has not returned to the jurisdiction of the United States.

The Commission shall complete its determinations with respect to each claim filed under this subsection at the earliest practicable date, but in no event later than 1 year after the date on which such claim was filed.

"(7) (A) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection, including necessary administrative expenses.

"(B) The Commission shall determine, from time to time, the share of its administrative expenses attributable to the performance of its functions under this subsection

and make the appropriate adjustments in its accounts, and determinations and adjustments made pursuant to this subparagraph shall be final and conclusive.'

"(b) Subsection (a) of such section 5 is hereby amended by inserting after the words 'As used in' the following: 'subsections (b) and (f) of'.

"(c) Subsection (e) of such section 5 is hereby amended by inserting after the words 'under this section' the following: '(except under subsection (g))'.

"Sec. 2. (a) The subsection (d) of section 6 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended (50 App. U. S. C., sec. 2005), which was added to such section by Public Law 304, 82d Congress, is hereby redesignated as subsection (f).

"(b) Such section 6 is hereby amended by inserting immediately after the subsection (d) which was added to such section by Public Law 303, 82d Congress, the following new subsection:

"(e) (1) As used in this subsection the term "prisoner of war" means any regularly appointed, enrolled, enlisted, or inducted member of the Armed Forces of the United States who was held as a prisoner of war for any period of time subsequent to June 25, 1950, by any hostile force with which the Armed Forces of the United States were actually engaged in armed conflict subsequent to such date and prior to the date of enactment of this subsection, except any such member who, at any time, voluntarily, knowingly, and without duress, gave aid to or collaborated with or in any manner served any such hostile force.

"(2) The Commission is authorized to receive and to determine, according to law, the amount and validity, and provide for the payment of any claim filed by any prisoner of war for compensation for the failure of the hostile force by which he was held as a prisoner of war, or its agents, to furnish him the quantity or quality of food prescribed for prisoners of war under the terms of the Geneva Convention of July 27, 1929. The compensation allowed to any prisoner of war under the provisions of this paragraph shall be at the rate of \$1 for each day on which he was held as a prisoner of war and on which such hostile force, or its agents, failed to furnish him such quantity or quality of food.

"(3) The Commission is authorized to receive and to determine, according to law, the amount and validity and provide for the payment of any claim filed by any prisoner of war for compensation—

"(A) for the failure of the hostile force by which he was held as a prisoner of war, or its agents, to meet the conditions and requirements prescribed under title III, section III, of the Geneva Convention of July 27, 1929, relating to labor of prisoners of war; or

"(B) for inhumane treatment by the hostile force by which he was held, or its agents. The term "inhumane treatment" as used herein shall include, but not be limited to, failure of such hostile force, or its agents, to meet the conditions and requirements of one or more of the provisions of articles 2, 3, 7, 10, 12, 13, 21, 22, 54, 56, or 57 of the Geneva Convention of July 27, 1929.

Compensation shall be allowed to any prisoner of war under this paragraph at the rate of \$1.50 per day for each day on which he was held as a prisoner of war and with respect to which he alleges and proves in a manner acceptable to the Commission the failure to meet the conditions and requirements described in subparagraph (A) or the inhumane treatment described in subparagraph (B). In no event shall the compensation allowed to any prisoner of war under this paragraph exceed the sum of \$1.50 with respect to any one day.

"(4) Any claim allowed by the Commission under this subsection shall be certified

to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of funds appropriated pursuant to this subsection and shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to the person entitled thereto, and shall, in case of death or determination of death of the persons who are entitled, be paid only to or for the benefit of the persons specified, and in the order established, by paragraph (4) of subsection (d) of this section.

"(5) Each claim filed under this subsection must be filed not later than 1 year from whichever of the following dates last occurs:

"(A) The date of enactment of this subsection;

"(B) The date the prisoner of war by whom the claim is filed returned to the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces of the United States; or

"(C) The date upon which the Department of Defense makes a determination that the prisoner of war has actually died or is presumed to be dead, in the case of any prisoner of war who has not returned to the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces of the United States.

The Commission shall complete its determinations with respect to each claim filed under this subsection at the earliest practicable date, but in no event later than 1 year after the date on which such claim was filed.

"(6) Any claim allowed under the provisions of this subsection shall be paid from funds appropriated pursuant to paragraph (7) of this subsection.

"(7) (A) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection, including necessary administrative expenses.

"(B) The Commission shall determine, from time to time, the share of its administrative expenses attributable to the performance of its functions under this subsection and make the appropriate adjustments in its accounts, and determinations and adjustments made pursuant to this subparagraph shall be final and conclusive.'

"Sec. 3. (a) Subsections (a) and (e) of section 2 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended (50 App. U. S. C., sec. 2001), are hereby repealed, and subsections (b), (c), and (d) of such section are hereby redesignated as subsections (a), (b), and (c), respectively.

"(b) The first sentence of the subsection herein redesignated as subsection (a) is hereby amended by striking out 'The Commission' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"))'.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

House Resolution 657 was laid on the table.

#### PROVIDING TWO ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE, RESPECTIVELY

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 689) providing for a consideration of H. R. 9689, a bill to provide for two additional Assistant Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, 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. 9689) to provide for two additional Assistant Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, 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. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and now yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for two Assistant Secretaries each for the branches of the service, that is, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. One might ask—just why do they need additional Secretaries for each branch of the service. Mr. Wilson, who is Secretary of Defense, and Mr. Seaton and John Slezak have come here, men for whom I know we all have the greatest respect for their judgment, have said that these additional Secretaries are necessary. They have told us they expect to use them in this way. That in the event this bill passes and the two additional Secretaries are granted, one of them will be placed in a position in regard to financial matters of his department, that is more or less to be an acting comptroller. The other additional Secretary will be placed in the capacity of logistics in regard to research and development in each of the branches. The setup in the Department of Defense now is that Secretary of Defense Wilson does have a comptroller who is in charge of the fiscal operations in the Department of Defense. Each one of the branches of the service under this bill would have an Assistant Secretary, one of whom would act as acting comptroller who would work with the comptroller in the Department of Defense and thus coordinate the financial work of the departments. The same thing is true in regard to the logistics and the research and development in the various branches. They would coordinate that work with the Department of Defense. Mr. Wilson came before the Committee on Armed Services and said he would like to have a civilian in these positions. I understand now that noncivilians are doing that work, which he feels civilians would do better.

If I may make one observation, which I think is in keeping with the matter before us, when Mr. Wilson was before the Armed Services Committee the chairman of the committee went into this matter. He asked Mr. Wilson when he was chairman of the board of General Motors how many people were em-

ployed there. Mr. Wilson said between 400,000 and 450,000; that the amount involved in General Motors was about \$7 billion a year. In the Defense Department there are about 5 million affected, 3½ million in uniform and about 1½ million working in ordnance plants, and so on. In addition Mr. Wilson said that in General Motors they had 33 vice presidents who were in charge of the multitude of efforts and operations.

So I say to you that I believe no one would question the motives of a man like Mr. Wilson. In my judgment, I hope this bill will be passed.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on this side.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. 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, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI asked and was given permission to address the House tomorrow for 1 hour, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

#### TWO ADDITIONAL SECRETARIES OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE

Mr. ARENDS. 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. 9689) to provide for two additional Assistant Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively.

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. 9689, with Mr. Bow in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] is recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take any more time than I feel necessary, but I do have some remarks which I think incorporate answers to some of the questions that may be in the minds of some of the Members, and I will try to completely answer them, if possible.

The purpose of H. R. 9689 is to authorize the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries for each of the military departments. If the bill becomes law, each of the military departments will then have a Secretary, an Under Secretary, and four Assistant Secretaries. The Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wilson, specifically requested this legislation and I think he is to be commended for his efforts to bring about greater efficiency in the military depart-

ments and the Department of Defense. He is of the opinion that the present organization of the military departments fails to provide for the current organizational needs of these departments and does not permit the military Secretaries to divide properly the responsibilities among their civilian assistants.

Secretary Wilson is also of the opinion that two additional Secretaries in each of the military departments will do much toward improving the civilian control of each of the military departments as well as increase the efficiency of each of the military departments.

And of probably greater significance is the fact that the two additional Assistant Secretaries in each of the military departments will strengthen the operational and functional control of each of the military departments and will permit the Department of Defense to concentrate its activities on the question of overall policy control as originally contemplated by the National Security Act.

One of the new Assistant Secretaries in each of the departments will be an Assistant Secretary for Financial Management. This Assistant Secretary may also act as comptroller for his department if so designated by the cognizant Secretary.

The Committee on Armed Services strongly recommends that in the title of one of the Assistant Secretaries the words "Research and Development" be inserted by administrative action so as to place proper emphasis on the importance of this activity. We recognize, of course, the desirability of flexibility in these matters, and have therefore not attempted to designate by law the titles of all of the Assistant Secretaries except that for financial management, but we do think each of the military departments should have an Assistant Secretary not only charged with the responsibility for research and development, but also will have within his title the words "Research and Development." This can be done administratively and can be changed if for some reason or other it is desired to place this responsibility in another Assistant Secretary. It is for the latter reason that we have not attempted to tie the hands of the Secretary by designating the title by law, but we do want to emphasize the importance of research and development.

If the proposed legislation becomes law there will be for the Army a Secretary of the Army, an Under Secretary, an Assistant Secretary for Financial Management, and Assistant Secretary for Manpower and Reserve Forces, an Assistant Secretary for Civil-Military Affairs, and an Assistant Secretary for Logistics who will also have the responsibility for research and development. We recommend to the Secretary that this Assistant Secretary be known as the Assistant Secretary for Logistics and Research and Development.

In the Navy there will be a Secretary, and Under Secretary, and an Assistant Secretary for Financial Management who will also act as comptroller. There will also be an Assistant Secretary for



Personnel and Reserve Forces, an Assistant Secretary for Material, and an Assistant Secretary for Air, a title already designated by previous law. We recommend to the Secretary that this title be augmented to that of Assistant Secretary for Air and Research and Development.

In the Air Force there will be a Secretary, an Under Secretary, an Assistant Secretary for Financial Management, an Assistant Secretary for Manpower, Personnel, and Reserve Forces, and an Assistant Secretary for Material. The fourth Assistant Secretary will be designated as the Assistant Secretary for Research and Development.

The Armed Services Committee thinks this legislation will do much to improve the efficiency of our military departments. We were particularly impressed with the statement made by Mr. Wilson that 20 years ago the total appropriation for the Navy and Army, which included the Air Force, was approximately \$650 million. Twenty years ago each department had a Secretary, an Under Secretary, and two Assistant Secretaries. Today, those departments are spending 75 times that amount of money but still only have a Secretary, an Under Secretary, and two Assistant Secretaries. It is obvious that there is considerable justification for the proposed legislation which would authorize the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries for each of the military departments.

It simply boils down to a question of whether or not the Congress wants to authorize the appointment of enough key personnel to do the job that Congress insists be done.

The Department of Defense employs more than 5 million persons—combining military and civilian personnel—and each of the departments alone spends more than any other department of the Government.

There are 23 Secretaries, Deputy Secretaries, and Assistant Secretaries today—this bill will provide for a total of 29. It sounds like a large number until we consider the tremendous responsibilities involved.

This bill authorizes the addition of 6 Assistant Secretaries—2 in each military department. It should result in more efficiency, greater savings, and more control of the military departments by the military Secretaries.

Finally, I want to add this thought. In 1952, the Office of the Secretary of Defense employed 2,575 persons—military and civilian. Last year, when Congress authorized 6 additional Assistant Secretaries for the Department of Defense, Mr. Wilson said it would result in greater efficiency with fewer employees. Well, today the Office of the Secretary of Defense has only 2,091 employees—a reduction of 484 employees. Mr. Wilson kept his word, and I have every reason to believe that the enactment of this bill will also result in additional savings to the Government.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I want to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that we had a far greater number of military and civilian personnel during World War II?

Mr. ARENDS. Yes, we did.

Mr. GROSS. How did we stagger through the war, can the gentleman tell me without all these additional assistant secretaries which will total 12 if these are added?

Mr. ARENDS. I think the answer is that during the war we paid little attention to matters of efficiency, or money, or anything else. All we were doing during the war was one thing. We had one objective before us and that was to win the war, regardless of cost or anything else. Now we are trying to bring about efficiency in operations, research and development and procurement within the departments and we are trying to get a better check on things being done within the Department of Defense.

Mr. GROSS. Then we came along with the Unification Act. I am happy to say I did not vote for it. Was that not supposed to provide for efficiency and economy?

Mr. ARENDS. Yes, it was, and, very frankly, as I have said before, I think we are today beginning to get some of that desired efficiency and economy.

Mr. GROSS. And then within another 6 or 10 years we will get just a little more?

Mr. ARENDS. I think we are now getting to the place where we are much closer toward receiving a dollar's worth of defense for every dollar we spend. Our Armed Services Committee is doing everything it can to cooperate toward that end.

Mr. GROSS. And if we keep on adding assistant secretaries we will get economy.

Mr. ARENDS. Let me tell you this, and the statement came from the Assistant Secretary in the Department of the Budget:

This legislation will not involve additional fiscal expenditures. It is believed that the efficiency that will result from the more effective organization of the military departments along functional lines will not only result in sufficient economies to underwrite the cost of this legislation, but will in the long run save substantial appropriated moneys.

I like to believe that.

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

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

Mr. TEAGUE. How much of a turnover has there been in assistant secretaries down there since the present administration took over?

Mr. ARENDS. I do not know.

Mr. TEAGUE. It is my understanding it is about 50 percent. If that is true, would the gentleman tell us how long a man would have to stay down there in charge of financial management or research and development before he earned his pay?

Mr. ARENDS. I am hoping that these assistant secretary jobs will be attractive enough to bring public-spirited people in this country, who are in a financial

position to do so, down here and devote their energies to these jobs. When they get some recognition, perhaps with a title to it, they may come to Washington and devote some of their energies for the benefit of Uncle Sam.

Mr. TEAGUE. If they come down here and stay only 6 months or a year, this is nothing more than patronage, and I am against it.

Mr. ARENDS. I am hopeful that we can get the right kind of men down here, regardless of politics, who can and will do a job.

Mr. TEAGUE. I hope the gentleman is correct.

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

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

Mr. RIEHLMAN. I want to commend the gentleman for bringing this legislation before the House today and also to commend him for the statement he has made about the recommendations the Armed Services Committee is making in regard to the assignment of these secretaries of defense. The Committee on Government Operations has made a recommendation and it made that recommendation some time ago that if any other assistant secretary is appointed he would be appointed to this position of comptroller in the different Departments of Defense and also in the field of research and development. Those recommendations were made by our committee. I hope the gentleman who is addressing the House will take the opportunity of reading our report we recently got out on research and development. I think he will recognize then that the Committee on Armed Services ought to follow up and see that these assistant secretaries are assigned to these most important positions which I am sure will tend toward efficiency and economy in the operation of our Defense Department.

Mr. ARENDS. I know of the fine work of the subcommittee headed by the gentleman from New York, and some of its recommendations. I am pleased that our thinking is in line and parallels that of the gentleman from New York.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman from New York think that another assistant secretary might explain the purchase of several million military overcoats that were bought and never used?

Mr. RIEHLMAN. I leave that to your discretion.

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

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the chairman of the subcommittee that this bill should be passed. It is a fact that the work is already being done in the three military departments. The report of the Bureau of the Budget and the report of the committee indicate that the bill will not result in any expenditure of funds. That is because the work is being done by employees in the Department. On the other hand, you are going to be able to get a much better type of

person to assume a position of Assistant Secretary than if you can only offer him a position as an employee or as a consultant or something of that kind. We want to bring into the Government the finer types of relatively young executives, and for a young executive to have in his record and his background service as an Assistant Secretary of one of the military departments will be of value to him in the future, whereas only a statement that he has been a Government employee or consultant would not be of any value.

In addition to that, when he becomes an Assistant Secretary he is placed in the line of precedence within the department. It then becomes possible for the Secretary of the military service to delegate to him some of the powers and functions that are imposed upon the Secretary. Then the Assistant Secretary can act on those matters; he can act in his own name. If he is not an Assistant Secretary but only an employee, whatever he does must be reviewed by someone who, under the law, is able to act in his own name, so that your administration is handicapped and you do not expedite the work of the department. I remember that in recent years on many occasions, in order that the Congress might have an opportunity to take a look at the man who is going to administer the functions in the department, we have required senatorial confirmation. There again there is great value in having these persons designated as Assistant Secretaries rather than just employees or consultants, because when they are designated as Assistant Secretaries their names must be submitted to the Senate for confirmation so that Congress gets a chance to look at them.

I do not know that there is any validity to the argument that you are getting too many Assistant Secretaries. You have got the employees there; you are paying them the money; the work is being done. It has to be done, and I think they should be given rank commensurate with their responsibilities and the ability to discharge the functions of the office more rapidly and more efficiently.

I believe the bill should be passed, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have no illusions about what will happen with respect to this bill. It will sail right on through the House as all the others have in the past, but I want the RECORD to show that I am opposed to it.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to big Government. I campaigned on that basis in 1952, and I thought a lot of other Republicans campaigned on that basis, but I guess I was wrong. I thought we would begin to whittle down once the Republicans took over control of the House, but instead of that, additional Assistant Secretaries and Under Secretaries are being voted all the time. I have not voted for a single one of them. I am fundamentally and organically opposed to big Government bureaucracy and empire building. One of the first bills we passed last year was to create a

new Under Secretary in the State Department. For what purpose? The story given us was that this new official would get rid of the surplus personnel in the State Department. And bless your hearts and souls, what happened? As of June, this year, he got rid of exactly 160 people in the State Department. I am not going to buy this bill of goods on the basis that six new Assistant Secretaries will provide efficiency or economy any more than I am going to believe that unification has produced economy in the Department of Defense. I would not be surprised if one of these days a bill went through Congress to provide for an Under Secretary to take care of the Under Secretaries and an Assistant Secretary to take care of the Assistant Secretaries.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time having expired, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 102 (a) of the Army Organization Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 264) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"There shall be in the Department of the Army an Under Secretary of the Army and four Assistant Secretaries of the Army, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive the compensation prescribed by law. One of the Assistant Secretaries authorized herein shall be designated Assistant Secretary of the Army for Financial Management, and may also act as Comptroller of the Army, if so designated by the Secretary of the Army."

(b) Subsections (b) and (c) of section 101 of the Army Organization Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 264) are amended by deleting the word "either", wherever appearing, and inserting in lieu thereof the word "an."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 1, line 7, after "appointed", insert "from civilian life."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. Two Assistant Secretaries of the Navy may be appointed from civilian life by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Such Assistant Secretaries shall be in addition to the Assistant Secretary of the Navy authorized under section 1 of the act of July 11, 1890 (26 Stat. 254), as amended, and the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air authorized under section 4 of the act of June 24, 1926 (44 Stat. 767), as amended, making a total of 4 Assistant Secretaries. Each such additional Assistant Secretary shall perform such functions as the Secretary of the Navy may from time to time prescribe and each shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed by law for Assistant Secretaries of military departments. One of the Assistant Secretaries authorized herein shall be designated as the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Financial Management, and may also act as Comptroller of the Navy, if so designated by the Secretary of the Navy. The Assistant Secretaries of the Navy shall

succeed to the Office of the Secretary of the Navy during his temporary absence in the position provided for the Assistant Secretary of the Navy and the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air by section 10 of the act of March 5, 1948 (62 Stat. 66), and the Assistant Secretaries of the Navy shall take order among themselves in the order prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy or if no order is prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy then in the order in which the several Assistant Secretaries of the Navy took office as such.

Sec. 3. (a) Subsection (a) of section 102 of the Air Force Organization Act of 1951 (65 Stat. 327) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"There shall be in the Department of the Air Force an Under Secretary of the Air Force and 4 Assistant Secretaries of the Air Force, who shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive the compensation prescribed by law. One of the Assistant Secretaries authorized herein shall be designated Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Financial Management, and may also act as Comptroller of the Air Force, if so designated by the Secretary of the Air Force."

(b) Subsection (d) of section 207 of the National Security Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 495), is hereby amended by deleting the word "two" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "four."

(c) Subsections (b) and (c) of section 101 of the Air Force Organization Act of 1951 (65 Stat. 327) are amended by deleting the word "either", wherever appearing, and inserting in lieu thereof the word "an."

The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 3, line 16, after "appointed", insert "from civilian life."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations of which the outstanding and distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN] is chairman, conducted an investigation into the field of military science covering a period of several weeks. That covers, of course, the important field of research and development.

The committee has rendered an outstanding service, has made a real contribution. I sat in with the subcommittee upon invitation because I have been very much interested in the field of military research and development for a number of years, particularly in the last 4 years I felt a situation existed in which we were not getting the maximum results, due more or less to organizational matters within the military, and other irritations and conflicts that developed between one group of men, well meaning on one side, the military subject to discipline, and another group on the other side, equally well meaning, the scientists of the country, as individualistic in their thinking as any group of individuals can be. Three or four years ago I introduced a bill calling for an Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Development. In the past Congress and also in this Congress I



introduced a bill providing for an Assistant Secretary for Air, of the Navy, and of the Army for Research and Development. I am very glad to note that there is an Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Development, Assistant Secretary Quarles. This bill provides for two additional Secretaries. I favor the bill.

I appeared before the Committee on Armed Services when this bill was before it and presented my views in support of an Assistant Secretary of the Army, Air Force, and Navy for Research and Development. I am very glad to note the language contained in the committee report which is practically a directive to the Army and the Navy to include the words "Research and Development" in the title of one of the two assistant secretaries this bill will create if it becomes law.

As far as the Air Force is concerned, one of the two will be designated as Assistant Secretary for Air and Research and Development, because Secretary Talbott so stated to the members of the House Committee on Armed Services.

