SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 9, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, May 7, 1956)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in whose sight all that concerns Thy children is precious, and whose merciful eyes note even a sparrow's fall: Speak to these struggling lives of ours, woven with such strangely tangled threads. Thou knowest all the days that go to make the total pattern as the years pass more quickly than a weaver's shuttle, days shadowed by sorrow, sparkling with mirth, bathed in tears, lifted up by gain and triumph, cast down by failure and loss. May all this medley of hopes and fears find its true meaning in Thy eternal purpose for our being.

In this violently agitated day open our eyes to perceive Thy presence in the mighty movements of these times, and to trust Thy wise and patient power to fashion a better day out of the strife and turmoil, the grief and bitterness, of this present time. In the deliberations of the Congress let every mind be attentive to Thy voice in this solemn day of global decisions, that we may know the things which belong to our peace and to the peace of the world. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 7, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3254) to authorize the county of Custer, State of Montana, to convey certain lands to the United States, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate, severally with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S.767. An act for the relief of Andrew Rosner;

S. 1111. An act for the relief of Eric A. Cummings;

S. 1883. An act for the relief of Pietro Rodolfo Walter Stulin;

S. 1970. An act for the relief of Kim Boksoon;

S. 2972. An act to punish the willful damaging or destroying of aircraft and attempts to damage or destroy aircraft, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution for payment to Crow Indian Tribe for consent to transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7513) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to grant an extension of time to the Matanuska Valley Lines, Inc., and to Russell Swank and Joe Blackard within which to apply for patent to certain lands in Alaska.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9132) to provide for the approval of the report of the Secretary of the Interior on the Ainsworth unit of the Missouri River Basin project.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 877. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rose Amoresano and her children;

H. R. 2045. An act for the relief of Joe Bargas;

H. R. 2840. An act to promote the further development of public-library service in rural areas;

H. R. 2845. An act to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-incurred disability of loss or loss of use of both buttocks;

H. R. 3532. An act for the relief of Seymour Robertson;

H. R. 3897. An act to relieve the Secretary of the Interior of certain reporting requirements in connection with proposed National Park Service awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof;

H. R. 4141. An act for the relief of Vivencio Fernado Raymundo, Bienvenida Raymundo, Lolita Raymundo, Agnes Raymundo, Henry Raymundo, and Fred Raymundo;

H. R. 5256. An act to provide for the redemption by the Post Office Department of certain unsold Federal migratory-bird