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

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

Mr. IKARD. May I compliment the gentleman for calling the attention of the House to the report of the Military Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations concerning research and development. Also, as a member of that subcommittee, I would like to pay tribute to the distinguished and outstanding leadership the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN] has afforded to the committee throughout this whole session of Congress, and the outstanding job he has done on this and other matters. I also compliment the gentlemen from Massachusetts on directing our attention to this matter, and contributing so much to the hearings, which I feel have served a very worthwhile purpose and will be of great benefit to everyone.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate the remarks of my friend from Texas. They are particularly applicable to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN] and the other members of the regular subcommittee.

I commend to my colleagues the reading of the report. It is one of the finest reports, one of the most constructive reports that any subcommittee or committee of Congress has ever written.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN] as we all know is not only a gentleman in fact as well as in name but he is also one of the outstanding Members of this body. The report is one that will live. The subcommittee under the leadership of the gentleman from New York shows Congress at its highest level and in its finest form in connection with an investigation. The investigation made by the Riehlman subcommittee could well be a guide for every other investigation that is made by any committee or any subcommittee or any special committee.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF], who is a member of the permanent subcommittee and who also has contributed immeasurably to the wonderful report made by this subcommittee.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, I associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from Massachusetts and to commend the magnificent leadership of the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN], who has headed this committee and who has attracted such a fine staff around him. The gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN] has had the loyalty and hard work of the members of his committee and of his staff because of the magnificent leadership and the very fine work he has done in the field of research and development.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I state that the reference made by my friend, the gentleman from Florida, to the fine staff is richly deserved. I have never had as much pleasure working with a staff on any committee, and I have been here for many years, as my colleagues know. I have never been more impressed by any staff than the staff of Mr. RIEHLMAN's subcommittee.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. As the ranking Democratic member of the Riehlman subcommittee, I want to add my words of praise to the work that WALTER RIEHLMAN has done on this committee and to the report. I call the attention of the Committee that every report for the past 2 years by this subcommittee has been unanimous. There has never been a dissenting report. That shows the gentleman from New York and the members of his subcommittee not only are dedicated to the best interests of the Congress as a whole, but it shows the degree of statesmanship and the ability to get along with other members of the committee is on a high order. I want also to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his participation in this subcommittee's deliberations and the contribution which he made to this investigation on the research and development programs of the three branches of the service. I believe this report will point the way toward more efficiency and savings in the future.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate the remarks of my friend, the gentleman from California. May I ask the distinguished minority whip 1 or 2 questions in order that the RECORD might definitely state the intention of the Committee on Armed Services. Of course, I intend at the next session to introduce a bill for an Assistant Secretary of Research and Development for the Army and one for the Navy. Secretary Talbott has shown outstanding leadership in this matter, as he is going to name 1 of these 2 Assistant Secretaries in this bill as Assistant Secretary for Research and Development. He recognizes the importance of research and development in the world today as well as in the world of tomorrow, particularly in connection with military research.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. The Committee on Armed Services certainly recognizes the importance of this and has rather emphatically set forth in its report what the intent and purpose of the bill is.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. I appreciate what the committee did. I want to ask first, when the committee put this language in the report, the committee intended so far as one of these two Assistants for the Army and Navy is concerned that they would probably be designated—whatever the full title might be—also Assistant Secretaries for Research and Development, is that not correct?

Mr. ARENDS. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. I expressed the hope that the title would be Assistant Secretaries for Research and Development—and then whatever else would be added after the words, "Research and Development." I think most of the members of the committee would agree with that. But in any event, it is the intention of the committee that 1 of these 2 assistants, one for the Army and one for the Navy, would also carry in their titles the words "Research and Development."

Mr. ARENDS. We are very clearly setting that forth, yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. And the committee would be keenly disappointed if that was not done, is that correct?

Mr. ARENDS. Very much so.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. We have four more Assistant Secretaries. Would the gentleman justify the other two?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Iowa is very keen and I admire him very, very much. The gentleman from Massachusetts strongly feels that research and development is vitally important in the preservation and success of our country. I think the gentleman from Iowa will agree with me in that respect. Do I hear any disagreement?

Mr. GROSS. I am listening to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts feels that it is vitally important to have an Assistant Secretary in each one of these.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts feels that it is vitally important to have an Assistant Secretary in each one of these branches for research and development.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

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

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw my objection.

Mr. GROSS. I was waiting for the gentleman to justify the four others. He has justified only two.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts is very much interested in research and development. I think it is of vital importance that we should have an Assistant Secretary in each branch of the Defense Department, specifically appointed for that purpose. One of those two is going to be in the Air Force, and the other two, the committee has clearly stated that they want that included in their title.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman think we ought to have some research and development in the Marine Corps as well?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. But so far as the new Assistant Secretaries are concerned the United States Marine Corps is a part of the Department of the Navy. Of course, when we have an Assistant Secretary for the Navy, we have him for the Marine Corps as well. The gentleman from Massachusetts supports the bill because he feels they made out a case, but he is particularly for the bill because there is something therein representing progress for research and development.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Bow, 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. 9689) to provide for two additional Assistant Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, pursuant to H. Res. 689, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. 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, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill S. 3400, an identical bill to the one just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 102 (a) of the Army Organization Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 264), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"There shall be in the Department of the Army an Under Secretary of the Army and four Assistant Secretaries of the Army, who shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive the compensation prescribed by law. One of the Assistant Secretaries authorized herein shall be designated Assistant Secretary of the Army for Financial Management, and may also act as Comptroller of the Army, if so designated by the Secretary of the Army."

(b) Subsections (b) and (c) of section 101 of the Army Organization Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 264), are amended by deleting the word "either", wherever appearing, and inserting in lieu thereof the word "an."

SEC. 2. Two Assistant Secretaries of the Navy may be appointed from civilian life by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Such Assistant Secretaries shall be in addition to the Assistant Secretary of the Navy authorized under section 1 of the act of July 11, 1890 (26 Stat. 254), as amended, and the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air authorized under section 4 of the act of June 24, 1926 (44 Stat. 767), as amended, making a total of four Assistant Secretaries. Each such additional Assistant Secretary shall perform such functions as the Secretary of the Navy may from time to time prescribe and each shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed by law for Assistant Secretaries of military departments. One of the Assistant Secretaries, authorized herein shall be designated as the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Financial Management, and may also act as Comptroller of the Navy, if so designated by the Secretary of the Navy. The Assistant Secretaries of the Navy shall succeed to the Office of the Secretary of the Navy during his temporary absence in the position provided for the Assistant Secretary of the Navy and the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air by section 10 of the act of March 5, 1948 (62 Stat. 66), and the Assistant Secretaries of the Navy shall take order among themselves in the order prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy or if no order is prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy then in the order in which the several Assistant Secretaries of the Navy took office as such.

SEC. 3. (a) Subsection (a) of section 102 of the Air Force Organization Act of 1951 (65 Stat. 327), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"There shall be in the Department of the Air Force an Under Secretary of the Air Force and four Assistant Secretaries of the Air Force, who shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive the compensation prescribed by law. One of the Assistant Secretaries authorized herein shall be designated Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Financial Management, and may also act as Comptroller of the Air Force, if so designated by the Secretary of the Air Force."

(b) Subsection (d) of section 207 of the National Security Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 495), is hereby amended by deleting the word "two" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "four."

(c) Subsections (b) and (c) of section 101 of the Air Force Organization Act of 1951 (65 Stat. 327), are amended by deleting the word "either", wherever appearing, and inserting in lieu thereof the word "an."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings whereby H. R. 9689 was passed were vacated and that bill laid on the table.

## TO REORGANIZE THE CAPITOL POLICE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 656) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read 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. 9413) to reorganize the Capitol Police force in order to increase its efficiency in the performance of its duties, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on House Administration now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to commit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER. When the House discontinued consideration of this legislation the other day the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] had 28 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], 27.

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 127]

Angell	Fisher	Mailliard
Baker	Golden	Morgan
Belcher	Harris	Morrison
Bennett, Mich.	Harrison, Nebr.	Murray
Bentsen	Harrison, Va.	Nelson
Boland	Harrison, Wyo.	Oakman
Brooks, La.	Hébert	O'Brien, Mich.
Buckley	Hill	Patman, Tex.
Chatham	Hinshaw	Perkins
Church	Hoeven	Powell
Clardy	James	Priest
Cotton	Kilburn	Reams
Coudert	Lane	Roosevelt
Curtis, Nebr.	Long	Scrivner
Davis, Tenn.	Lucas	Secrest
Dawson, Ill.	Lyle	Short
Dingell	Machrowicz	Smith, Miss.
Evins	Magnuson	Sutton



Taylor	Weichel	Willis
Thompson, La.	Wheeler	Wilson, Tex.
Vinson	Whitten	Winstead
Warburton	Wigglesworth	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 365 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### AMENDING SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 102 MAKING CORRECTIONS IN H. R. 7839

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings by which the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 102) to make corrections in the enrollment of H. R. 7839, was passed be vacated for the purpose of offering two amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer the two amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. WOLCOTT of Michigan.

On page 2, line 2, strike out "301" and insert "302."

At the end of Senate Concurrent Resolution 102, insert the following new paragraph: "In section 227 (c) (ii) (2) (B) of the National Housing Act, as added to that act by section 126 of the bill, insert after the words 'such outstanding indebtedness' the following '(without reduction by reason of the application of the approved percentage requirements of this section)'."

The amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### TO REORGANIZE THE CAPITOL POLICE FORCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, one meets with many surprises in this body. I was told that this police reorganization bill was a bipartisan proposition and that it had the endorsement of the leadership on both sides of the aisle. It is my understanding that after the unfortunate incident which occurred in this Chamber on the 1st of March, the leadership of both sides met with the Secretary of the Senate, the Sergeant at Arms, and Captain Broderick of the Capitol Police and worked on a bill in an attempt to prevent the possibility of another incident of that kind. And it is my understanding that this bill had the agreement of the leadership as well as the Committee on House Administration. Undoubtedly, I was misinformed. When the bill was presented to the Committee on Rules in the application for a rule, I know that it was on a nonpartisan basis. I know that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLISON] who is a former FBI man appeared before us, and although

he did not say that this bill was 100 percent perfect, he gave his endorsement to the bill. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether this is the answer to the problem, but I know that no one here should assume the responsibility of not doing everything possible to avoid another incident such as occurred here on March 1. We were very fortunate at that time. Fifteen or twenty people might have been killed. As far as I am concerned, I am going to vote for this bill probably with the knowledge that it is not a perfect bill. It provides for 50 additional policemen who will have to qualify. They will not be the type of many of the boys whom I, as chairman of the Personnel Committee, have appointed for Members on both sides of the aisle, such as young men attending Georgetown and George Washington Universities. I hope that these youngsters can still remain on, but I think we need more than that.

In conclusion, let me say I do not want to be a party to another incident in this Chamber when they shot 26 times in this Chamber. Fortunately no one was killed. I do not want another thing like that to occur where many might be killed, then the people will turn to us and say, "Can this Congress not ever learn anything?"

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, the statement by the chairman of the Committee on Rules indicated that the leadership supported this bill. There is divided opinion among the Members, but as far as the leadership of the House is concerned, I feel that they still stand for some approach to a merit system for the Capitol Police.

I feel the House would be interested in knowing some of the background leading up to this particular bill.

For 102 years the Capitol Police system has been on patronage. The present captain, 8 lieutenants, 9 sergeants, and 139 privates have during these many years been designated or recommended by Members of the House and the other body. And that is true as of this time.

Under this bill there is no particular effort being made to immediately bring absolute security to this House Chamber. We do feel that it is an approach in the right direction to try to bring the Capitol Police system under a merit system.

At this point I want to express my sincere appreciation for the members of the present police force. The incident that happened on March 1 is not at all directed toward the Capitol Police. It has come to my attention that perhaps certain Members feel that this bill is directed toward them. That is not true. At no time during the discussion in our committee was there any reflection whatsoever on the present Capitol Police. The House itself must assume personal responsibility for the neglect that we ourselves have allowed the Chamber to gain, by virtue of the rules that have been adopted, because under the present rules of the House the Capitol Police are not allowed to enter the gallery unless invited to do so. Under

our particular bill, the rules of the House will have to be amended, in order that these men may go into the gallery.

But I do want to make this statement concerning the men on the present force. Let us think for a moment about the present organization. Of the present 157 on the force, 83 are students; approximately 15 of those men are 50 years of age and over; there are 3 on the force who are 60 years or over. There are 4 on the force who are 70 years or over. Approximately 16 men on the force have served for over 3 years. There are 15 on the force who have served for over 15 years, and there are 13 on the force who have served over 9 years. I have no idea as to the political affiliation of any member of the force.

I would like to point out there is nothing in this bill that would prevent students from taking the examinations and having membership on the force; but it would mean, under this particular bill and under the rules adopted, that they would have to give their full time to the work.

If you have the bill before you I would like to direct your attention to page 18, section 2 of the bill.

Section 2 (b) sets up the Capitol Police Board. The Capitol Police Board is composed of the Architect of the Capitol and the Sergeants at Arms of the Senate and House. The Capitol Police Board has been in force for many, many years.

The bill provides that the membership may go up to as many as 200. It is not contemplated that the present force would be increased. I know there are Members on the House floor who would be interested in whether or not the police of the Library of Congress and the Supreme Court might not be brought into the Capitol police system. Under the present arrangement and under the law we would have no authority over the police in the Library of Congress or in the Supreme Court. I was interested in determining that the Library of Congress has 76 members on its force. If we could bring the Library force into ours, our maximum of 200 would not be sufficient.

In this connection, the Supreme Court has 33 officers.

The appropriation has already been passed to cover this legislation. On page 509 of the supplemental appropriation bill is an item that calls for \$633,203. That represents an increase of \$217,523. This increase is reflected as indicated on page 3 of the report. Certain additional men are brought into the system.

Under the proposed legislation there would be a Chief, Capitol Police. The salaries are indicated. I point out that the salaries indicated are the gross salary.

I think the House is entitled to know there would be certain increases. The captain is now receiving a total gross of \$5,813.33. Under this proposed legislation he would receive \$8,500. The lieutenant is now receiving \$4,283.05. He

would receive under this legislation \$6,009.

The privates are now receiving \$3,996.27. It is proposed under this particular bill that they would fall within class 1 or 2, and the class 2 would call for a total gross of \$4,115, as compared with the present salary scale of \$3,996.27.

I might add in passing that these salaries are patterned after those of the Metropolitan Police Force.

You will notice that a clerk is set up here to officiate with and serve the Capitol Police Board.

I think it should be mentioned that currently and for a number of years we have been paying \$28,000 to three Metropolitan policemen as liaison with the Capitol police. It is expected that within a period of time this liaison could be reduced to a minimum of perhaps one, but liaison is necessary for smooth working between the Capitol Police and the Metropolitan Police.

I would like to remind the House also and it perhaps should not be discussed at the present time, that since the March 1 incident, certain protection has been given to the Capitol which represents a decided increase in costs.

There is one feature, too, that should be brought to mind, that under this proposed legislation on page 31, section 12, it is proposed to give the men training by the Metropolitan Police Force. It would not cost the Congress anything. They propose to run the Capitol police in with their own men and give them the training at certain periods each year. Those particularly better men would be given certain training with the FBI. It was interesting to those who have gone into this subject that at the present time there is not even a book of rules, there is nothing to guide the men other than a few perhaps written instructions. But so far as training is concerned, they do not receive any specialized training whatsoever. It has been determined also that perhaps some of the men who have been placed on the force have never had a gun in their hands.

I think it should be pointed out also that after the examination they will serve on a temporary basis for 1 year. All of the members would, of course, be subject to the examination which I shall not discuss but other members of the committee will follow that this is truly a merit system. At the present time there is no security clearance on any of the men, but under this proposed legislation there would be the usual security check. The bill also provides for veterans' preference and the bill provides for an oral examination.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL].

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, again we hear the words "too little and too late." This time it is southeastern Asia. The free world has again suffered a setback at the hands of the Kremlin.

It is easy to engage in recrimination but this would serve no purpose except dubious partisan advantage.

Reasonable men seek to build foreign policy in a constructive way. Reasonable men face realities abroad—they do not destructively attack their fellow countrymen and, by so doing, divide their own nation in an hour of great peril.

Let us look forward to what we can do affirmatively and creatively to protect our Nation. Let us examine an area of the world where there is still time. That area is even more strategically important to the national security of the United States than southeastern Asia. The region to which I refer is Asia's southwestern corner, known to Americans as the Near East.

Here we find Suez, the lifeline of the free world, the crossroads of three continents. Here we find the bridge to Africa and the gateway to the Orient. Here we find the oil resources of the Arab lands. And here we find the industrial and military stronghold of Israel which democracy used as a major Near Eastern defense base during World War II and which the Israelis subsequently built into a nation devoted to western ideas.

The Near East links Asia with Africa. And the Kremlin is well aware of the geographical facts regarding the Near East. After Asia on the Communist timetable is Africa. Just as Borodin outlined the assimilation of the Far East in the early twenties, Soviet planning for Operation Near East began in 1931. By June 1953 Moscow started to activate the machinery for Communist penetration of the Near East and Africa.

Soviet expansionism has taken the form of perimeter expansion—movement into territory immediately contiguous to the Soviet land mass. The stepping stone to Africa, then, was seen in the Near East.

In June 1953 an espionage and propaganda staff was organized in Moscow under S. P. Koziarev. It was given the mission of infiltrating Africa via the Near East. A. I. Chikov was assigned by Koziarev as liaison officer with the Arab League.

Quick to exploit regional strife, the Soviet strategists insinuated themselves into Arab League policy. This was done largely through Soviet diplomacy which applied a "let's you and him fight" theme wherever it could be injected into Arab-Israel and Arab-American affairs. The Russians shrewdly encourage Arab antagonism against Israel in the hope that the Arabs will launch a new attack against Israel. This would create the chaos so necessary to the Red goal. In the Near East as elsewhere they seek to divide and conquer.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee was recently told by Henry A. Byroade, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs, that Arab-Israel tension now represents the greatest danger in the Near East. Mr. Byroade testified before the committee that the one spot in the near eastern region where he could not report progress was the Arab-Israel area. He reported an accelerated Soviet campaign of penetration manifested mainly by a Communist bid for Arab friendship.

Simultaneously, reports from Communist Rumania told of increased persecution and imprisonment of Zionists and other persons sympathetic to Israel.

Chairman ALEXANDER WILEY, of the Foreign Relations Committee, recently summarized the Near Eastern outlook by saying that "the policy we are trying to continue, at least, is to see that the Arabs and Israel do not start a fight that will precipitate perhaps the beginning of the third world war."

But if we are seriously trying to avert Arab-Israel warfare, we must challenge the administration's new policy toward that region.

Andrei Vishinsky does not have much trouble fomenting discord between the Arab League and Israel. All he needs to do is add a few hammers and sickles to the monkey wrench already in the peace machinery. Substantial help has been furnished him since 1953 by the administration's appeasement of the Arab League's "war at any price" program.

The Department of State appears determined to win Arab favor no matter what the price—and it appears that Israel will be called upon to pay that price.

Since the day it was established in 1948, Israel has been a democratic state clearly and firmly aligned with the free world and always ready to join in its defense. Since 1952, Israel has been asking for arms from our Government so that it may strengthen itself and thus strengthen the entire region. Up to this moment, we have turned Israel down.

Now, in contrast, the Arab States are feudal and undemocratic and they have no interest in standing with us in defense of the democratic way of life.

They are infected by neutralism. They remain passive spectators in the cold war. Yet, despite their inertia and indifference, we are forcing our arms upon them.

What a mixed-up policy it is.

Playing blind man's buff always was a reckless sport, even in a parlor. But when you play it in the field of foreign policy and the blind man hands out guns to whomever he tags, no matter who that person may be, no matter what he plans to do with the gun, this becomes the most dangerous kind of recreation. But this is more than innocent confusion. I am sorry to say that we are deliberately picking the wrong people for our favor and support in the Middle East. We are gambling on undemocratic elements to defend democracy. Simultaneously, we are weakening the one democracy in the region if those whom we back are determined upon Israel's destruction.

The administration decided to grant military assistance to Iraq some months ago. This action is being taken despite Iraq's refusal to adhere to the Turkish-Pakistan pact in resistance to Soviet aggression. This action is being taken despite open Iraqi threats that she plans some day to resume warfare against Israel. There is no assurance that these weapons will be employed against potential Soviet invaders. In 1941, when allied fortunes were at a low ebb, the same Iraqi officers who, today, command



the army of that state, cast their lot with Nazi Germany. They attacked our allies from the rear, using weapons provided by the allies.

There is every danger today that Iraq will use our guns against our ally—Israel. We need go no further than the evidence supplied by the Iraqis themselves. Dr. Fadhl al Jamali, Iraqi Foreign Minister, has said that "whoever would seek peace with Israel would be guilty of high treason and should be hanged. The destruction of Israel will be achieved only by strengthening of the Arab States."

Iraq is the one Arab League state which invaded Israel in 1948 which has since refused to sign an armistice with that country. Bear in mind, too, that the oil pipeline from Kirkuk, Iraq, to Haifa, Israel, was closed by Iraq in 1948. This action not only denied Israel a vital source of power for domestic development. It also deprived the free world as a whole of the strategic and economic advantage of Haifa's important refineries and their accessibility to the West. Thus, Iraq, which we propose to arm in defense of the West, has weakened the western industrial and war potential by its blockade of the Haifa refineries. But above all, the shipment of arms to Iraq serves the Kremlin's interest, for this may prove to be the spark to ignite the tinderbox. On the one hand, these arms will not serve for a single moment to deter the Soviet offensive in the area. On the other hand, they may ignite a new Israel-Arab conflagration and plunge the area into the kind of chaos which would invite Soviet incursion.

Our policy of arming Iraq is only one facet of our Near East policy which should demand our review and our challenge. Ever since Israel was established, the Arab States have not only refused to enter into peace negotiations with her but have carried on an economic boycott and blockade. Israel is not the only victim of this blockade. The American flag has been lowered in surrender to it. Since 1948 the Government of Egypt has blacklisted all ships carrying supplies to Israel. As a consequence, no ship may engage in commerce with Israel if it desires to use the Suez Canal. One of the consequences is that Israel must import its oil from distant Venezuela and from the Soviet Union. It cannot bring its oil from the Middle East because American tankers flying the American flag dare not bring that oil to Israel through the Suez Canal. We who have always fought for the freedom of the seas have abdicated, out of solicitous concern for the good will of Egypt and we have done this at the expense of a friendly democracy.

On December 3, 1953, Egyptian guns, mounted at the entrance of the Gulf of Aqaba, fired on the American ship *Albion*, which was en route to the Jordanian port of Aqaba. This ship was carrying wheat for Arab refugees in Jordan. We were doing something to help the Arabs but the Egyptians saw fit to fire on an American freighter because they were under the belief that the ship was bound for the Israel port of Elath, a few miles away. If our Gov-

ernment made a formal and public protest to the Government of Egypt over this outrage against our rights, I have not seen it.

This blockade against international shipping is a violation of the Suez Canal Convention of 1888. It is a violation of the Egyptian-Israeli armistice. It is a violation of the charter of the United Nations. It is a contemptuous disregard of the decision of the Security Council of the United Nations itself. On September 1, 1951, the Security Council adopted a resolution demanding that the Egyptians terminate the restrictions on the passage of international commercial shipping wherever bound. Despite this clear injunction of the Security Council, Egypt not only intensified its blockade but extended it to the Gulf of Aqaba. Maritime countries protested that the blockade was a violation of their legitimate navigation rights. Egypt's only reply is that she regards herself to be at war with Israel and, therefore, is entitled to resort to this kind of economic warfare. Egypt has been able to get away with this because, for more than 3 years, the great powers failed to back up the 1951 Security Council resolution.

Within recent months, when Israel brought the issue once again to the attention of the Security Council, the Kremlin came to Egypt's rescue by vetoing the Security Council resolution reaffirming the previous stand. Our failure to act swiftly, decisively, and vigorously in 1951, has made it possible for the Soviet Union to enter the region in a maneuver to win Egypt's friendship at the expense of both Israel and the Western World. Our pursuit of the Arab countries has involved our retreat from international principle. We accept, without challenge, indignities heaped upon us by the Arab League. American businessmen are told that they may not do business with Israel and that if they do, Arab League states will boycott their products. This economic siege against Israel is not confined to Israel. It is attrition against our own economic sovereignty. Once a democratic people yields to threats and violence and permits its policy to be determined by bluff and bluster, it ceases to command respect. It begins to lose influence in the field of international diplomacy. The policy we pursue in the Near East today is strengthening feudal dictatorship, weakening and undermining a free democracy and humbling our own prestige and influence.

To look at the realities of the Near East we must look beyond the governments of various states and into the hearts and aspirations of the people. We can, and we must, win millions of people in that area who are uncommitted in the struggle between communism and democracy. These uncommitted millions must be given an opportunity to understand the benefits of freedom and rise above the regional strife that is undermining their welfare—their welfare and the security of the entire free world. We must help these people understand the aims toward which the democracies are striving.

In the Near East today, millions are living under feudal conditions, ruled by despotic government. Israel is denounced and opposed because Israel represents progress and change and freedom as we know it in America. Among the Arab masses, seeds of distrust and despair have been sown. Among them two attitudes are emerging. One is that attitude of neutralism—of preferring not to take any part or position in the conflict between communism and freedom. The other attitude, assiduously cultivated by the Arab League rulers, is one of hatred toward Israel, supported by incitement of acts of armed violence, boycott, and blockade, and threats to "drive the Jews into the sea."

If the United States is to avoid a Near Eastern repetition of what has occurred in Korea and Indochina, it is of the greatest urgency that our Government establish and implement a clear and positive areawide policy. It is not feasible to have one policy with respect to Israel and another in regard to Arab nations which are presently threatening to play into Russia's hands by launching a new assault against Israel.

The anchor of such an areawide Near Eastern policy must be that broader concern which may be described as "pro-humanity."

It is true that we cannot forcibly impose peace on the contending sides. But we ought not to make peace more difficult. We ought not encourage either side in the delusion that we approve renewed conflict. We should not arm one side. Peace may be achieved if mature American diplomacy can bring about direct negotiations between the Arabs and Israel. But peace may be lost, along with humanity, if we let that region which was the cradle of civilization become its grave.

The great threat ultimately to both Arabs and Israelis is Soviet imperialism. If the advance of Soviet penetration and agitation in the Near East is to be resisted, our Government must proceed immediately with a definite American foreign policy intended to unite rather than divide the peoples of the Near East. Our policy must elevate the status of all the people of the area—Jew and Arab alike. This program must strike effectively at poverty, disease, illiteracy, religious friction, and the exploitation of man by man. More than anything else, it must prevent the outbreak of further hostilities. For peace in the Near East is a prerequisite to peace in the world.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unsuccessful in getting the previous gentleman who just addressed the House to yield to me at the point where he was talking about the examination to set up this new force. I agree with everyone that we should have greater security for the Members of Congress, but I am just a little bit fearful that the qualifications to be set up and the examinations insofar as they apply to the physical part of it is going to work

a decided injustice to some 3 or 4 members of the present police force in that they will not be able to qualify. I think we entirely lose sight of the fact that we have 3, 4, or 5 present members who are disabled veterans but are still able to do police duty and probably could very well do desk police duty. I do not want those men turned down. Some of them have been on the force here for better than 10 years. Your veterans' preference does not protect those men. I have an amendment which I shall propose which will do that.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to the Members of the House in support of H. R. 6004. I introduced this bill, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. After hearings, this committee favorably reported this bill, with certain amendments.

Since I sponsored this proposed legislation, I regard it as desirous and necessary to explain the need for it in the ship radio communication field, the existing conditions which the legislation seeks to remedy and the state of communications that will exist after its enactment. In general terms, the proposed legislation increases the safety of life and property at sea, by requiring the installation of an automatic radio call selector on United States cargo ships, thus assuring reception of radio messages on such equipped ship 24 hours each and every day.

Let me first tell the Members of the House about the present existing radio communication standards in our shipping industry. More than 95 percent of the ships flying the American flag are cargo vessels which employ one radio operator, and in addition, these vessels are equipped with an auto alarm, which is an instrument which responds to the international distress signal only. This further fact, I think, will come as a surprise to most of us—this radio operator on board the cargo ship works his 8 hours a day and is then off duty for 16 hours; during this 16-hour period that this radio operator is off duty, his ship cannot be reached. It is indeed a startling fact that for 16 hours each day, each of the approximately 1,300 cargo vessels flying the American flag is stone deaf, cut off from the rest of the world. Of equal significance is the fact that in spite of the electronic devices that American genius has produced in the past years, no real improvement has been made in this respect in the radio room on board a ship during the past 25 years. This combination of circumstances and conditions, in my opinion, requires our attention and action.

I ascertained that, in brief, the following was the dismal background of improvement of ship radio communications in the past 40 years in the overall safety-at-sea program. In 1912, as many here will remember, the *Titanic* disaster occurred. The investigation that followed established that the steam-

ship *California*, at the time of the tragedy, had passed the stricken *Titanic* just out of visual view, and that it had not received the distress signal because the radio operator of the steamship *California* had gone off watch a few hours before, and therefore the steamship *California* rendered no assistance to the drowning passengers and crew.

The problems raised by the *Titanic* disaster preoccupied the people interested in the safety-at-sea program for the next few years, and finally in the early twenties there was perfected the auto alarm, which was the best product of that time.

The auto alarm, the installation of which was made mandatory, responds only to a distress signal after a ship has been overtaken by disaster and is in danger of sinking. This auto-alarm device, without any change, has been the watchdog of the seas for these past 30 years, and thus, without going into the effectiveness of the system, which I am advised has many shortcomings, provides for a limited means of alerting a ship whose radio operator is off duty only after a disaster has already occurred. Thus, in all these years since the sinking of the *Titanic*, the foregoing is the total advance in ships' radio communications—the possibility by a device to alert a ship when a sister ship already has been overtaken by disaster.

A ship at sea frequently requires aid in an emergency under such conditions where an S O S by the disabled ship is not warranted—thus a message from another ship or station intended as a warning of a hurricane or other adverse weather condition in its vicinity or an unusual sea condition in its path; a message for a ship carrying defense material in time to divert such ship; medical assistance and transfer of sick or injured at sea—all such messages today have a possibility of receipt only if a radio officer is on duty during his 8 hours at his radio station. The overwhelming odds, however, are that such messages will not be received. The auto alarm plays no part in an attempt to deliver such message. With the automatic radio call selector, as provided for in the proposed legislation, there is a vastly increased assurance of delivery of the message.

I must elaborate somewhat on the tremendous gain to our Nation during a national emergency in the ability to reach a ship at any time, which would be assured by the use of this device. Our merchant marine rounds out the seapower of the United States and is in effect our fourth arm of defense. It carries military supplies to support our military forces wherever they may be. Our merchant marine tankers operate as refueling ships for Navy vessels. Without cost being a real factor, this device will include this means by use of a predetermined code to simultaneously reach all vessels sailing under such code. The value of this feature cannot be measured when, as, and if such need occurs.

The proposed legislation H. R. 6004 would require that cargo vessels flying

the American flag be equipped with the automatic radio call selector which shall be capable of receiving the following international Morse code signals:

First. The ship station call sign.  
Second. The international distress signal—S O S.

Third. The international safety signal.  
Fourth. The international urgent signal.

Fifth. Any other predetermined code which is desired for use in national emergencies.

With this device, every ship equipped with it for 24 hours a day would be able to receive simultaneously messages directed to that ship by its call letters, S O S signals which signal is sent when a ship is in dire peril and assistance is needed; international safety signals, the signal which precedes the sending of an important notice on navigational weather, a notice which all ships should receive; international urgent signals, which relate to the safety and welfare of a single ship or a single person or a group of persons on that ship or sighted from that ship; and finally, predetermined codes which could be used in the event of a national emergency, and which feature in truth may loom as one of its most valuable potentials.

The best analogy that I can give to the Members of the House as to the present state of radio ship communications compared with that of the proposed state of radio communications under this law, would be as follows:

If you will consider and think about the telephone in your office and in your home and imagine that the ringing bell is removed, you will fully appreciate that so long as you sit near your telephone with the receiver to your ear, you will receive all calls that are intended for you. However, when you place the telephone receiver back on the hook or walk away from the room where it is installed you know that while you are gone no telephone message will be able to reach you. That is the present situation in the radio room on board a cargo vessel. So long as the one radio operator carried is at his radio station on board ship he can receive messages. When he walks away, his ship is incapable of receiving any radio messages. When such ships are equipped with the automatic radio call selector, which is the counterpart of the ringing bell of the telephone, it will alert and summon the radio operator by the ringing of a bell or bells in the radio room, in the radio officer's quarters and on the bridge, or wherever may be desired, to indicate that a message is intended for his ship and thus provide a means for the receipt of messages 24 hours a day.

As I have stated, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has favorably reported this bill. The Department of the Navy in response to an inquiry to the Department of Defense submitted on behalf of the Department of Defense a report on this proposed bill which in part states as follows:

The Department of Defense believes that safety of life and property at sea would be enhanced by the installation aboard ship of



a device such as that described in the proposed amendment. Therefore if such a device were presently in existence, and had passed satisfactorily the tests required by the Federal Communications Commission in order to prove its capabilities, the Department of Defense would interpose no objection to a proposal requiring its installation aboard ship provided the installation was economically feasible.

This is the attitude and view of our Navy, our first arm of defense, and the Government Department most interested in our ships at sea. It must also be noted that the proposed law does not apply to Navy ships, which are specifically excluded, nor to any ship which employs a human radio watch 24 hours a day—as by the way does the Navy.

Further, I should like to state that the American Radio Association, CIO, which represents the ship radio officers, wholeheartedly endorses the proposed bill and urges its enactment because of its firm conviction that the safety at sea standards will be tremendously increased. This is the attitude of the men most interested and charged with the responsibility of such safety programs.

Such views as have been expressed in opposition to the proposed legislation are based primarily on the purported ground that a device capable of fulfilling the requirements of this proposed law is not in existence. I desire to state to the Members of the House that such basis for opposition has been entirely removed, and that a unit meeting the requirements of the proposed legislation has been actually successfully demonstrated. I quote to you a short news item appearing in the New York Times on Monday, July 12, 1954, in which is reported the successful demonstration of such a unit. Similar reports appeared in other newspapers as well, but I will read the New York Times article now:

**SHIP RADIO ALARM RINGS OUT S O S—ALERTS  
OFF-DUTY OPERATORS TO BOTH EMERGENCY  
AND ORDINARY MESSAGES**

A device that rings bells to alert off-duty marine radio operators to emergency calls as well as ordinary messages was demonstrated for the first time last week.

The electronic selector was manufactured by the Brelco Electronics Corp., 139 Duane Street. The company previously had developed a radio call selector that signals only when another station is transmitting the vessel's call letters.

The House of Representatives is considering a measure that would make this type of device mandatory on virtually all merchant ships. However, the Representatives incorporated in the bill provisions that would also require the device to respond to 3 different types of distress calls and to special call letters that might be assigned to ships in time of national emergency.

Benjamin B. Green, president of Brelco, demonstrated a sample unit incorporating all these features in an exhibition designed to rebut critics who contended that such a unit could not be developed. Mr. Green said that merchant ships at present using the call selector would be able to adjust their equipment at small cost.

The demonstration was also attended by officials of the American Radio Association, CIO, which had recommended the additional features in hearings before Congress.

As a result of this proposed legislation, an interest in the automatic radio call selector has been evidenced by the Ministry of Transportation of Great Britain, by Japan, and by Norwegian fleet own-

ers. The United States has traditionally led the way in the adoption and use of new technological improvements and it is as a result of the adoption by the United States of higher standards that improvements in worldwide conditions have been attained. The same pattern appears to be in the making with the proposed use of this automatic call selector.

I might state to the Members of the House that there is precedent for this legislation that may be found in the mandatory requirements for the auto alarm, as now appears in the same sections of the Federal Communications Act of 1934 which the proposed legislation seeks to amend.

One of the main principles enunciated in the proposed legislation is that a method and system of communications of a preventative nature be available to our ships, in addition to the present system which only provides for a method of communications after disaster has already struck. It is a fact that American ships at first would be the only ones to have this apparatus aboard. As I have already indicated, foreign countries are evidencing an interest in this equipment. That American ships and American seamen would be the first to benefit is true. The device would respond to signals made by all ships whether American or foreign and absence of this unit from foreign ships does not prevent American ships from serving as the links in a radio network of ships which may make the difference between life and death of a seaman and passengers. An argument that was suggested was that we wait making this device mandatory because ships of other nations are not required to install such a piece of equipment. This is indicative of an unprogressive approach and adopts standards for our country that may be set by countries with lower technical and economic levels.

The proposed bill contains an antitrust provision so that no one manufacturer may have a monopoly in the manufacture of the device, and permits an adequate time before becoming effective to allow for the equipping of the ships that are subject to the law.

The public interest requires that the safety standards at sea be maintained at the highest possible level and the sole purpose of the proposed legislation is to fulfill our obligation to the public to assure them that such standards are set and fixed. Let us not wait until a disaster strikes to trigger us into action, for the financial value of even a single life that may be saved cannot be measured.

For all of the reasons that I have set forth I urge the passage of H. R. 6004 by the Members of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a news item appearing in the New York Times.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, several days ago we had this bill up and while I was in the course

of making a few remarks about it a point of no quorum was made. The bill was laid aside for several days and is again brought up in regular order.

As the gentleman from Illinois has said, this is a nonpartisan bill. I do not know of anything partisan about it. It is supposed to protect the Members from assault from the gallery and I believe Members on both sides are unanimously in favor of not being shot at from the gallery like sitting ducks. So I think we can all approach this subject from the nonpartisan standpoint.

I do not think this bill does what we are intending it to do. The purpose of the bill is to try and afford some protection to the membership of the House from such incidents as occurred here last spring when an assault was made upon the Members of the House. It is supposed to give us protection from the gallery. As a matter of fact, it does not at all and no one will tell you that it does intend to protect the membership from assaults from the galleries. I do not think anyone will dispute that.

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

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

Mr. LECOMPTE. It is contemplated that there will be an officer in uniform in each of the galleries. There is that much protection contemplated in the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am glad the gentleman gives me that information.

Mr. LECOMPTE. That is not in the bill, but it is contemplated that that will take place.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Now, see if I am right about this. The trouble with the whole situation is that the Capitol police force is under one jurisdiction. Your galleries are under another jurisdiction. So, whoever it is that runs the Capitol police force has no jurisdiction to do anything about running the galleries of the House, which is the thing we are trying to protect ourselves against. Now, if it is not going to perform that purpose, then the only purpose it will perform is to put a lot of policemen under civil service, and I do not think that that is going to do us any particular good.

This bill, as I understand, is going to cost overall approximately \$1 million a year, which seems to me to be a tremendous amount to spend for that purpose. It does not, as the gentleman from North Carolina said, include the police over here at the Library; it does not include the police over at the Supreme Court. I just wish that we could do a complete job on the thing, because when we pass this bill then that is going to be the end of it. That is about all we are going to do. And, if this bill does not do the job as some of us think it does not do the job, I am just wondering if we should not give it a little further study and maybe come up with an answer to all of the problems so that the whole of Capitol Hill could receive protection by competent police officers; put them under civil service, give them any kind of training that you wish to give them, but if we are going to do it at

all, I am wondering if we do not want to do something that will be more effective.

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

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

Mr. HALLECK. I participated in the discussions. In the discussions that were had after the shooting took place, as the gentleman suggests, it was evident that we had become quite conscious of the necessity of doing something to try to protect the House of Representatives and the Congress and its Members.

Now, the first observation I would make to the gentleman is that this is much broader than just the protection that would be involved in the galleries. This applies to all of the grounds of the Capitol, and I take it that means the House and Senate Office Buildings.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I will say to the gentleman that I understand that. My objection is that it does not protect you in the gallery.

Mr. HALLECK. Let me just address myself to that a little further. There were numerous suggestions made as to what might be done with respect to the galleries. There was a suggestion that heavy, thick, bulletproof glass be erected and that wicker be installed above that. The consensus of those of us who struggled with the problem was that probably our constituents, when they came here, would not very much appreciate looking at us down here from that sort of a cage. Maybe that is putting it a little bluntly, but I think there were many who felt that way about it.

I would like to suggest also to the gentleman from Virginia that no one, so far as I know, claimed that this was the answer to all of the problems or the threats that might be involved. We did have regard for the fact that committees meet and frequently are engaged in the consideration of business with respect to which there might be much indignation or high public opinion. Many have had the experience on occasions when our work in our office has been interfered with by people who were there who had to be ejected. Now, all of those things, I understand, are a part of it.

Let me say to the gentleman that I have a very vivid recollection of standing here in this aisle and watching those people shoot at me from the gallery. Pistols were being emptied and the persons firing them were in the process of reloading them. They were deterred only by the courage and the effort of a civilian or two who happened to be visitors in the gallery. From my standpoint, I am inclined to believe that if some of the sort of people who come here when we have a joint session were in position around the gallery, it would not afford the complete protection that we would like to have, but in my opinion, it would go a long ways.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I just wanted to say that if we do something, if we do anything, we ought to do a complete job. I think, on the discussion that is going to follow after the adoption of this rule, the House will be able to make up its mind whether this does the job or whether it is just a stopgap

that is not going to do any real good, or is just a gesture.

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

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

Mr. GREEN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE] said that, although it is not provided in the bill, it is the intention to station Capitol policemen in the galleries. I am wondering if there is any reason why under the present rules and regulations we could not have Capitol policemen in the galleries.

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

Mr. LECOMPTE. There is no attempt in this bill to change the rules of the House. The statement was made that the galleries are under the chief Doorkeeper. I have not found in the rules anything that prohibits the Chief of Police from putting a man in each of the galleries. That is what is contemplated he will do, a man in uniform, and that will have a deterrent effect on any would-be criminals. They do not like to start shooting in front of a man in uniform.

Mr. GREEN. Is there anything that now prohibits a Capitol policeman from being stationed in the galleries?

Mr. LECOMPTE. They do not have a sufficient force of trained men. A good many of the men on the police force are not professional police officers.

Mr. GREEN. They have done an exceptionally good job.

Mr. LECOMPTE. They have done a fine job; I am not critical of them at all. They have done a splendid job. But we are trying to improve the situation.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. I would like to say to the gentleman that I am somewhat in accord with him. I think the personnel could very easily be checked and double checked, as far as the Capitol grounds are concerned. But I see no remedy as far as the hazard from the galleries is concerned. Personally, I am not frightened to death about that. I was not so scared that I did not file for reelection, so far as that is concerned, and most of us did the same thing. But I would like to throw out this suggestion. I would rather have five well-trained United States marines stationed around here, not necessarily in the Chamber but in the halls, not as doormen but protectors, than any crowd that the Civil Service might pick out, for they are known the world over. But these protectors do not necessarily have to be all marines; all branches of the service train men for missions of that kind; but I still do not know of any group on the face of the earth that has a better reputation for carrying out a mission than the United States Marines. You could very easily have the three services, or the four services for that matter, represented. I think the Speaker of the House would only have to suggest it and they would certainly be here. They need not necessarily be obstreperous, they could be stationed at strategic points either in or out of the Chamber. As far as protection is concerned, if that is what you want here, I would rather have them than all

this fanfare under this bill. So far as I am concerned I am not frightened, but I still think it is time to use a little commonsense and use a reasonable amount of precaution and thereby not invite trouble.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minutes only to respond to the last suggestion made by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

I might say to him that the proposal to have men here from the various services was considered by those of us who tried to work out the program. There were many reasons why it was deemed inadvisable. Not the least of those is that even in the services they have specially trained men for the military-police operations. The average individual trained for combat service in any of the armed services may not have the qualifications considered most desirable for the sort of job we have in mind.

I trust that my friend from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] will not attempt to put words in my mouth to the effect that I do not have confidence in the men in the armed services, because certainly I have. But, as far as the job for which they are trained is concerned, they may not have the qualifications we have in mind. The matter was considered and was rejected, as a practical proposition.

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

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. First let me say that I certainly would not ever attempt to put words in the gentleman's mouth. But let me say this, that each branch of the Armed Forces has specially trained groups of men, they have schools where they get special training for the very work that I mentioned. I am not afraid to stay in the Chamber without them, but I say if we really want the kind of protection we are talking about we can certainly get it with very little trouble.

Mr. HALLECK. All I can say to the gentleman is it was considered. It would not be worthwhile to go over all the reasons why that idea was rejected.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. LECOMPTE. 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. 9413) to reorganize the Capitol Police force in order to increase its efficiency in the performance of its duties.

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. 9413, with Mr. GRAHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 9413 represents the effort of the Committee on House Administration together with the leadership on both sides of this aisle to bring forth a bill that will give to the House of Representatives a permanent merit system police force that it is believed



will be adequate to take care of the policing of the Capitol, the galleries, the Capitol Grounds, and the House and Senate Office Buildings.

It can be said that this bill is not perfect. Most legislation and everything else that comes from human hands is hardly perfect, but this is the best effort the leadership on both sides of the aisle have been able to evolve after a series of meetings. I think the leadership will be glad to speak up for this bill but, of course, all Members can speak for themselves.

Several meetings were held in the office of the Speaker following the assault by fanatics on this House on March 1 of this year, when five Members of the House were shot down. Heaven alone protected us in the fact that none were killed.

Under the bill which has been written and rewritten, there is provided a professional police force not to exceed 200 men under the Capitol Police Board, which exists by statute at the present time and consists of the Architect of the Capitol, the Sergeant at Arms of the House and the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate. The bill provides that all members of the police force automatically become members of the new Capitol Police force, and a member who is on duty on the 1st day of January when the new police force comes into being, if they pass the qualifications will be under probation for 1 year. It is hoped and expected that the efficiency of the police force will be increased from year to year. It is not contemplated that we can in a moment build up and have an adequately and completely efficient police force.

For myself, I want to say that I have no criticism of the present police force. I have no criticism of the police force as a result of the assault made on the House by people armed with high-powered guns on the 1st day of March. I do not criticize our present police force in any way. Fanatics entered the gallery and fanatics, perhaps, can enter the gallery again with guns, but it is contemplated that there will be stationed at all times when the House is in session a man in uniform in each of the four galleries. I doubt that a bandit will enter under those conditions and open fire on the House.

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

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. CHUDOFF. If it is contemplated to have a uniformed man in the galleries after this bill is passed, why have not the Capitol Police put a uniformed man in the galleries since March 1?

Mr. LECOMPTE. The police force is not under me. I cannot answer the gentleman's question. We are trying here to provide for an adequate police force. We do not have an adequate police force now and I doubt that there are sufficient numbers of trained men available at the present moment.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Could the gentleman inform us whether it would be possible at the present time to have a Capitol policeman in the gallery at all times?

Mr. LECOMPTE. That might be a question of the interpretation of the

rules. There is no effort in this bill to change the rules of the House.

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

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, a member of the committee who has contributed valuable service in the writing up of this bill.

Mr. BURLESON. There are police in the gallery at the present time.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Yes, but they are not in uniform.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. And they have been in the gallery since the first of March.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Yes, they have been in the galleries right along.

The bill sets up a method of selection so that we get away from the situation, as it exists at present, where the police force is to a considerable extent appointed by patronage. We hope to have it completely nonpartisan and a merit-selected police force. The bill describes the manner of the examinations which will be held. There will be added to the Capitol Police for the purposes of examination two men who will assist in giving the oral examination to which all candidates for police appointments will submit.

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

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I would like to inquire briefly with reference to one type of employee. For instance, I happen to know one of the men who has worked here faithfully and who is one of the best policemen we have had. He worked for 10 years, and in fact twice, on two different occasions, he has taken guns from men who might have caused us trouble. When the patronage was changed, along with many others, this man was laid off. His name is F. L. Jester. Will a man like that who has served faithfully for 10 years and who was then laid off just because of the patronage situation have a chance to be given a preference of any kind?

Mr. LECOMPTE. There is nothing in this bill that prevents this man from applying and being permanently employed.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. None of those Democrats who were laid off some time ago can be restored?

Mr. LECOMPTE. What do you mean? Do you want somebody who was on the force 20 or 30 years ago reinstated?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No. This man was on for 10 years.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Any man who is on the force at the present time will be taken care of under this bill. That is the answer to your question.

Mr. MERRILL. If the gentleman will yield, under the system set up, the experience of the applicant will be given a certain number of points. Therefore, a new applicant who has had considerable experience on the police force, in the test would get a chance to have a higher rating.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Of course.

Mr. MERRILL. So that this man would therefore get a better chance on account of his experience?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Of course, he could take the examination.

Now, further in reply to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], who

was uneasy about some of the veterans, we have specifically written into this bill a provision with regard to veterans:

Any applicant who receives 75 or more points and who served on active duty in any branch of the Armed Forces of the United States, during any war, or in any campaign or expedition (for which a campaign badge has been authorized), and who has been separated therefrom under honorable conditions, shall have an additional 5 points added to his score, and if the applicant has a service-connected disability of at least 10 percent he shall receive an additional 5 points.

I think that takes care of the disabled veterans. At the present time there are 157 members of the police force. The Chief of Police and the Police Board will eventually, if capable men are found, have a police force up to but not in excess of 200.

The salary scale you will see on page 24 is the gross salary and is not to be confused in any way with the fact that a great many legislative employees are paid on a basic salary, with considerable additions added on from year to year by acts of Congress providing for percentage increases. The figures in the bill are the total gross salaries.

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

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. A question was raised as to the Supreme Court Building.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The Supreme Court has a police force of their own.

Mr. BONNER. I understand that, but they are under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I do not know about that. I think the force is under the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. We did not want to interfere with the police force of the Supreme Court in any way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BONNER. In the discussion of this matter was there considered one joint police force for the Capitol Hill area?

Mr. LECOMPTE. No. It is for the Capitol Hill area, but not including the Supreme Court. We did not have any requests from the Supreme Court to provide any additional police force for the Court buildings and grounds.

Mr. BONNER. The appropriations from Congress pay for the police protection of the Supreme Court and the Library of Congress. Would it not have been a better system—

Mr. LECOMPTE. That might have been, but it was not suggested when the leadership on both sides got together and tried to work out something that would be adequate. The suggestion of the gentleman from North Carolina is splendid for future consideration.

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

Mr. LECOMPTE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished leader from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think I can state for the benefit of Members that the leadership on both sides have met on several occasions. It was agreed by the leadership on both sides that there should be

a career force. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LeCOMPTE] introduced a bill. Before he introduced that, as chairman of the Committee on House Administration, he showed me a draft of it. I said, "Introduce the bill as an avenue for consideration, and then we can have something to level at." As a result of that, former Speaker RAYBURN and I designated the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE], and they, in turn, conferred with the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS] to examine the bill and make suggestions to us, which they did.

They suggested amendments. Every amendment was adopted that was suggested by these gentlemen.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. And they were valuable contributions to the bill, too.

Mr. McCORMACK. All were adopted except one amendment, and that was minor, dealing with the termination of the present employees, December 31. We felt it would take to around April 1 for the transition to take place. It is not a major matter, however.

So for the benefit of the membership of the House on both sides, I think I should state that this bill represents the views of the leadership and the amendments adopted by the House committee and recommended by the Democratic members.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. That is correct, and valuable they are too. This bill represents the best thinking by the leadership on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. McCORMACK. The bill is now much better than it was when originally introduced.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. And it came out unanimously from the committee. I now must yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I agree with the gentleman from Iowa that the bill gives them the ordinary veteran's preference, but then it takes it right away from them. You give it to them on page 22 and take it away from them on page 23.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. No; we do not take anything away from them.

Mr. BAILEY. Let me read it to you:

SEC. 5. (a) The Capitol Police Board may at any time require any member of the Capitol Police force to take a physical examination to be given by the attending physician of the Capitol, and if, as a result of such examination, the attending physician finds that such member is no longer physically qualified to perform the duties of the office or position he holds he shall be removed from the office or position he holds.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. That is true of every other member of the police force.

I wish to express my obligation to the members of the committee. Valuable contributions were made by all members and especially by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE]. The bill comes before the House with the unanimous endorsement and approval of the committee.

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

Mr. Chairman, as the chairman of the Committee on House Administration has said, this has been a nonpartisan approach to this matter in trying to work

out a bill for the reorganization of the Capitol Police. The result is not the entire answer at the moment; that is granted. It is an approach to a problem.

Before I enter upon any discussion of the method of appointment, which I think will be interesting to the Members, allow me to say that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LeCOMPTE], chairman of the Committee on House Administration, has always manifested the greatest consideration to all members of his committee.

I have not previously had much occasion to say anything like this for we seldom debate bills coming from this committee—but he has always been most considerate with the entire committee. He has always conducted the affairs of the committee without any partisan feeling whatever. I think in passing perhaps it might be well to call attention to the general duties of this committee. It handles a great many things; many things not handled by the regular committees are referred to this committee; it is the catch-all, it is the House keeping committee of the Congress. Some people have thought we handled public housing because it is the Committee on House Administration. To say the least, I do want to pay the chairman this compliment since we are coming to the end of the session and have not had occasion to do it before. He has provided able leadership and I am sure I speak for the minority side when I say we appreciate him.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I notice the salaries as set out in the bill call for a Chief of Capitol Police at \$10,000. Is that basic pay or is that full and complete?

Mr. BURLESON. That is full pay. The word "basic" which precedes the word "salary" simply means that they are entitled to longevity and other benefits which accrue under civil service. It does not mean that as a legislative employee he is entitled to a basic salary, plus percentage increases as it applies to legislative employees.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. It says, for instance in section 6 (b):

The annual basic salary of a private of any class of the force shall be increased by \$300 while he is assigned to duty as a station clerk.

What does the word "basic" mean there?

Mr. BURLESON. It means he is entitled to the increase which comes with the service. He serves 1 year probation and begins drawing his increases as provided for the various stages in civil service. It is standard civil service practice.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. And it does not apply to the Chief, the captain, and the lieutenant; their salaries constitute the full amount they are given.

Mr. BURLESON. They are entitled to longevity and other benefits which any other civil-service employee is entitled to after a certain term of service.

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

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

Mr. LeCOMPTE. I may say that these salaries are a little more than the present police force gets and just slightly less than the Metropolitan Police Force.

Mr. BURLESON. Slightly less than the Metropolitan Police Force, yes. It is patterned after them with reference to rank and salary, including accrued benefits.

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

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SADLAK. Is there any provision in here for pensions for these men?

Mr. BURLESON. The same retirement benefits which everyone has under civil service.

Mr. SADLAK. Is it contemplated that these men on the new police force may be able to retire in 20 years as is the customary provision for regular police officers and the FBI?

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT], have studied those questions very carefully. They gave special attention to that feature. It is just the same as in the civil service all the way through in connection with every other position. To answer the gentleman's question specifically, there is no time set when a member of the force may serve and then retire.

Mr. SADLAK. What I am getting at is that the new job, if the present job is not so considered, would be considered hazardous work?

Mr. BURLESON. I would assume it could be so considered.

Mr. SADLAK. I know from experience that men engaged in work of that nature have always had an expedited service; in other words, they were able to qualify for pensions after 20 years. That might be the case with the new police force. It is not the case with the present force.

Mr. BURLESON. There may be merit to the gentleman's thought. Perhaps that feature should be considered in the near future.

Mr. Chairman, in this matter of protecting Members of the Congress, I do not believe anyone expects complete and absolute protection. If we do, we should stay home in bed. The only way we are going to have complete protection, as the chairman just stated, is to have this Chamber walled off or keep everyone out of the gallery. I do not know why we should as individuals expect to have complete protection. After all, we are living in a hazardous age. A bomb may conceivably be dropped on the Capitol at any time. We could not expect protection entirely. So I do not know why we should concern ourselves to such an extent that we do not try to do something but not demand complete protection beyond the possibility of injury to ourselves. I am sure those gentlemen who had the unfortunate experience on March 1 will agree to that.

We are doing the best we can. We are working with the tools at hand. There are a great many things contemplated to be done after we get a permanent police force. It will be necessary, perhaps, in some cases to change the rules.



It will be necessary for the Speaker, whoever he may be after January 1, to look into these things and use what we have wherever he wants to use them. After all, as my very dear friend from Virginia just said a little while ago, it makes no difference on which side of the aisle you sit, we do not want to be shot at like sitting ducks. I assume that the Speaker will not want to be shot at either. So they will take the permanent force which we have and use it as best they can. That is what is contemplated in this measure.

Bear in mind this is to be a permanent police force and that we are going to invest funds in their training. They go through the FBI or the Metropolitan Police Training School. When they do that the taxpayers have a great deal of money invested in every man who goes through that training. With reference to the boy going to school, of course, I wish we could have them all here and that we could have them on the police force and let them go to school. But that cannot be done. So we are going to invest a lot of money in them; neither does the boy have time nor the inclination to make police work a career. We are not going to put him through a 3 or 4 months' course of training while he is going to school. That is a necessity for a permanent police force. It is going to cost some money. I do not know about the million dollars a year. I thought the figure was around one-half million a year. But we do have the machinery for a permanent police force which can be improved with experience. This is not entirely a trial and error method, although there is an element of trial and error in it. So, if we have a permanent police force, rules and regulations can be devised by the police board, administered by the Chief of Police, to insure maximum protection.

May I say parenthetically that I know of no Member of this House, including those gentlemen who were unfortunate as to be wounded by the assassins' bullets on March 1, who has criticized the present police force. The chairman made that plain. Therefore, this measure is in no respect a reflection upon these men who now constitute the force.

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

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DEANE. To point out the cost this first year, the appropriation has been made and passed by the House, and the total cost, which would include new uniforms, if the Capitol Police Board so decided, would be \$633,203.

Mr. BURLESON. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. GRANT. I certainly want to congratulate the committee on doing a fine job on this bill, and I want to ask the gentleman from Texas this: Is it possible under this bill to have several plain-clothesmen in the galleries?

Mr. BURLESON. Would it be possible to do so?

Mr. GRANT. Yes.

Mr. BURLESON. I think under the rules of the House that that is possible now. Of course, the Doorkeeper, under the Speaker's direction, has control of the galleries. As the chairman of the Committee on House Administration has indicated, it is my understanding that uniformed policemen will be placed in the galleries when this bill becomes effective; that it would have a deterring influence in regard to occurrences like we had recently. It is impossible, of course, if we had a thousand policemen up here—nor would they think of doing such a thing—to search every individual who came into this Chamber. I know a year or so ago some visitors came in and sat on this floor. They inadvertently wandered in, and they, of course, had to be reminded of the rules. Those things just happen.

Mr. GRANT. I wonder if the committee gave any consideration to the integration of the Capitol Police with the Metropolitan Police. The reason I say that is because we have so many systems in the District. We have the Park Police; we have the Library Police, the Metropolitan Police, and the Capitol Police.

Mr. BURLESON. Yes. The committee discussed that on several occasions. It is integrated to this extent, and I would like to discuss that a moment. Under the civil-service system we propose in this legislation, a member of the Metropolitan Police force appointed by the chief shall be a member of the board to examine applicants. A representative of the FBI, appointed by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, will constitute another member of the examining board, sitting with the Sergeant at Arms of the House, the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, and the Architect of the Capitol. I agree with the gentleman that the rules and regulations promulgated should provide the greatest possible integration.

Now, if I may, Mr. Chairman, mention the method of qualifying applicants. First, the Civil Service Commission will give an examination to applicants and that examination will amount to a maximum of 40 points. After that examination, a physical examination will be given by our own doctor at the Capitol, which amounts to a maximum of 30 points. The personal interview with Capitol Police Board will constitute a maximum of 20 points, and 10 points will be added for other qualifications, making a total of 100 points, plus veterans' preference.

Mr. CHUDOFF. I wonder if the gentleman can tell me if these men are going to be given credit for any experience which they have had on the present Capitol Police Force?

Mr. BURLESON. Automatically they will get credit under the 10-point system, because they have had this experience. Points so accumulated are added to the total score. Naturally, they would have an advantage in taking the Civil Service examination and for the 10 points which would be added.

Mr. Chairman, let me say this further. There has been talk about the purpose of the bill. The purpose of the bill is not only for our own protection. There

are 157 acres around the Capitol. There are places around this Capitol where it is not safe to be late at night. It has been that way for a long time.

We are repairing the back part of the Capitol, which is really the most attractive part of the grounds. There is a lot of money being spent in order that visitors may go there again as they did prior to the war. It is going to take more personnel to keep the grounds properly patrolled.

There is one other thing we hope for and that is in the training which these members of the force will have, they will be given training in security. We talk about protection from attack from the galleries. But the day may come when a high explosive bomb could be brought into the Capitol and then none of us would have much to worry about. So we should have men who are trained in security. And they will be trained in that field. Each of these men is going to be investigated by the FBI before his application is finally accepted. Pass this measure and in my humble opinion, we will in time develop a police force of high efficiency.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS].

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I speak in favor of this bill because of the service that I have had on the District Committee and the experience I have had with the Metropolitan Police, and in anticipation of a correlation and integration of their service with our police force on Capitol Hill.

I want to compliment the majority leader who used the term "approach" in speaking of this bill. Certainly this is a fine approach to what we should do here in the House. It seems to me, in the years that I have been here, that Members of Congress are always willing to take care of everybody else, but they very seldom do anything for themselves. Here in this metropolitan area we have the Metropolitan Police, the Park Police, and the White House Police. Those three forces are correlated, they work together although they are within themselves separate units. But they try to accomplish a situation over all of law and order in the Capital City. It is said in police circles that the White House Police are the best policemen in this town, that the cream go over there. I think that is correct. And I think we should have the most efficient men over there.

However, it seems to me that where we have 435 Members of the House and 96 Members of the other body that we should have a complementary force here on Capitol Hill that should be just as effective as any other police force in the metropolitan area.

So far as the salaries of these men are concerned, the amount is really negligible when you think of what we really have invested that is under their power to protect. In the future as we go along with this program developing we will find that we will be able to draw good men here who will be capable and can serve with the efficiency with which they should serve.

Many of these boys who are now serving as guards here, as we call them, have

no ability to use a gun, have never been trained in how to use a gun, and would not serve in any way in an emergency if there were an attack here such as we had with the Puerto Rican situation.

So I say to you today that I think that as a Congress we must take this step to set up a Capitol Police force that will be efficient and strong and deserve recognition and respect throughout all the Capital.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNS. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. I suggest that these men be trained in courtesy, too. If one goes to Ottawa he finds that the guards on duty there are most courteous in showing people around. These men should receive that kind of training.

Mr. KEARNS. I think the gentleman is correct. These men should be trained to the utmost in their attitude of courtesy toward people. I think that should be one of the prime requirements.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY], one of the gentlemen who suffered in the cowardly assault made on this floor on March 1.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, like a lot of our colleagues here, I know that before the 1st of March I was not very much concerned about security. I did not think any was going to be needed in this Chamber. Then, like all of us that day, I certainly got very security conscious in an awful hurry.

I am not prepared to say what a uniformed, trained police force would have been able to do on that day. I do not think the finest police force in the world could have stopped the assault, although I do think that if we had had those trained men immediately available our Puerto Rican friends would not have been able to stand up there and fire down on us, and go through their magazines and even reload in some cases. I can recall that when I heard the shots I thought a couple of good foxholes would have done us much more good than maybe the police, but that is beside the point.

There has been a lot of discussion since that assault about what should be done. The gentleman from Texas said a little while ago some consideration had been given to putting heavy bulletproof glass all around the galleries and a wire screen above that so you could not throw a bomb over. I understand there was consideration being given to that, and then the cost factor came into it and the fact that the glass might be a little heavy for the gallery, and those and other factors ruled that out.

Then there was the thought of putting up some sort of electric eye that would screen all the visitors coming into the Capitol to determine whether they were carrying pistols or anything like that. Anything that picks up metal like that might be a little bit embarrassing to some people. It might be a little embarrassing to me. I still have some metal inside of me here, so I certainly would not go for that.

I do not know whether or not this bill is the answer to it, the final answer, but I do know this. I know that when I was

walking over to answer the last quorum call some of my colleagues said I did not have any business to be around here. All of us were pretty lucky that day, whether we were here or not. I think we were terribly lucky. If it had not been for the fact that instead of dropping a couple of bombs down here or instead of using a few machine guns, maybe; if it had not been for the fact that you had 4 deluded people up in that gallery up there, and 3 of them apparently could not control their Lugers, and one of them, the lady, according to the jury, was not trying to shoot anybody, anyway; if it had not been for those factors Heaven only knows what might have happened in this Chamber.

As I said when I had the privilege of coming back and addressing the House for the first time on April 27, I think the only sensible thing to do is to try to derive some sort of a lesson from the good fortune that befell all of us on that day. As I say, I do not know that this bill is the answer. I do not think it probably is the complete answer. You could not ever get a complete answer here, and still observe the freedom, and still allow our people, when they come down here to Washington, to have that sense of closeness to their legislators in an action that they are so proud of. But I do think this is a step in the right direction.

I do think our police force should be put on a trained, professional basis. We have heard a lot of talk about consideration or preference for one type or another of individuals who might be on the force or another type who may not be on the force at the present time. I would like to suggest that the overriding consideration in this bill should be only to have only one form of preference, and that is a Congressional preference because I do not believe if we are thought of well enough by our folks to send us down here to represent them that we can put our security on too high a basis. I have looked over this bill and I have read the report of the committee. They have done a good job of it. In time, perhaps, we can go on and take further steps which will prove beneficial and useful. I think the idea of putting our Capitol Police force on a merit basis, as is done in this bill and raising its standards so that they will be able to guarantee the security of the Congress more effectively than has been the case is a highly understandable and commendable step, and I urge the passage of the bill.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will read the substitute committee amendment printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "Capitol Police Reorganization Act of 1954."

#### UNITED STATES CAPITOL POLICE

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established for the protection of the Congress and the United States Capitol Buildings and Grounds a police force which shall be known as the

United States Capitol Police (hereinafter referred to as the "Capitol Police force").

(b) The Capitol Police force shall consist of such number of members as the Capitol Police Board determines to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That such number shall not exceed 200.

(c) The duties imposed by law on the Capitol Police force shall be performed under the general direction and control of the Capitol Police Board, established by the act entitled "An act to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes," approved July 31, 1946, as amended (40 U. S. C., secs. 212a and 212b).

(b) There shall be at the head of the Capitol Police force an officer to be known as the "Chief, United States Capitol Police" (hereinafter referred to as the "Chief, Capitol Police"), who shall be appointed by the Capitol Police Board in accordance with section 3, and who shall directly supervise the Capitol Police force in the performance of its duties in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Capitol Police Board shall prescribe pursuant to section 11.

(e) In case of a vacancy in the office of Chief, Capitol Police, or the suspension of the incumbent, or the incapacity or inability of the incumbent to perform the duties of such office, the Capitol Police Board may authorize another member of the Capitol Police force temporarily to act as, and exercise the functions and powers of, the Chief, Capitol Police.

(f) There are hereby transferred to the Capitol Police force all functions and powers vested in the Capitol police, as established by section 1821 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (40 U. S. C., sec. 206) —

(1) by section 1826 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (40 U. S. C., sec. 215),

(2) by the act entitled "An act to protect the public property, turf, and grass of the Capitol Grounds from injury," approved April 29, 1876 (40 U. S. C., sec. 214), and

(3) by section 9 of the act entitled "An act to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes," approved July 31, 1946 (40 U. S. C., sec. 212a).

#### APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS

SEC. 3. (a) The members of the Capitol Police force shall be appointed by the Capitol Police Board, without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the offices or positions to which they are appointed. The Capitol Police Board shall prescribe uniform mental and physical standards for each of the classes of offices and positions specified in the table set forth in section 6 (a). No individual shall be appointed to an office or position on the Capitol Police force (1) unless he meets the applicable standards so prescribed by the Capitol Police Board, (2) unless he has successfully passed the mental examination and physical examination given in accordance with section 4, and (3) unless he has been investigated as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and a report thereon has been made to the Capitol Police Board and, after consideration of such report, the Board believes that the individual is loyal to the United States, its Constitution, and its form of government.

(b) The Capitol Police Board shall keep a register of applicants for appointment to the Capitol Police force who have made a score of 75 points or more as computed according to subsection (c). Except as provided in subsection (e), members shall be appointed to the Capitol Police force from such register. In making an appointment to any office or position on the force, the Capitol Police Board shall make its selection from among the highest three names of those individuals on such register who are



eligible for appointment to the office or position.

(c) The standing of a particular applicant on the register of eligible applicants shall be determined by adding the following:

(1) The number of points up to a maximum of 40 which he receives on the mental examination given by the Civil Service Commission pursuant to section 4 (a);

(2) The number of points up to a maximum of 30 he receives on the physical examination given by the attending physician of the Capitol pursuant to section 4 (b);

(3) The number of points up to a maximum of 20 which he receives as a result of an oral interview conducted by a 5-member board composed of 1 officer or employee of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice appointed by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, 1 officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force appointed by the Chief of Police of the Metropolitan Police force, and the 3 members of the Capitol Police Board; and

(4) The number of points up to a maximum of 10 which he receives as a result of other qualifications which he may have, such as education, previous training, or experience, as determined by the Capitol Police Board. Any applicant who receives 75 or more points and who served on active duty in any branch of the Armed Forces of the United States, during any war, or in any campaign or expedition (for which a campaign badge has been authorized), and who has been separated therefrom under honorable conditions, shall have an additional 5 points added to his score, and if the applicant has a service-connected disability of at least 10 percent he shall receive an additional 5 points.

(d) For 1 year following the date of his appointment, a member of the Capitol Police force shall be on probation. If during the period of probation the conduct of the member, or his capacity to perform his duties, is unsatisfactory to the Capitol Police Board, he shall be notified in writing to that effect and shall be removed from the force.

(e) The Capitol Police Board is authorized to prescribe regulations, consistent with this act, governing the filling of offices or positions on the Capitol Police force, in any grade above that of private, class 4, through the appointment of individuals who are already members of the force.

#### EXAMINATIONS FOR APPOINTMENT

SEC. 4. (a) For the purposes of appointments to offices and positions on the Capitol Police force—

(1) the Civil Service Commission shall prepare, and give, at such times as the Capitol Police Board shall designate, examinations which will fairly test the relative mental capacity and fitness of the persons examined to perform the duties of the offices or positions to which they may be appointed,

(2) the attending physician of the Capitol shall prepare, and give, at such times as the Capitol Police Board may designate, examinations which will fairly test the physical qualifications of the persons examined to perform the duties of the offices or positions to which they may be appointed.

(b) The results of any examination referred to in this section shall be given only to the individual who took the examination, the Chief, Capitol Police, the Capitol Police Board, the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, and the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives.

#### REMOVAL FOR PHYSICAL INCAPACITY; AGE BEYOND WHICH MEMBERS MAY NOT SERVE

SEC. 5. (a) The Capitol Police Board may at any time require any member of the Capitol Police force to take a physical examination to be given by the attending physician of the Capitol, and if, as a result of such examination, the attending physician finds that such member is no longer physically

qualified to perform the duties of the office or position he holds he shall be removed from the office or position he holds.

(b) No individual may be a member of the Capitol Police force after the last day of the month during which he shall have attained the age of 62 years.

#### COMPENSATION

SEC. 6. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), the annual basic salaries of the members of the Capitol Police force shall be at the rates set forth in the following table:

Chief, Capitol Police	\$10,000
Captain	8,500
Lieutenant	6,009
Sergeant	5,521
Chief clerk	5,521
Private, class 4 (3 or more years' service)	4,641
Private, class 3 (2 or more but less than 3 years' service)	4,378
Private, class 2 (1 or more but less than 2 years' service)	4,115
Private, class 1 (less than 1 years' service)	3,900

(b) The annual basic salary of a private of any class of the force shall be increased by \$300 while he is assigned to duty as a station clerk.

(c) The annual basic salary of each member of the Capitol Police force (other than Chief, Capitol Police), in a grade above that of private, class 3, shall be increased by \$120 at the beginning of the next pay period following each 5-year period of continuous service completed in such grade after the date of enactment of this act. For the purpose of this subsection, service shall not be deemed to have been discontinued by reason of any assignment (with an accompanying increase in basic salary) pursuant to subsection (b). An increase in basic salary under this subsection shall be known as a "longevity increase."

(d) Except in the case of appointment to the office of Chief, Capitol Police, any member of the Capitol Police force who is promoted to an office or position in a higher grade in the salary table set out in subsection (a) and who, immediately prior to being appointed to such higher grade was receiving one or more longevity increases under subsection (c), so that his basic salary, as increased by such longevity increases, was in an amount in excess of the basic salary for the higher grade to which he is so promoted, shall, upon appointment to such higher grade, be entitled to the basic salary of such higher grade plus an amount equal to the minimum number of longevity increases which will make his salary in such higher grade not less than the salary he received before being appointed to such higher grade, including longevity increases.

(e) Whenever the Capitol Police Board, acting under section 9 (e), demotes any member of the Capitol Police force to a lower grade and such member prior to such demotion was receiving one or more longevity increases, such Board may, in its discretion, exclude from such member's rate of compensation one or more of such longevity increases.

(f) For the purpose of determining the longevity increases to which an individual is entitled under this section, service of such individual as a member of the Capitol Police as established by section 1821 of the Revised Statutes of the United States shall not be counted. An individual who is appointed to the Capitol Police force under this act as a private, after having had more than 1 year, in the aggregate, of Capitol Police service, as hereinafter defined, shall be appointed to the grade of private, class 2. For purposes of the foregoing sentence the term "Capitol Police service" means service as a member of the Capitol Police as established by section 1821 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and service as a temporary member

of the Capitol Police force in accordance with section 14.

#### ANNUAL AND SICK LEAVE

SEC. 7. (a) Subsection (b) of section 202 of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 (5 U. S. C., sec. 2061 (b)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) Notwithstanding subparagraph (H) of paragraph (1) of this subsection, this title (except sec. 204, relating to sick leave) shall apply to members of the United States Capitol Police."

(b) Members of the Capitol Police force shall be entitled, under such regulations as the Capitol Police Board shall prescribe, to leave with pay on account of sickness, not to exceed 30 days in any 1 calendar year.

(c) In the case of any member of the Capitol Police force disabled by injury received, or disease contracted, in the actual discharge of his duty, the Capitol Police Board is authorized to grant such leave with pay, in addition to that provided for in subsection (b), as the Attending Physician of the Capitol may recommend.

#### UNIFORMS AND EQUIPMENT

SEC. 8. (a) The Capitol Police Board shall determine the uniform to be worn by members of the Capitol Police force, and shall make such regulations as it may deem necessary governing the wearing of such uniform.

(b) Members of the Capitol Police force shall be furnished, at Government expense, such uniforms, belts, arms, and other personal equipment as the Capitol Police Board may deem necessary for the performance of their duties. The expense of maintaining his uniform in proper condition shall be borne by the member of the force.

#### SUSPENSION, REMOVAL, AND OTHER DISCIPLINARY ACTION

SEC. 9. (a) The Chief, Capitol Police, may be suspended or removed from office by the Capitol Police Board, and any other member of the Capitol Police force may be fined, demoted, suspended, or removed from his office or position by the Capitol Police Board, but, except as provided in section 3 (d) and in section 5, only in accordance with the following provisions of this section and only for any of the following causes:

(1) Commission of any offense against the laws of the United States (including the laws and ordinances of the District of Columbia) whether before or after conviction thereof in any court;

(2) Misconduct in office; and

(3) Violation of any regulation made under section 11.

(b) The Capitol Police Board may by order suspend (either with or without pay), or remove from office, the Chief, Capitol Police, for any cause specified in subsection (a), but only after such Board (1) has preferred charges against such Chief in writing, (2) has afforded him a reasonable opportunity for hearing on such charges, and (3) has prepared written findings in support of its action. The Board shall furnish to such Chief a copy of its order and its findings.

(c) Whenever the Chief, Capitol Police, is so suspended or removed from office, he may file a written appeal with the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives on or before the 30th day after the date he was furnished a copy of the order and findings of the Capitol Police Board.

(d) Whenever an appeal is filed under subsection (c), the President pro tempore of the Senate shall appoint 4 Senators, 2 from each of the 2 major political parties, and the Speaker of the House shall appoint 4 Representatives, 2 from each of the 2 major political parties, who shall sit as an appeals board to hear and act upon such appeal and the decision of such appeals board shall be final.

(e) The Capitol Police Board may by order fine, demote, suspend (either with or with-

out pay), or remove any member of the Capitol Police force for any cause specified in subsection (a), after (1) the Chief, Capitol Police, has preferred charges against such member in writing, and (2) the Capitol Police Board has afforded such member a reasonable opportunity for hearing on such charges. The action of the Capitol Police Board shall be final.

(f) Any member suspended or removed under this section who is reinstated or restored to duty, on the ground that such suspension or removal was unjustified or unwarranted, shall be paid compensation at the same rate as the compensation being received by him immediately prior to such removal or suspension, for the period with respect to which he received no compensation because of such suspension or removal, less any amounts earned by him through other employment during such period, and shall for all purposes except the accumulation of leave be deemed to have rendered service during such period.

(g) Any member demoted under this section who is restored to the office or position from which he was demoted, on the ground that such demotion was unjustified or unwarranted, shall be paid compensation at the same rate as the compensation being received by him immediately prior to such demotion, for the period for which he received no compensation with respect to the office or position from which he was demoted, less any amounts he received as compensation with respect to the office or position to which he was demoted.

(h) All fines imposed under this section shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

(i) No individual removed under this section from any office or position on the Capitol Police force shall be reappointed a member of such force, except that this subsection shall not prohibit reinstatement or restoration to duty of any individual whose removal has been held to have been unjustified or unwarranted.

#### EXTENSION OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT TO MEMBERS OF THE CAPITOL POLICE FORCE

SEC. 10. Clause (c) of section 4 of the act entitled "An act to extend the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to certain employees in the legislative and judicial branches of the Government," approved July 13, 1937 (5 U. S. C., sec. 693d), is amended to read as follows: "(c) the United States Capitol Police."

#### REGULATIONS

SEC. 11. The Capitol Police Board may make, modify, and enforce such regulations, not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, as it deems necessary for the proper government, conduct, discipline, and good name of the Capitol Police force.

#### GOVERNMENTAL SERVICES AND FACILITIES

SEC. 12. All departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, and of the municipal government of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed to furnish and to make available to the Capitol Police force such of their services and facilities as the Capitol Police Board deems necessary to aid the Capitol Police force in carrying out its duties (including the training of members of such force).

#### DISBURSEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 13. All sums appropriated to carry out this act shall be disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

#### TEMPORARY MEMBERS

SEC. 14. (a) Each individual who, immediately prior to the time this act takes effect, is a member of the Capitol Police as established by section 1821 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (40 U. S. C., sec. 206), shall have, from the time this act takes effect, the status of a temporary member

of the Capitol Police force created by this act, but such individual, while having such status, shall be in the same grade and receive the same rate of compensation held and received by him, and shall continue to be subject to the same provisions of law with respect to retirement to which he was subject, immediately prior to the time this act takes effect. No such temporary member shall have any right to benefit granted by this act to members of the Capitol Police force created by this act, but he shall have the same rights and benefits to which he would be entitled if this act had not been enacted and he were still serving in the Capitol Police established by section 1821 of the Revised Statutes.

(b) The Capitol Police Board shall remove, at such time as it deems appropriate, but in any event no later than December 31, 1954, any such temporary member who, on or before December 31, 1954, has not been appointed to the Capitol Police force created by this act. Any individual removed under this subsection shall be removed under the same terms and conditions, and entitled to the same rights and privileges, as he would be if this act had not been enacted and he were being removed from the Capitol Police as established by section 1821 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (40 U. S. C., sec. 206).

#### REPEALS AND AMENDMENTS

SEC. 15. (a) The following laws and parts of laws are hereby repealed:

(1) The provisions of law codified as section 206 of title 40 of the United States Code;

(2) Section 1822 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (40 U. S. C., sec. 207);

(3) Section 1823 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (40 U. S. C., sec. 208);

(4) The proviso at the end of the first sentence under the subheading "Capitol Police" under the heading "Legislative," in the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1876, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1875 (40 U. S. C., sec. 209);

(5) Section 1824 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (40 U. S. C., sec. 210);

(6) Section 1825 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (40 U. S. C., sec. 211);

(7) The provisions of law codified as section 212 of title 40 of the United States Code;

(8) The last sentence of section 14 (c) of the act entitled "An act to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes," approved July 31, 1946, as amended (40 U. S. C., sec. 212b (c)); and

(9) The provisions of law codified as section 213a of title 40 of the United States Code.

(b) The first sentence of section 102 (a) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, is amended by striking out "and" immediately before "(6)" and inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: "; and (7) members of the United States Capitol Police."

#### EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 16. This act shall take effect on the first day of the first month beginning more than 30 days after the date of its enactment.

Mr. LECOMPTE (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and be open for amendment at all points.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAILEY: On page 22, line 8, after the period, insert "Provided, That any individual presently employed as a member of the Capitol Police force who is a disabled war veteran shall be exempt from the provisions of section 3 of this legislation requiring a physical examination should he otherwise qualify."

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, there is no need to take 5 minutes to explain the intent of this amendment. This cannot possibly affect more than 2 or 3 or as many as 4 members of the present police force. It makes no attempt to in any way interfere with the selection and qualifications of future members of the force. I am talking about some 2 or 3 individuals who are members of the present police force who are disabled veterans. I have in mind one individual who was serving when World War II was declared. He went into the service and he came back and resumed his duties on the police force. He is on the police force today. He is a married man with two children and is trying to pay for a home.

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

Mr. BAILEY. I yield providing you do not make an argument.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman to yield for a question.

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I was going to ask the gentleman why he believes there is any reason to think that the gentleman cannot qualify under this bill. I think he will qualify from what you say about him. He will be automatically on the police force.

Mr. BAILEY. He will be, but will he be able to qualify if he is so disabled?

Mr. LECOMPTE. He is qualified now. I think he can qualify. He will have to meet the physical requirements.

Mr. BAILEY. If you require a pretty stiff physical examination, he will not be able to qualify because he is sufficiently injured to be drawing disability compensation.

Mr. LECOMPTE. That in itself does not bar him. That would not bar him.

Mr. BAILEY. What you do here is you give him the ordinary veteran's preference on page 22, which contains the section I am trying to amend.

Mr. LECOMPTE. We also give him a 5-percent credit for disability.

Mr. BAILEY. Then you provide within 10 days or 30 days after you have declared him a member of the police force to call him up for another physical examination, and he has no 5 percent or 10-percent preference rights. I want to make this point, Mr. Chairman. I want to make this plea to my colleagues of the House: These men earned that disability in the defense of the United States and not in the defense of this Congress. We, the Members of Congress, are just as expendable as that man was when we sent him into the front lines to serve the United States. He comes first, not the Members of this Congress. Now I dare you to bar that man from membership on the police force who has gone



out and received wounds and been declared disabled just because you want to set up a permanent police force. There are plenty of desk jobs that he can hold. Why bar him in the beginning.

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

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will you go so far as to say that no one but disabled veterans should run for Congress?

Mr. BAILEY. I do not get the intent of the gentleman's inquiry. I would not want to bar him from running for Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, I read to the House the provision on pages 21 and 22 which gives preference to all veterans of all wars, even for campaigns or expeditions for which a campaign badge has been authorized. In addition to that, if the applicant has a service-connected disability of at least 10 percent, he shall receive an additional 5 points. After that he may be receiving disability compensation through the Veterans' Administration and even that does not qualify him in any way in the world.

Mr. BAILEY. Look at page 23, section 5, subsection (a).

Mr. LeCOMPTE. I do not yield to the gentleman.

All of the men on the police force at the present time are covered under this act in the new Capitol Police force. Of course, if he is 100 percent disabled or 75 percent disabled, perhaps he could not qualify to serve on the police force. I think it was the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], who emphasized that we must take care of disabled veterans, and we have got that written in there. I do not see how it could be any plainer than it is on page 22.

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

Mr. LeCOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Does the gentleman know whether or not the bill takes care of the veteran who is receiving 10 or 15 percent disability, whether or not it would have any effect on his salary?

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Oh, no. That would not be deductible from his salary. His disability compensation is in addition to any salary he draws any place else.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The bill does not so provide.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Well, that is regular in all statutes. Any man working for the Government may have disability compensation, but that does not affect his salary as an employee of the Government.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I have been informed that it does in some cases. Does not the gentleman think the veteran ought to be protected?

Mr. LeCOMPTE. He is protected.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Is there anything here that does protect him?

Mr. LeCOMPTE. There is no deduction from anybody's salary because of a disability compensation. I have never known that to occur any place.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I have been informed that it does.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. A pension and disability compensation are two different things. I do not believe I have ever heard of disability compensation being deducted from a man's salary.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Would the gentleman object if we added that additional protection?

Mr. LeCOMPTE. It would not be any additional protection because he has that protection. We cannot give him anything he does not have. I am in favor of having that, but I do not see how you could write that into the bill to give him any more protection than he has. The gentleman recognizes that disability compensation and a pension are under different categories?

Mr. EBERHARTER. It would affect a man receiving a pension?

Mr. LeCOMPTE. If he is drawing a pension, he has to be a man who does not have sufficient income or he would not be entitled to the pension. I think it would be a mistake, Mr. Chairman, to adopt this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I cannot agree with the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] that we do in fact give service preference and take it away in another section of the bill. That was not the intent and that is not the fact.

This matter was given great consideration.

Mr. BAILEY. If the gentleman will yield, and he should since he has mentioned my name, will the gentleman explain to me section 5 (a)?

Mr. MOSS. If the gentleman will withhold for just a few moments, that is exactly what I will do. Section 5, subsection (a) that the Capitol Police Board may at any time require any member to take a physical examination to be given by the attending physician of the Capitol, requires that the examination show that the person is able to perform his duties. That is not any different than the situation right now. At any time that the Capitol Police Board should determine that the gentleman you have referred to is not physically fit to perform his duties he would no longer be retained in the employment of the Congress. This is not an unreasonable requirement, it is a very ordinary requirement. I can think of no police force that does not have a similar requirement.

Mr. BAILEY. Then of what value is the 5- and 10-percent preference clause?

Mr. MOSS. The same value that it is in every instance where a man seeks employment in the Government.

Mr. BAILEY. You give it to him in one section and take it away from him in the other.

Mr. MOSS. You do not take it away from him. You have merely required that a man be physically fit to do the job he is employed to do. I say it is not an unreasonable requirement.

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

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

Mr. BURLESON. In fact that is the only purpose for allowing the 10 percent for disability.

Mr. MOSS. That is correct.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MOSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DEANE. In the passage of legislation like this certain people will be penalized. The age limit in the bill is 62 years. There are 5 or 6 men on the force today who are 70 years of age. If we make exceptions in one case it seems to me it would be only fair to make them in terms of all these deserving men.

I am glad to associate myself with the gentleman from California who has worked so hard and faithfully in helping draft this legislation.

Mr. MOSS. I want to make this comment. It is well to recall here what we are trying to do. We are trying to provide more security by creating a professional police force, by holding out inducements to attract the best possible people. It is not aimed at eliminating from the present force any man who is qualified. To require a minimum of physical fitness from a police officer is not in any way unreasonable. I think it would be fundamentally dishonest to say that a man unfit physically to perform his duties should continue on the payroll regardless.

I urge that you defeat the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to take this time; it is late, but I would like to ask one or two questions of the committee, if I may, as to what constitutes "best security," and even if a man has physical fitness, is that where you stop?

For example, when General MacArthur delivered Seoul, the capital of Korea, to Syngman Rhee in October 1950, one-half hour before the general and Mr. Rhee entered the building, an officer spotted some live dynamite wired over the front portal ready to blow up the capital as soon as General MacArthur and his staff entered. The dynamite was placed above the door level where a person would see it only by chance. No amount of physical ability could have met that situation; it took headwork.

Secondly, securitywise, militarily speaking, there could be better traffic direction within this building. There should be a clear set of entrances through which visitors could be admitted and checked. That, however, does not require physical ability; like other safety items, it requires a little more headwork and not so much brawn especially, to give you the best type of security. But the question is, Do you want to remove the democratic essence of the House and the Senate and the Capitol by giving it a military, police-state posture? I think not.

Third, there has been no mention of the trend of emotion in the country, especially when highly tense issues are in debate. When the shooting took place in this Chamber on March 1, we were arguing about the wetbacks, a very controversial measure; before and during formal debate on the bill, many complimentary remarks were made about

some of our Latin American friends. There was, in addition, a great emotional tenseness in the land. When the bill was presented, tenseness, independent of the wetback situation, was rampant. The Nation was at that time engrossed in many investigations against the Reds. It does not require physical ability alone to spot a controversial or volatile mood, and that, as a result, there might be danger. The Reds will do anything to gain their ends, to strike terror, or to slaughter, at such moments. I do not think even the best qualified man is going to stop a bullet from being shot, with the mood of the land so tense. The secret service did not prevent the firing of bullets at Blair House when President Truman was there. It is for us, and others, to keep the morale of the land attuned to peaceful pursuits and orderly procedures. If we fail in that, then we must take the consequences, as was done on March 1 here in the House. Brainwork must accompany brawn in this whole issue.

I ask, Can a man who might have been wounded in action, a man with a head on his shoulders, can he qualify under this bill to, say, to help supervise or plan in arranging for continuing security? Not only for ourselves but for the visitors when they come into the gallery?

I would not want a police badge to be seen in this Chamber. I want it kept a civil, deliberative institution. I want the people to feel they do not have to be openly monitored when they come here. Plainclothes men can do, especially during debate. Flashing badges are out. I want to see men in plainclothes so that people do not feel they are being monitored. Our Government is an honor system. We, as individuals, are replaceable. Every man in this Chamber who was wounded came back here and thanked God for being alive. Let us place a little more faith and hope in the divine, and realize that operating our form of freedom by Government is itself a very dangerous undertaking. Revolutions show that the mood of the land must not be abused, lest blood flow. In the face of an ugly mood, competent police in the gallery can do many heroic things to promote security, but they cannot do it alone.

Now, do you allow head work to come in as a qualification under this bill, Mr. Chairman?

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

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

Mr. LECOMPTE. The selection of a permanent police force is delegated to the Capitol Police Board. We very carefully added, at the suggestion of the gentleman from North Carolina who took such an important part in drawing this legislation the provision that there will be questions and answers, and that there will be in addition to the Capitol Police force an employee of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice appointed by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, one a member of the Metropolitan Police force appointed by the Chief of Police of the Metropolitan Police force, with the 3 members of the Capitol Police force,

5 members, to examine the men before they are appointed to the Capitol Police force.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Will there be an opportunity for a man who might have been grievously wounded in battle to show he has something above the shoulders? After all, we are interested in survival, which includes top-flight planning as well as agile action.

Mr. LECOMPTE. We have the regular 10 points and he will have a chance to present his case before that group and they can judge his ability and give him 40 points on it.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. That is all I care to say. I did not think I could vote for this measure unless you showed in this measure consideration for a man having it above the shoulders as well as in the body.

Mr. LECOMPTE. That is what we are trying to do. We are trying to get an efficient, permanent, nonpartisan professional police force.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, it is with profound sorrow that I call attention to an incident that happened here on the floor a week ago tomorrow and to one that occurred today.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. A week ago the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, our majority leader whom we all follow when we can—and his task these closing days is a most difficult one, ably performed, had given us assurances that if we would stay on the floor and vote on the amendments the vote on the bill would come on Saturday morning. Some 40 or 50 of us, acting in good faith, stayed. The gentleman from Indiana attempted to carry out his agreement with us. But the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] made a very emotional plea in behalf of his Texas colleagues. He pleaded that Members of the Texas delegation were down South working in the primary election—six of them I think he said—and would be back Monday. That in fairness to them the vote should not be taken on Saturday. He rather severely criticized our leader. He insisted that the vote go over until Monday, and the gentleman from Indiana, yielding, being a little—I was about to say "soft," but I will say "kindly disposed" and wanting to maintain amicable relations with the minority leader, unable to withstand the flood of Texas tears he put us on the block—and again we do not complain for we know his task is difficult—threw us, 35 or 40 of us, over the fence. And that was all right with me. I do not care, and I do not know of any of the rest who care. We realized his position—are satisfied.

So, the vote went over until Monday so that these 6 gentlemen, our colleagues from Texas, could attend their primaries. Perhaps they are more valuable as Members of Congress than am I but that is not true of the other Michigan Members—especially our colleague from the 6th district, Miss THOMPSON, who serves so well and faithfully. There are 12 of us from Michigan that have primaries on the 3d of August. That is next Tuesday. We outnumber them 2 to 1. Are we only half as valuable? So, when the issue came up today they made sure that we could not go home and take care of our Michigan primaries. That is the way they treated us. It does seem a trifle discriminatory. And today—where were the six from Texas—still home?

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

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I speak with reluctance because I appreciate the good intentions, the study and the time that have gone into the preparation of this bill by the distinguished members of the committee. My reluctance is the greater because the measure has favorably passed the scrutiny of leadership both Republican and Democratic and under a bipartisan sponsorship is brought before us with the expectancy of a prompt and unanimous adoption. Under such circumstances it would seem presumptuous on my part to set my judgment above that of great statesmen with long and honorable records of service in this body.

I have been a Member of but 2 Congresses, 1 of Democratic administration and 1 of Republican administration. I have seen no difference in the courtesy and the degree of service of our Capitol police.

Some of them may be young men who are attending the colleges and universities in this area. I have found them without exception courteous, competent, alert. I do not think it is to their discredit that they are working their way through college. I do not think that it detracts from the service that they render as police officers that they are enabled to go on with their education.

It may be that some of the members of the Capitol Police force have passed the age of 62. I am not because of that fact for throwing them to the dogs as long as they continue efficiently to function, as I have without exception observed them perform the duties of their assignment.

#### OUTRAGE OF MARCH 1

It happened that on the 1st day of March of this year a group of fanatics, gaining entrance to the galleries of this House in the manner that had obtained for a century or more, outraged the dignity of the House and the traditions of a self-governing people.

For many years visitors to Washington, including delegations of school children, visiting the Capitol of their country in the spirit of pilgrims to a shrine, had come to the galleries of this Chamber to witness the legislative functioning of the democracy of which they were a part. It remained for these fanatics, possessed of no real grievance, for the first time in our history to violate all the



restraints of a people gifted with the ability of self-government.

The lives of Members then on the floor of this House were by their conduct endangered. I think we all feel very deeply that only the benevolent will of God saved the lives of many Members. I can only interpret the sparing of our lives in this tragical incident as a manifestation of the divine acceptance of our country and our Government as an instrumentality for the fulfillment of His purposes.

#### DEMAND FOR GREATER SECURITY

It is natural and proper that being forewarned, by something that had happened that never had happened before, ways should be considered of minimizing the possibility of a repetition. The Members of the Congress, and especially the members of the committee charged with the responsibility, have given much thought to the subject.

At one time I understood the proposition was considered of building enclosed walls of bulletproof glass to separate the visitors in the galleries from the legislators on the floor of this body. I do not like to feel that my constituents coming to their Capitol, sometimes at financial sacrifice, would be separated from me as I represent them on this floor by a wall of bulletproof glass. I am sure that all my colleagues, including those on the committee, entertained a similar thought.

#### PICKING ON CAPITOL POLICE

Unfortunately, in discarding a security proposal not to anyone's liking, and challenging the good reputation of the many millions of Americans visiting their Capitol, the Capitol Police were picked on. I am using the words "picked on" with well-considered judgment.

The Capitol Police were not, as everyone knows, a factor in the atrocity of March 1, 1954. There was not the responsibility of protecting the galleries. It was not part of their job. To the contrary, the authority for protection of the galleries was vested elsewhere.

This bill implies, no matter what its proponents may say to the contrary, that the outrage of March 1 would not have occurred if the present Capitol Police had been on the job. Because I want to be fair, and because I think this House in everything should be fair, I do not like the implication.

#### ENVIALE RECORD OF 102 YEARS

What is the record of the Capitol Police?

For 102 years there has not been a fatality resulting from a traffic accident in the area under the protection of the Capitol Police. Every day when I come to this House and when I return from this Chamber to my office I get safely across the street despite the fact that there are few streets in America that are filled with more traffic hazards. This is true of every other Member of this body. It is true in like measure of every child, of every woman, and of every man, constituting our constituents, who come to visit us in the Capitol of their country.

I have never seen an instance in the two Congresses of which I have been a Member, one Democratic and one Republican, when the utmost in protec-

tion, in direction, and in courtesy has not been extended by the Capitol Police. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the job they have done in the zone of duty to which they have been assigned constitutes a policing record that never has been and never will be excelled.

#### LONGER CONSIDERATION NEEDED

Whether you can get a better job done and with the same contribution to good public relations, as well as security, by changing the system I certainly think should be given longer consideration. Among many other things to be considered is whether we should give priority to protecting ourselves from the public, mostly our own constituents, or protecting from traffic fatalities in a dangerous area, and from discourtesy, our own constituents.

Whether we want and feel that we need for our own security a professional police force is a matter I think can be determined with a clearer evaluation of all the factors after we have been home for a few months mingling with our constituents. We are in the closing days of a hard and long session. Soon this Chamber will be vacant and the galleries will be unoccupied. There will be no danger of a repetition of March 1 until the 84th Congress convenes in January. Why then the rush of hurrying through this legislation?

What sense does it make when in the intervening months there will be no danger to say that the passage of this bill at this time is demanded by a proper sense of security? I am not saying that there should not be at the proper time and after the proper consideration legislation minimizing the dangers of a repetition of March 1, 1954.

#### UNIFORMED POLICE IN GALLERIES

I do not know that it is in the interest of good government that we should have uniformed policemen stationed in the galleries. This is not the practice in the case of protection of our President, our governors, and the mayors of our large cities. They are protected, and they should be protected, especially since there has been an alarming increase in mental disorders. But it is not done by the public display of uniforms and guns. Indeed it is done so that in most instances the public is not aware of the protecting personnel.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that to rush pellmell and in the closing days of this session into the adoption of legislation of this character might end in a gesture of security ending up in something actually increasing the insecurity.

#### VETERAN HAS NO PROTECTION

That the bill as it now stands is grossly unfair to the present members of the Capitol Police is so clear that no serious attempt is being made to deny it. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] has made it as clear as the ringing of a bell that under this bill the veteran has absolutely no protection.

I know of one member of the Capitol Police, badly wounded in an engagement of World War II, and if I remember correctly a wearer of the Congressional Medal of Honor, who is as clear-headed, as efficient and as courteous as any man in or out of the police service

that I have ever known. Under this bill he could be called for a physical examination and if he could not wiggle his toe and twist his thumb according to the prescribed formula he would be fired.

#### POLICEMEN OVER 62 BANNED

Under this bill any member of the Capitol Police force who had passed his 62d birthday would be thrown to the wolves. I appreciate that this is the rule that obtains in my own city of Chicago and in many other cities. It may be all right as far as the professional police group of a large city is concerned. I am not arguing that. But I am saying that there are many outstanding police officers in our great cities forced to retirement by this arbitrary 62-year rule, who actually are in their physical and professional prime, and who in such situation can be most advantageously recruited for the Capitol Police.

Mr. Chairman, we have a growing class of American citizens in the aging group. I do not like to see the Congress of the United States put itself on record as saying that a man 62 years of age and who retains his full physical and mental vigor cannot be employed by the Congress of the United States in a job for which he is eminently well qualified.

If the Congress of the United States, fully understanding the issue, so puts itself on record I say to you that the older people of the United States, who now have the balance of voting power, will very soon make themselves felt in a position to the rear where the pantaloons start to drape from the belt.

#### CONCERNING PATRONAGE CHARGE

It is argued that the Capitol Police are now part of the patronage system. Permit me to say something on that score. I do know that the majority party has what is known as a patronage committee and that all appointments stem from that source. That is all I know about it. As a Member of no seniority I have had no personal contact with the system.

But as I have said I have been a Member of a Democratic Congress and a Republican Congress. I have been merely an observer, not a participant. I have seen in both Congresses the same type of young men working for us as a means of continuing their education. I have seen the same type of older men earning some means of maintaining themselves by serving us. I have seen the same type of veterans. And everywhere I have seen efficiency, I have seen exhibited a courtesy and a delight in being helpful that I have never seen elsewhere in like measure.

From this observation I have reached the conclusion that these appointments come not from political motivation but from good and understanding hearts no matter which party is in power or which patronage committee is functioning.

I do not want to see these young men now serving with the Capitol Police forced either to give up their jobs or abandon their ambitions for higher education. This would be going farther than we ever have gone in the big cities of the United States. In my own city of Chicago we are happy and proud that every year members of our police force

receive academic degrees and degrees in law and medicine and dentistry and engineering as a result of college work that they had done while in the working hours giving full time and attention to their police duties. One of my colleagues in the debate today has said that under this bill this could not be done here in Washington in the policing force which is our creation and over which for 102 years we have exercised authority.

Mr. Chairman, I have felt an obligation to myself and to what I have always regarded as what is right and what is wrong to speak my thoughts on this bill. I have done so with the utmost respect for the good intentions of those who offer the measure and of the long service and the statesmanship of those who advocate it.

#### OBJECTIVES SOUGHT COMMENDABLE

The objectives sought are commendable. The structure of obtaining those objectives, attaining a greater security but not at the loss of some of the precious qualities of that which we now have, requires more study. In January I am sure we can come up with a better structure, and in the meanwhile the Congress will be in adjournment and there will be no one in the galleries to be protected against and no one on the floor of this House to be protected.

I hope that this bill will not be numbered among those for which later we will have to make the excuse that it was passed in the closing spasm of a Congress that was tired out and wanted to get home.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BAILEY) there were—ayes 24, noes 94.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. IKARD: Page 18, line 17, after the period insert "Provided, however, That for the purposes of this act the Capitol Police Board shall be composed of two Members of the House of Representatives to be designated by the Speaker, two Members of the Senate to be designated by the President of the Senate, the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, and the Architect of the Capitol."

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, may I say that I think this is a splendid amendment that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. IKARD] has offered. For my part, speaking only for myself on this side of the committee, I shall be very glad to accept the amendment.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, we certainly here would be glad to accept it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. IKARD].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCARTHY: Page 22, line 7, after the word "per centum" insert a comma, and following that the words: "or comparable disability incurred in line of duty as a member of the Capitol Police force."

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, what his amendment proposes to do is simply to give a 5-point advantage to any member of the Capitol Police force who has been injured in line of duty. If his disability is comparable to the 10 percent disability of a veteran he will be given 5-point preference.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Would that apply to a veteran who already had 10 points?

Mr. McCARTHY. No; only to a man who has a disability comparable to a veteran's 10 percent disability, but incurred that disability as a member of the Capitol Police force. He could, and very well might, be a veteran.

Mr. LECOMPTE. And is already on the police force now.

Mr. McCARTHY. He would not necessarily have to be on it now. He would have had to be on it some time in the past.

Mr. LECOMPTE. He would have had to be on it some time in the past. There are probably not very many to whom that would apply.

Mr. McCARTHY. I know of one case but I do not know that he wants to become a member of the force again. I do not know of anyone else to whom it might apply.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I see no objection to the amendment.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, may we hear the amendment read once more, to be sure that we understand it. If I heard it correctly, we have no objection to it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCARTHY: On page 22, line 7, after the word "per centum," insert a comma and following that the words: "or comparable disability incurred in line of duty as a member of the Capitol Police force."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAYS of Ohio: On page 20, line 16, insert "Provided, however, That no more than 50 percent of the Capitol Police force shall be appointed from civil-service lists."

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply makes this a hybrid affair instead of being a strictly professional police force. It has been pointed out that it might be necessary to have professionals placed in strategic places in the galleries, and so forth, but I do not really see any necessity for having a well-trained professional policeman out directing traffic here in the Capitol plaza, where numerous ones are, at the street crossings, and so on. I am very

serious about this. A lot of Capitol policemen have been college students who have come here and worked for 3 or 4 years directing traffic and doing various chores for which they really do not need any special training other than that which they can get in a couple of weeks. This would give an opportunity for some of those boys still to be employed. At the same time, you can have 50 percent of the police force on a professional basis to do the actual professional police work that you need done around the Capitol and the other buildings.

I shall not take any further time. That is what I have in mind by the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment would defeat the purpose of this bill, which is to get a high-class, well-trained, professional police force. That is all I have to say on that point.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, in view of the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. IKARD], in which he increases the number of members of the Capitol Police Board, it occurs to me that there should be a technical amendment on page 21, line 13, where mention is made of a five-member board. I believe that "five" should be changed to "nine." I ask unanimous consent that that change be made.

Mr. BURLESON. Actually it would constitute a seven-man board, except in the instance of the examination of the applicants, where the Metropolitan Police and the FBI are represented; that is in the examination where points up to a maximum of 20 are added.

Mr. LECOMPTE. That would change it to seven, would it not?

Mr. BURLESON. Seven, yes.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The board will be composed of 7 members, present with them being 1 officer of the FBI and 1 of the Metropolitan Police.

Mr. BURLESON. The board actually would constitute 7 men, but on the examining board there would be 2 additional, which would be the 9-man board. However, the board referred to in the bill would be only a 7-man board.

Mr. LECOMPTE—

The number of points up to a maximum of 20 which he receives as the result of an oral interview conducted by a 5-member board.

The board which is conducting it would be composed of nine, would it not?

Mr. BURLESON. It would be a 7-man board if 4 Members of Congress were added to the Sergeant at Arms of the House, the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, and the Architect of the Capitol.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I accept that. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the number "5" in line 13 on page 21 be changed to "7," with the addition that is provided below of a representative of the FBI and of the Metropolitan Police.

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

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.



Mr. MERRILL. I would like to point out that as this was originally written it said that the examining board shall consist of 5 members composed of 1 FBI member, 1 member from the Metropolitan Police, and 3 members of the original board.

If you are going to add four members to the original board, the board referred to on line 13, page 21, the board composed of three men, the original board plus the two extra members, makes five.

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

Mr. LeCOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman is correct as he has stated it. However, there must be a distinction made between the examining board and the Police Board of the Capitol, which would have seven members.

Mr. MERRILL. Yes, but the amendment the gentleman wants to make refers to the examining board and not to the Police Board. Therefore, the number should be changed from 5 to 9.

Mr. BURLESON. In that respect, the gentleman is correct and I stand in error if you are referring to the examining board.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. But the representative of the FBI and the representative of the Metropolitan Police are not, in fact, members of the board except for the purpose of making investigations and holding the examination.

Mr. MERRILL. That makes the examining board 9 and not 5.

Mr. BURLESON. I call the attention of the chairman to the fact that where reference is made to a three-man board, it should now be a seven-man board.

Mr. MERRILL. That is right.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LeCOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of California. I want to bring out what I think is one very important matter. While I do not know that the full intent involved here may be taken care of, I think one thing that is needed today as a preference for any professional police officer is the course of training that is offered by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the National Police Academy. I would like to get an expression of the sense of the committee as to whether or not it is felt that as the opportunity offers, these members should be given an equal opportunity to attend the National Police Academy, as our other police agencies throughout the country.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. That, I think, is covered pretty well in the bill.

Mr. JACKSON of California. I thank the gentleman.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LeCOMPTE:  
On page 21, line 13, strike out "five" and insert "nine."

On page 21, line 19, strike out "three" and insert "seven."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee substitute amendment to the bill.

The committee substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and, the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GRAHAM, 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. 9413) to reorganize the Capitol Police force in order to increase its efficiency in the performance of its duties, pursuant to House Resolution 656, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. 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, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SPECIAL ORDER POSTPONED

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order allowed for me today for the purpose of discussing the record of our colleague [Mr. LANTAFF] be postponed until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

#### HOURLY OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

#### SOVIET RUSSIA WAS ESTABLISHED IN THE HEART OF EUROPE BY VIRTUE OF A BLIND FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, history will record that when in July 1945 Soviet Russia was established in the heart of Europe that it was a fateful milestone for all of mankind. Such was the appraisal of that event by no less an authority than Sir Winston Churchill himself. He should know, as he was a principal actor in that tragic melodrama.

Mr. Hanson Baldwin, writing in the July Atlantic Monthly, evaluates Winston Churchill as a military strategist and world statesman. He concludes that Churchill was right in the position that he took on questions of military strategy. Further, that he was sound in assessing the future political situation subsequent

to the war. Obviously the United States had no peacetime plans.

Baldwin points out that Churchill warned, prior to Potsdam, that an entire generation has been drilled to the conditioned reflexes of communism, that half of Asia is Communist, and the rest is a battleground. Three-fifths of our national budget goes for arms; 142,118 Americans gave their blood in Korea to halt the march of world conquest. He continues, "The world is two worlds—and there is no end in sight."

Mr. Speaker, Hanson Baldwin speaks with authority. I do not always agree with his conclusions, but his articles are interesting and challenging.

In the last volume of Churchill's personal account of World War II, he provides proof—proof buttressed by other documentation, "that American political astigmatism, our blindness to postwar political aims, and our naive belief that Soviet imperialism had modified its dreams of world conquest was partially responsible for the establishment of communism in the heart of Europe."

In blind pursuit of but one objective in World War II—that of a military victory, the political peace—so important to the world—was lost. Mr. Baldwin called the turn on this unfortunate situation in 1950. He says:

My thesis—one held and advanced by many others—was that the unconditional surrender doctrine, our failure to penetrate the Danubian plain and to push into the Balkans, and the halting of our armies short of Prague and Berlin and their subsequent withdrawal to the west had helped to give the Russians hegemony over Central and Eastern Europe. Similarly Yalta, with its territorial bribes to Russia, to induce her to enter the Pacific war, and our hasty and unnecessary use of the atomic bomb against a Japan already defeated and prostrate influenced adversely the peace in the Orient.

Mr. Speaker, many who have defended Roosevelt's agreements at Yalta contend that failure of the agreements lies with Russia who broke them, who took advantage of our policies, and who turned our actions against us. Baldwin's response to that argument is:

Our World War II actions, policies, and agreements were in many cases so naively trusting, politically superficial, or limited in outlook as to make it not only possible, but easy, for Soviet communism to turn them to its advantage. Our World War II mistakes aided Moscow to extend its Communist domination far beyond the borders of Soviet Russia.

The 800 millions of people now dominated by Russia is mute evidence of that fact.

What was the approach of the United States to Russia, under Roosevelt? Did the United States fear the domination of the Soviet in the heart of Europe? Mr. Baldwin says "No" and gives us the answer:

Robert Sherwood records in Roosevelt and Hopkins that Harry Hopkins took with him to the Quebec Conference in August 1943 a document, Russia's Position, which quoted from a very high level United States military strategic estimate. This paper pointed out that "Russia's post-war position in Europe will be a dominant one . . . since Russia is the decisive factor in the war, she must be given every assistance and every effort must be made to obtain her friendship. Likewise, since without question she will

dominate Europe on the defeat of the Axis, it is even more essential to develop and maintain the most friendly relations with Russia."

It is remarkable that this paper and the entire policy of the American Government (until almost the end of the war) showed no worry about postwar domination of Europe by Russia, even though twice in the twentieth century, the United States had gone to war to prevent domination of Europe by Germany.

This was abject surrender to godless communism, Mr. Speaker.

Pointing out that Mr. Churchill was obviously aware of the coming Russian menace, while Roosevelt and his advisers, except in 3 or 4 instances, had no fear of it, Baldwin says:

So much, then, for the attitude of Downing Street; Churchill's approach to the problems of international power was unquestionably far more realistic than the idealistic but impractical attitudes of the egocentric, charming but internationally inexperienced Roosevelt and some of his trusted advisers.

What of the specific major issues of the war years which contributed to the later loss of the peace?

And again, he says:

Thus one of the fundamental policies of World War II, a policy which has greatly influenced, for better or for worse, the lives of this generation, was born. Unconditional surrender was laid down as a "dictat"—a one-man decision—without any study of its political or military implications and was announced publicly and unilaterally at a press conference to the surprise of the Nation's chief ally, Great Britain. Historians may agree or disagree as to the validity of the unconditional surrender policy, but history can describe the manner in which this policy was born, in only one way: "This is a hell of a way to run a railroad."

Mr. Speaker, what are the political objectives—peace aims—in the present so-called cold war? It is important for our people to know. Is our objective solely a military one—resist communism by swift retaliatory strikes? But assuming we win, what happens after that? We await the answer.

We should have learned one lesson from World War II in this connection. Roosevelt's unconditional-surrender policy left a vacuum in Europe, and Red Russia moved right into it. Says Mr. Baldwin, on that point:

This policy (unconditional surrender) represented a negative peace aim, not a positive one. It meant, as Mr. Churchill himself states, complete destruction of German (as well as Nazi) power, and peace terms so harsh that as the late British Foreign Minister, Ernest Bevin, put it, it "left us with a Germany without law, without a constitution, without a single person with whom we could deal, without a single institution to grapple with the situation. . . ."

It meant the creation of vacuums of power, the complete destruction of two nations—Germany and Japan—which in modern history had been the traditional counterpoise to Soviet Russia. It meant the subordination of political aims to military ones; it put military victory ahead of political peace. The unconditional-surrender policy was a triumph of the total-war concept—a concept that has never led, and will never lead, to the only kind of peace worth having, a more stable one.

It was the foundation stone of the politico-strategic edifice the United States erected during the war upon the quicksands of unreality. We fought to win, and we forgot that wars must have political aims, and that complete destruction and unconditional sur-

render cannot contribute to a more stable peace. We substituted one enemy for another; and today's enemy, Soviet Russia, is more threatening than the old.

History needs no footnotes to prove the truth of these assertions; it is written in the daily headlines and in all our policies since the war. Unconditional surrender meant in World War II the complete destruction of the power of Germany and Japan; nearly ever since, at the cost of billions, we have been attempting to build up again the power of these two nations in order to restore some balance of power in the world. The tragedy is that we cannot erase the psychological memories of unlimited devastation and destruction with unlimited dollars. The Germans and the Japanese have not changed and neither nation will soon forget the no-quarter terms of World War II.

It will be hard, I think—

Says Mr. Baldwin—

for history to refute the contention that the loss of much of eastern Europe was due in considerable measure to American political astigmatism.

It can be accepted as a verity that aside from military victory, wars must have political aims as well.

As a threat to the onward march of communism in this so-called cold war, it has been suggested that we rely on the deterrent of massive retaliatory power. It is only fair to ask against what type of aggression will we launch such an attack? Is the target Peiping or Moscow?

Assuming such strategy and that the mission was accomplished—the enemy defeated—what political objectives have the military planners been given?

What comes after victory—another divided Korea?—another divided Germany?—another divided Austria?—another divided Indochina?

If both sides visit devastation upon each other in this atomic age, what do we do next? Is unlimited destruction to be used for limited political ends? Just how will massive destruction achieve a peaceful, stable world?

Mr. Speaker, early last March I addressed a letter to the Secretary of State and asked him for an answer to some of these questions. I was particularly interested in the ones relating to the political. It is in this field that our foreign policy has failed so miserably in the last 20 years.

To this day, Mr. Speaker, I have had no answer to these questions by the Secretary of State. This may be quite an unimportant matter to him, but it is vitally important to all of the people of the United States.

#### AMENDING THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT 1936

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2408) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide a national defense reserve of tankers and to promote the construction of new tankers, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement on the part of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2431)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2408) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide a national defense reserve of tankers and to promote the construction of new tankers, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to same with an amendment as follows:

After the words "The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to pay the cost of national defense features incorporated in any such new tanker" strike out the words "and which are not used by the owner or operator."

And the House agree to the same.

THOR C. TOLLEFSON,  
JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.,  
HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.,  
HERBERT C. BONNER,  
JOHN F. SHELLEY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN M. BUTLER,  
CHARLES E. POTTER,  
FREDERICK G. PAYNE,  
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,  
GEORGE A. SMATHERS,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

#### STATEMENT

S. 2408, as passed by the Senate, in effect reduced the minimum age of vessels eligible for trade-in, in the case of tankers, from 12 years as provided under section 510 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to 10 years. A number of restrictive provisions with respect to the traded-in vessels were inserted into the bill as amended by the House. The tankers must be in class with respect to hull and machinery, the trade-in allowance where originally acquired from the Government under the provisions of the Merchant Ship Sales Act, 1946, is limited to the depreciated sales price under that act, plus the depreciated cost of betterments. Further, the amount of credit to be allowed by the Secretary of Commerce cannot exceed the price paid for the tanker by the owner, plus the value of capitalized betterments. If the tanker is used by the owner subsequent to the date of contract for the construction of a new vessel, the credit is reduced by the amount of depreciation on the old tanker during the period of such use.

The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agrees to the same, except with respect to that part of the amendment regarding payment for the cost of national defense features which are used by the owner or operator. The bill as passed by the Senate provided for payment of the cost of national defense features by the Secretary of Commerce. To this provision, the House added the requirement that such payment would be made only where such features are not used by the owner or operator. It was agreed that the phrase, "and which are not used by the owner or operator", with respect to the defense features, be stricken out and the House agrees to the same.

The only national defense feature expected to be included in the new tankers is a speed requirement of 18 knots. In some cases, operators are presently building tankers of this speed for their own account, and there is a definite trend in the trade toward increased speed. It is the view of the conference committee that the costs of the increased speed features should be adjusted contractually, and that the Secretary of Commerce should exercise extreme care in the



preparation of contracts with applicants under this bill to insure that the national defense requirements for speed do not become a form of subsidy.

THOR C. TOLLEFSON,  
JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr.,  
HORACE SEELY-BROWN, Jr.,  
HERBERT C. BONNER,  
JOHN F. SHELLEY,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### RESIGNATION OF MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message which was read:

JULY 28, 1954.

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,  
*Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I enclose herewith copy of a letter which I have this day addressed to the Honorable Thomas J. Curran, Secretary of the State of New York, notifying him of my resignation as a Member of Congress from the Eighth Congressional District, New York, which took effect on July 21, 1954.

In my communication to you of July 21, 1954, I enclosed a copy of a letter addressed to Governor Dewey. Apparently, notice of my resignation is required to be transmitted to the Secretary of the State of New York (election law, State of New York, sec. 297), hence the enclosed.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely,

LOUIS B. HELLER.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time in order to query the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] as to what we may expect tomorrow.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I discussed with the gentleman from Texas the possible program for tomorrow. The gentleman suggested to me consideration of a bill, H. R. 9875, with reference to a recent Texas City disaster, and I told him we would call that tomorrow first.

There are rules outstanding on S. 541 having to do with detention benefits. There are two reclamation project rules outstanding. The railroad-retirement rule is outstanding, and a rule on the Merchant Marine Academy. Also a rule amending the Tariff Act on cargo. There is also a bill having to do with the labeling of foreign produced trout.

We will come in at 11 o'clock, and if we can keep a quorum present and proceed with these measures and dispose of them, I think most of them could be disposed of tomorrow within a fairly reasonable time. I would like very much to do that. It is possible in respect to some of these bills that there would be very little debate necessary.

If it could be so arranged that would facilitate action on all of these measures, Mr. RAYBURN. I thank the gentleman.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered for the day.

#### FREEDOM FOR THE PEOPLE OF CYPRUS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, today, according to cables from London, the British Government has offered a new constitution to the people of Cyprus. I note that this so-called new look was proposed in conjunction with other British moves in the Middle East. However, I do not think these proposals with respect to Cyprus go far enough. Cypriots want their freedom from British colonial rule and union with Greece. I should imagine that nothing less will suffice.

For years now the Greek population of the Island of Cyprus in the eastern Mediterranean has expressed its desire for freedom from colonial rule and for unity with the mother country, Greece.

Great Britain has ruled this island since Disraeli made his agreement with the Sultan of Turkey in 1878, to secure British neutrality in the war between Turkey and Russia. British rule of Cyprus, therefore, was conceived to meet an ancient and forgotten problem and predicated upon a situation which has long ceased to matter except to the people of Cyprus who are still under British colonial domination.

Repeated requests by the Cypriots for self-determination have fallen upon deaf ears in London. Cypriots naturally wonder why their claims for freedom and self-determination should be thus rejected in this postwar era, when the free nations speak so proudly and expansively on the theory of self-determination for all people everywhere.

A plebiscite held in Cyprus in 1950, with the consent of the British authorities, showed that 81 percent of the population voted for the union of Cyprus with Greece. Statistically, this meant that 402,000 people in Cyprus, who are Greeks, voted for this union. The population of Cyprus has been predominantly Greek since the dawn of history and it still is. There are 18 percent of Turkish extraction and the remaining 1 percent is composed of miscellaneous Middle Eastern peoples.

Anyone who knows his Mediterranean countries knows that Cyprus is Greek and has been for more than 3,000 years. The ebb and flow of eastern invasion, from historic times down to the present, has never changed the essential Greek character of the population of Cyprus.

Now the British may wonder why one of their Crown Colonies would wish to become a part of the Greek state. They may argue that Cyprus has never belonged to the modern Greek nation. In contravention it can be argued that the people of Cyprus historically have marched to war under the banners of Greece. They fought on the side of Alexander the Great. Cyprus was a part of the Greek Byzantine Empire. It has always retained, since the time of recorded history, its essential Greek character.

With great respect to the aspirations of Cyprus, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from a speech made by none other than Sir Winston Churchill when, in his usually masterful style, he addressed the members of the Legislative Council in October 1907:

I think it is only natural that the Cypriot people who are of Greek descent should regard their incorporation with what may be called their mother country as an ideal to be earnestly, devoutly, and fervently cherished. Such a feeling is an example of the patriotic devotion which so nobly characterizes the Greek nation.

The people of Cyprus fought side by side with the British during two world wars. It is interesting to note that a regiment from Cyprus was among the first units to reach France in World War II. The people of Cyprus have suffered long and hard in the cause of their own freedom and in the cause of the free world struggle for liberty and self-determination. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, they eminently deserve and should have the self-determination and freedom which they have so gallantly earned with blood and spirit.

Great Britain is usually to be found on the side of freedom-loving people. As recently as a few weeks ago the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Sir Winston Churchill, was a party right here in Washington to a joint declaration respecting the subject peoples. In concert with the President of the United States he said:

We will uphold the principles of self-government and will earnestly strive by every peaceful means to secure the independence of all countries whose people desire and are capable of sustaining an independent existence. We welcome processes of development where still needed that lead toward that goal.

The people of Cyprus are worthy of this right to self-determination. The Greek Government has made known to the United Kingdom its point of view with respect to the union of Cyprus with Greece. The sentiment of the Greek nation and the Cypriots has been expressed. In Cyprus itself 81 percent of the population voted for a union with Greece. However, the overtures by the Greek Government have fallen upon deaf ears in the British Foreign Office. Greece has only received the shortest kind of answer.

"The question is closed," say the British.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that in this changing world, in this age of unrest, no question concerning the free determination of a people can ever be considered a closed one.

Now, the matter of military bases on Cyprus has been raised. The people of Cyprus have offered to the British every possible concession. They have told the British that they can have what they want and need, so that, therefore, any British argument for the retention of Cyprus because of the planned evacuation of the Suez Canal zone is completely invalid. The Greeks of Greece say to the British, with respect to the Greeks of Cyprus: "Keep your bases, expand them if need be, but give the Cypriots freedom."

The Greek Government has decided to submit the entire question concerning Cyprus to the United Nations General Assembly. If the British do not act to rectify the situation these papers will be filed before August 21, and the matter will be discussed at the September session of the General Assembly. Those who believe in the future of the island of Cyprus and who believe in the right of self-determination enunciated by the Prime Minister of Great Britain respectfully ask that the British reconsider this entire matter prior to the filing date. The United Nations has more than enough business to occupy its time and full attention.

Who, Mr. Speaker, could seriously question the ability of the people of Cyprus to govern themselves?

Across the water there are those who feel that we should understand their desires to carry on negotiations between enemies. If negotiations between enemies are considered to be desirable, is it not even more desirable that there should be more frank and open negotiations between friendly nations with respect to matters concerning one or both of them?

The Greeks have expressed their willingness to negotiate. Why not Great Britain?

#### INDUSTRIAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is my deep personal conviction that our Government should give serious consideration to an industrial educational program in conjunction with national defense. Government orders should be placed with American manufacturing plants which have been affected by the influx of foreign-made products.

Specifically, I have in mind industries where skilled workmen and precision personnel are employed. For example, the watch, clock, and tool industries located in my congressional district are vital industries in the event of an international conflict involving the United States.

Educational orders to train and familiarize private manufacturing establishments with the production of munitions of war of special or technical design, noncommercial in character, would strengthen our national preparedness for defense. At the present time our various industrial plants which played such an important part in production

and victory in World War II are maintaining emergency standby assembly lines, but not training adequate personnel to expand emergency operations rapidly, with no more advance notice than a phone call from the Department of Defense.

The purpose of my remarks today is to further the assurance of a complete and well-rounded program of defense and guarantee immediate production in the event of any unforeseen emergency.

In many respects the educational programs I recommend would be more economical than present standby programs, because the faster our industry and our working men and women can get into production during a time of emergency, the smaller physical reserve of implements of war we will need to maintain in time of peace to be ready for an emergency.

This plan would authorize the Department of Defense to place orders with plants which under its war plans would be used for the production of war matériel.

At the present time we are, through the American taxpayers, building up foreign industrial plants which not only will be in competition with us in world trade, but in the event of a war abroad, more than likely will be overrun within a matter of days.

I cannot help but recall the early days of World War II when the British were compelled to come to the United States for vital precision equipment to protect their country. Fortunately, at that time we had a fairly adequate supply of skilled precision workers. Only through the help of our working men and women were the British and our other allies able to carry on in the face of great odds.

Today one only has to read the newspaper accounts of the glaring acts of aggression and barbarity in the world to realize the critical day in which we live. The recent attack on an unarmed commercial airliner, without regard for innocent lives, is another act of men bent on world domination.

The people in my State, and especially those I represent, are very conscious of the necessity for a program such as I am recommending. There are plants in my district, both large and small, which have been compelled to discharge men and women who have worked for years to become skilled and proficient. A workman skilled in his trade is a lifesaver for a man in the front lines, one flying on instruments, one sailing on or under the sea—and yes, even our doctors who use the many instruments produced by our skilled workmen.

Our American workmen and our industries must be protected and helped during these days of unrest throughout the world. A nation strong in production and employment will always be strong in morality and spirit.

Before we make any further advances or commitments outside of our continental limits, I recommend that an inventory first be taken here at home.

Our inventory can well start with our tool industry, which certainly is sick and in need of a manufacturing diet of government and commercial orders. For instance, if some of the billions of dol-

lars going for offshore orders of tools and dies were spent in factories like Hendey's, in Torrington, Conn., and others in other American cities, the entire country would benefit, from the corner grocer to the large department store owner. Money so well spent in turn would revert to our Government under such a training program because the tools and dies produced would be the property of the United States Government.

Sometimes I fear we are developing a bad case of hindsight in allowing anything to interfere or conflict with the full operations of our industry.

One only has to look back into the history of our country to realize that we have become a world power only through our own ingenuity and hard work. While other nations are more engrossed in long holidays and siestas, our people keep working. I like the cultural arts and appreciate them as much as anyone else, but I realize that in order to enjoy them and preserve them for posterity, we as a world power also must preserve world respect.

This can only be accomplished by keeping our country strong mentally and morally through work. Only when men become idle and bored do they decay and become disgruntled with themselves and their country.

#### WAR DAMAGE PAYMENTS IN THE PHILIPPINES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REES of Kansas). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a copy of a bill which was recently passed by the Legislature of the Republic of the Philippines.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, southwest Asia is in a state of fomentation. No one can tell when the tensions and forces working within it may snap. With the frustrations and uncertainties created by the Geneva agreements a spirit of unrest pervades that section of the world.

We, as a nation bordering on the Pacific Basin cannot be indifferent to what takes place there.

The shooting down of a British airliner and the unwarranted attack by Red Chinese planes on our aircraft bent on a mission of mercy must give us pause.

Fortunately, there is one nation in Asia bound to us by strong ties on which we can depend. The Republic of the Philippines has been tested in war. The blood of her heroes has mingled freely with that of our own sons on many a battlefield of World War II and in Korea.

We must preserve and protect the friendship.

Mr. Speaker, what happens to this champion of democracy in the Orient is of the greatest interest to us.



We must keep the Republic of the Philippines strong morally, militarily and economically so she can stand side by side with us in the world conflict against communism.

The election and acceptance of President Magsaysay to lead the Republic of the Philippines is evidence of the direction in which that country lays its course.

On July 23, 1953, I introduced House Joint Resolution 320, authorizing the appropriation of \$100 million for additional war-damage payments in the Philippines. In this connection, I deem it expedient at this time to briefly relate the facts and thus refresh our memory with regard to war damage and the Philippines.

Throughout the half-century when the Philippines was a possession of the United States, there were frequent declarations by our policymakers that the Philippines would be created a free and independent nation at such time as its people were able to govern themselves—the only Christian nation in that part of the world. The Philippines had been under foreign rule for several centuries. Chinese, Dutch, British, and Spanish were among those who conquered parts or all of the 7,000-island archipelago from time to time, despite the resistance of the Filipinos and their desire for independence. In the 50 years of American control, there was no lessening of the wish for freedom which was promised at such time as the people demonstrated their ability to sustain it. Meanwhile, American teachers sought to improve the education of the youth; agricultural experts endeavored to demonstrate improved methods of crop production; technicians introduced new procedures for industries and business; and efforts were made to instruct in the sound administration of public and private enterprises.

World War II interrupted the preparation for independence by the Philippines. History records the grim events that occurred in what was then the Commonwealth between December 7, 1941, and the time of liberation in 1945. Despite the propaganda of the Japanese, the vast majority of the Philippine people remained loyal to the United States because of the bonds of friendship that had been developed in the years of American jurisdiction. They fought side by side with the forces of the United States and, during the Japanese occupation, gave aid and comfort to those nationals of the United States who were imprisoned or who waged guerrilla warfare against the invaders. Their loyalty and assistance continued, notwithstanding the havoc that was wreaked on their homes, farms, industries, and businesses, or the torture and even death to which many were subjected. When the military forces of the United States returned to the Philippines, the people again fought to overcome the Japanese.

With the conclusion of the war, the United States made ready to grant the long-awaited independence to the Philippine people. The ravages of the conflict, including the destruction caused in the battle of liberation and the tragic events of the occupation, however, had seriously disrupted the life and economy

of the Philippines. Its financial condition prevented the people from embarking on a career as a free nation without assistance. The relationship between the United States and the Philippines had been unique and, during the occupation, the highest American officials had given assurances that the damage of war would be repaired and the people repaid. With the granting of independence, the time for the fulfillment of these assurances had come.

In the Senate and the House of Representatives there was overwhelming sentiment to restore damaged and destroyed public and private property in the Philippines. One of the difficulties, however, was the question of cost. Various surveys had been made, but it was a practical impossibility to obtain a detailed accounting of all destruction. On the basis of the statistics then available, it was agreed in April 1946 that the United States Government would authorize the appropriation of \$400 million for the payment of claims for damage to private property. In addition, the Congress authorized the appropriation of \$120 million for the restoration and improvement of public property and essential public services.

The legislation which contained these authorizations was entitled the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, and provided for the creation of the United States Philippine War Damage Commission to expend the \$400 million for private claim payments. In addition, the Commission was allotted \$57 million of the \$120 million authorized for the restoration of public property. The balance of the latter fund was allocated as follows:

Public Roads Administration, for rehabilitation of roads and bridges, \$40 million; Corps of Engineers, for restoration of ports and harbors, \$18 million; and the Public Health Service, for the restoration and improvement of health services, \$5 million.

#### THE PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1946

The Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 was an early implementation of the expressed purposes of Members of our Congress to take care of immediate Philippine rehabilitation problems in rough outline as quickly as possible. It was obviously not intended as blanket legislation to cover all of the vexatious challenges implicit in these problems.

The act was administered by the Honorable Frank A. Waring, of California, the Honorable John A. O'Donnell, of Pennsylvania, and the then judge, now senator, Francisco A. Delago, of Bulacan, Philippine Islands. Senator Delgado is now chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the Filipino Senate. In this connection, he is not unknown to the older Members of this body, who remember him as a former resident commissioner from the Philippines in the House of Representatives during the 74th Congress.

The Commission was to receive, investigate, approve or disapprove, claims covering damage to property during and as a consequence of World War II in the Philippines.

Claims up to \$500 were to be paid in full as quickly as allowed. Further, the

successful claimants were to be paid on the basis of 1941 market prices less depreciation of amount per year from the date of acquisition of the lost or damaged properties.

Payments made by the Philippine War Damage Commission, prorated according to law among all claimants, totaled 52.5 percent of the amount allowed on each claim in excess of \$500. In contemplation of exorbitant postwar cost, of substantial disallowances on the claim as filed, and the partial payment of slightly more than half of the amount approved, it is estimated by the War Damage Commission that successful claimants probably received no more than 20 percent of the cost of the reproduction of their homes, businesses and other property.

Finally, when all the claims had been adjudicated and it was adjudged that with the funds available the combined total would be 52.5 percent of the approved balance of any claim adjudicated for more than \$500, or 22.5 percent less than the statutory maximum of 75 percent fixed by the act.

The War Damage Act aforesaid was reported by the old Committee on Insular Affairs. I had the honor to serve on this committee under the chairmanship of Judge Jasper Bell, of Missouri, affectionately known to all who were here through the 79th Congress. The committee had no precedent to guide it. In its wisdom, however, the committee wrote the following language into Report No. 1921, page 32, Committee on Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, 79th Congress, 2d session:

While the committee feels it is urgently necessary to provide through this legislation (S. 1610) for the rebuilding and restoration of the physical plant of the Philippines, it is generally realized that additional legislation will probably be necessary in the future to augment and supplement the benefits which will be accomplished through S. 1610. \* \* \* It is expected that proposals for additional legislation will be made from time to time by the agencies of the United States Government, by the Government of the Philippines, and by the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission to meet needs for legislation as they arise.

It is fair to state that the foregoing paragraph of the report certainly was not placed in there by accident and cannot be discarded. The Philippine War Damage Commission as the record will attest, did a most efficient and exemplary job. It not only concluded its work a month ahead of the statutory deadline, but it returned a substantial part of the money authorized for its administrative expenses to the United States Treasury.

We have a moral responsibility to the people of the Philippines. They were our wards and we their tutors in democracy for nearly a half century. We encouraged them to fight, and they responded to our request. They paid in blood and sweat and raw red wounds and, yes, in the lives of their people for their resistance to an enemy drunk with power intent on establishing the doctrine "coprosperity sphere of Asia," another way of saying "Asia for the Asians."

The valiant resistance of our then political ward shortened the war in the Pacific by many months, if not by many years.

The Philippines are the anchor of our defense in the Pacific.

Then, too, the Philippine Republic will consume both our soft and durable goods. They have a great capacity to absorb them. Our nationally known brand names are familiar to them. Our trade with the Philippines is not a one-way street. They produce much that is essential in our economy. We use their hemp, their sugar, their hardwoods, and their pineapple. Any money we spend in the Philippines encourages the solid type of trade we so badly need.

Finally, I have here a concurrent resolution, No. 2, of the Philippine Senate, Third Congress, of the Republic of the Philippines, 1st session, adopted by the Philippine Senate on January 28, 1954, requesting the President of the Philippines to make representations to the Government of the United States of America, and to take the necessary steps for the passage of House Joint Resolution 320, 83d Congress, to fulfill the mandate of the 79th Congress as expressed in the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, to pay the balance of any claim adjudicated for more than \$500, an additional 22.5 percent in fulfillment of the statutory maximum of 75 percent fixed by said Rehabilitation Act. This resolution was transmitted to me by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, special and personal envoy of the President of the Philippines, with the request from President Magsaysay that its contents be conveyed to this body.

#### Senate Concurrent Resolution 2

Concurrent resolution requesting the president of the Philippines to make representations to the Government of the United States of America and to take the necessary steps to implement the same for the passage of House Joint Resolution 320, 83d Congress, or the approval of a similar bill or measure, authorizing the appropriation of at least \$100 million for additional war damage payments in the Philippines.

Whereas the second Congress of the Republic of the Philippines approved and adopted Concurrent Resolution 32 on March 11, 1952, requesting the President of the Philippines to make the necessary representations to the Government of the United States of America, and to take such steps as may be needed to implement the same for the passage of H. R. No. 7600 and its counterpart in the Senate (S. 3220), United States 81st Congress, or the approval of a smaller bill authorizing the appropriation of at least \$100 million for additional payments of war damages in the Philippines;

Whereas the said resolution recited the history and basis of the passage of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 by the United States 79th Congress, by which the Philippine War Damage Commission was created and authorized to disburse, as it did disburse, the amounts of \$400 million and \$120 million for the payment of private and public claims, respectively, resulting from property loss and destruction in the Philippines wrought by the last Pacific war;

Whereas the defunct Philippine War Damage Commission was able to pay eligible private war damage claimants whose claims were approved in excess of \$500, only that amount plus 52½ percent of the balance of their corresponding approved amounts on the basis of the 1941 values;

Whereas the postwar replacement cost of building materials has risen more than 3 times their prewar 1941 values;

Whereas the United States 79th Congress provided in section 102 of the aforementioned

Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 a maximum payment of 75 percent of the approved amount of the claims larger than \$500, thereby making an implied commitment to provide the necessary funds to make payments to that extent on the said larger claims;

Whereas the same Concurrent Resolution 32 recited the basis for additional war damage payments by the United States, among which is the fact that that commitment has become an obligation on its part;

Whereas as a direct result of efforts undertaken by a mission under Senate Resolution 134 of our Congress, House Joint Resolution 320 was introduced by Congressman G. P. MILLER in the House of Representatives of the United States Congress on July 30, 1953, 83d Congress, authorizing the appropriation of \$100 million for additional war-damage payments in the Philippines, and the same is now pending consideration by the said House of Representatives;

Whereas it will redound not only to the best interest of the Philippine Government and people if the said resolution or a similar bill or resolution were passed by the United States Congress, but will also result in enhancing the prestige and trade of the United States of America in the Philippines, Asia, and throughout the world;

Whereas assistance to the Philippines in the form of additional war-damage payments is also in consonance with the global policy of the United States Government to help free nations improve their economic conditions in order to enable them to resist Communist aggression more effectively;

Whereas to resist Communist aggression within and outside its borders the Republic of the Philippines is spending considerable amounts of money, notwithstanding its limited financial resources, appropriating for the fiscal year 1954 alone the sum of \$174,919,910 for the department of national defense, which sum constitutes 37 percent of the total appropriation of the said Republic for the ordinary and extraordinary expenditures of its Government for the said fiscal year, of which appropriation for the said department the sum of \$10,606,390 is for the maintenance of elements of the armed forces of the Philippines as a United Nations unit in Korea, and the greater portion is for the expenses of fighting the Communist-inspired Huk rebellion in the Philippines; and

Whereas additional war-damage payments of at least \$100 million are not only essential to the rehabilitation of the economy of the Philippines but also indispensable to contain and fight communism in the Far East: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives of the Philippines concurring), That the President of the Philippines be requested, as he is hereby requested, to make the necessary representations to the Government of the United States of America and to take such steps as may be needed to implement the same, for the early passage of House Joint Resolution 320, 83d Congress, or the approval of a similar bill authorizing the appropriation of at least \$100 million for additional payments of war damages in the Philippines.*

#### CRUSADE FOR POLISH FREEDOM, REV. CANON JOHN MALINOWSKI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am highly privileged to support my distinguished colleagues, Congressman MACHROWICZ and Congressman McCORMACK, as well as others, who are sponsoring the resolution for a crusade for Polish freedom.

Ever since Poland was dragged behind the Iron Curtain, I have been protesting her delivery into slavery and the infamous manner by which it was accomplished—contravention of our most sacred war aims and political ideals to which all freedom-loving nations have been pledged for centuries.

Unless Poland and other nations like her, who have been cast into Communist slavery, can be liberated and restored to their rightful position in the free world there will be little hope for lasting peace on this earth.

Man is distinguished because of his immortal soul. It is that soul which gives him individuality. It is that soul which makes him a being separate from every other being and separate from the state. Man exists by reason of this soul to serve the purpose of his Creator and not to be shaped and fashioned into an automaton to suit the whim and caprice of dictators and tyrants.

Man is not only possessed of a soul, but the Almighty has planted in his breast the unextinguishable spark of individual freedom. This spark can no more be stifled and suppressed than the soul can be destroyed. It is indestructible. Both are part of an eternal pattern which inspires the struggle for liberty through the darkest hours of persecution and suffering, willing to die, if need be, to secure it. The bestial Soviet masters, which presently brutalize and tyrannize the gallant Polish people, have little understanding of history or they would recognize that in the long run their efforts to subjugate this great nation would be doomed to utter failure, Poland will rise again just as surely as there is a God in the heavens.

It is the duty of all lovers of freedom to speed the day when Poland and her sister nations, now afflicted with bondage, shall be emancipated from their heavy burdens. This Nation "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal" and dedicated to freedom of choice and self-determination has a special duty and obligation to fulfill to promote the liberation of Poland. Because our own great Nation went through similar persecution and oppression, although it was mild in comparison to what the Polish have suffered, and therefore our Nation was born out of the struggles, the labors, the bloodshed of patriots, who would rather die than live under tyranny.

The crusade for Polish freedom, which is led by the Reverend Canon John Malinowski, a refugee Catholic priest and former member of the Polish Armed Forces, who has devoted several years of intense activity to this sublime effort, is promoting this cause. He has visited many nations in Europe, South and Central America and, more recently, our own Nation in what is an inspiring moral campaign to awaken the indignation of the new world to the newest tyranny of the old world.

Many governments have proffered Canon Malinowski their expressions of sympathy, understanding and assistance. The parliaments of Chile, Uruguay, Brazil, Peru, Ecuador, Venezuela, Bolivia and Mexico passed resolutions supporting his crusade. The Canon has



met with disappointments and obstacles. He was permitted to remain only five hours in Communist controlled Guatemala prior to the recent revolution. In Bolivia he was first met with a very cold reception, but persisted with his work and finally enlisted the support of many important political figures. During his travels he found many evidences of Communist propaganda and anti-American sentiment stirred up by Communist agents, tools and stooges. In certain South American countries he allegedly found Russian diplomatic offices cluttered with Communist officials in a position to spread Communist propaganda and promote other activities directed at democracy.

On the whole from all sides Canon Malinowski has received a tremendous response to his militant appeals.

It is hardly necessary for me to reiterate what I have stated so many times on the floor of his House regarding the righteousness of the Polish cause. This crusade must continue because its ultimate aim to retrieve more of the Communist-occupied nations which have fallen prey to Soviet imperialism is lofty and justified by the facts of the present situation. We have been reminded many times of the contributions of Polish patriots to the cause of our own freedom when we were fighting valiantly to secure it. As Americans we must never forget the great contributions of Poland's heroic sons, Kosciusko, Pulaski, Krzyzanowski, and others who fought and died when they rallied to the side of our own young Nation as it struggled for its very existence. Generously indeed they gave their strength, their courage, and their lives for the sake of America. Today their own land, the land of their noble descendants, Poland, lies helpless—strangled by chains of slavery—and it is to the people of America that she turns for help in her fight for liberation. This crusade is based upon all the truths which Americans cherish—the truths embodied in the natural rights of man, the principles of the American Constitution, and the most sacred spiritual ideals of our Nation.

It is for us severely to condemn the bestial visitations of tyranny which continue to be inflicted upon the Polish nation by a ruthless Red tyranny.

It is for us to extend our sympathy and our aid to the Polish nation in her indomitable battle for liberty.

It is for us to work in and out of the United Nations, the Congress, and in every way we can, to urge and try to secure all possible assistance for the Polish nation in its heroic struggle to regain its independence.

This is not a crusade for the Polish alone. It is a crusade that should be militantly joined by every true American, who believes in the principles and ideals of our own Nation. It is a crusade which should direct attention upon the frightful atrocities and brutalities to which the Polish people have been subjected. It is a crusade which must aim to stop these horrible persecutions, these ruthless, tyrannical cruelties and

to secure liberation for the Polish people and to reestablish the Polish Government on a basis of freedom and justice within her historic boundaries and under her noble traditions.

If we can give courage and assistance to Canon Malinowski and all those working and sacrificing with him for these ends, we will thus vindicate and perpetuate the most sacred ideals of our own country and in time, with God's help, we will secure another glorious victory for freedom.

To touch upon a personal note I may state that Canon Malinowski is a most gracious and impressive personality. Young, vigorous, of prepossessing appearance and poise, energetic, gifted, and tireless, he radiates that invincible spirit of intrepid daring, tireless devotion, and unyielding determination that for centuries has typified his Polish heritage. Above all, he is a man of courage, a great leader who inspires confidence and support. Let us too be fired by his zeal, by his enthusiasm, by his tenacity and spirit. Let us, too, with high courage and warm faith, stand behind him in his crusade for freedom—freedom for Poland and all enslaved souls—freedom for mankind.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. DIES.

Mr. GRAHAM.

Mr. JOHNSON of California, the remarks he intends to make in Committee of the Whole on the bill H. R. 9924 and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GWINN.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin.

Mr. YOUNG and include extraneous matter.

Mr. D'EWART and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RIEHLMAN.

Mr. GUESER.

Mr. FRIEDEL.

Mr. BENDER.

Mr. RADWAN.

Mr. SIEMINSKI in two instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. REED of New York.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CLARDY (at the request of Mr. BENTLEY) from July 29 to August 7, 1954, on account of official business.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH (at the request of Mr. HESELTON), for the balance of the week, on account of illness in family.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2846. An act to amend certain provisions of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended,

the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, and the Investment Company Act of 1940; and

S. 3589. An act to provide for the independent management of the Export-Import Bank of Washington under a Board of Directors, to provide for the representation of the bank on the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, and to increase the bank's lending authority.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LeCOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 303. An act to transfer the maintenance and operation of hospital and health facilities for Indians to the Public Health Service, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, July 30, 1954, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1782. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of February 21, 1946 (60 Stat. 26), to permit the retirement of temporary officers of the naval service after completion of more than 20 years of active service"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1783. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide rewards for information concerning the illegal introduction into the United States, or the illegal manufacture or acquisition in the United States, of special nuclear material and atomic weapons"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1784. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill relating to the transportation of mail by highway post-office service"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1785. A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, transmitting the 12th Semiannual Report by the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for the period January 1 to June 30, 1954, pursuant to section 603 of Public Law 402, 80th Congress (H. Doc. No. 483); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1786. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the economic report of the Federal Trade Commission entitled "Investigation of Coffee Prices"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### 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. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Committee on Government Operations. Twenty-second intermediate report on Air Force development and procurement of AN/ARC-21 airborne radio transceivers (Rept. No. 2573). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Committee on Government Operations. Twenty-third intermediate report pertaining to relief and rehabilitation in Korea (Rept. No. 2574). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE 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. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 53. An act for the relief of Lewis Roland Edwards; without amendment (Rept. No. 2566). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 771. An act for the relief of Anni Wolf and her minor son; without amendment (Rept. No. 2567). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2210. An act for the relief of Frank (Franz) Homolka, Olga Homolka (nee Mandel), Adolf Homolka, Helga Maria Homolka, and Frieda Homolka; without amendment (Rept. No. 2568). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2512. An Act for the relief of Jeannette Kalker and Abraham Benjamin Kalker; without amendment (Rept. No. 2569). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3306. An act for the relief of Kang Chay Won; without amendment (Rept. No. 2570). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4522. A bill for the relief of Petrus Van Keer; with amendment (Rept. No. 2571). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9996. A bill for the relief of Susan Ellen Heiney; without amendment (Rept. No. 2572). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:  
H. R. 10108. A bill to amend section 112 (n) (8) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that in certain cases of a sale or exchange of a taxpayer's residence, certain periods of limitation shall not run against the taxpayer while he is on extended active duty in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:  
H. R. 10109. A bill to amend section 705 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BAILEY:  
H. R. 10110. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a \$1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:  
H. R. 10111. A bill to provide for the construction on a site in Jacksonville, Fla., of a hospital for the use of the Public Health Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SADLAK:  
H. R. 10112. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 with respect to the acquisition of new stock under employee stock options; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHELLEY:  
H. R. 10113. A bill to amend section 705 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:  
H. R. 10114. A bill to amend section 812 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMAS:  
H. R. 10115. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of Texas of certain real property (and improvements thereon) located in Harris County, Tex.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WHITTEN:  
H. R. 10116. A bill to authorize the construction of highways and other facilities within the boundaries of Government-owned lands for recreational or other uses; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 10117. A bill to provide that certain land acquired for flood-control purposes which is suitable for agricultural use be disposed of as surplus property; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:  
H. R. 10118. A bill to amend section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating

to the examination of national banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:  
H. J. Res. 574. Joint resolution announcing to the people of the world that we as a nation recognize the rights of all men to freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press and the right to assemble and to petition for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:  
H. Res. 692. Resolution to provide for a survey of the food service facilities of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:  
H. R. 10119. A bill for the relief of Lenon Reese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENTLEY:  
H. R. 10120. A bill for the relief of Erika Marie Dietl and her two children, Caroline Dietl and Robert Dietl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:  
H. R. 10121. A bill for the relief of Agnes Rosenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN (by request):  
H. R. 10122. A bill for the relief of Henry G. Mathusek; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 10123. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bertha Lang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:  
H. R. 10124. A bill for the relief of Paul Gonzales Jio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:  
H. R. 10125. A bill for the relief of Arnold Rosenthal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:  
H. R. 10126. A bill for the relief of Irene Spliwok Schaezel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:  
H. R. 10127. A bill for the relief of Gloria May Stu King Woo Loh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10128. A bill for the relief of Mary Zadourian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:  
H. R. 10129. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Korkodilos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

##### Recognition of Red China

##### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

##### HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, ever since China fell into Communist hands, placing a contiguous land mass from the Elbe River to the Pacific Ocean under the

direct or indirect control of the Kremlin, the legal recognition of the Mao Tse-tung regime by the world's principal powers has been one of the major intermediate goals of Soviet diplomacy. Having themselves experienced the disadvantages of nonrecognition for a number of years, the rulers of Soviet Russia are determined to obtain universal recognition of Red China as speedily as possible since they rightly feel that international legality is at present a prerequisite for the effective furtherance of the Com-

munist master plan for world revolution on the part of China.

Extension of diplomatic recognition to Red China by the United Kingdom was a major triumph for Communist diplomacy. It not only accomplished one of the points of Mao's master plan, but also created a wedge between the United Kingdom and the United States, which has been used effectively ever since. As a result of the Korean war and the recent Geneva Conference, increasing pressure has been brought upon official and public opinion in the United States to extend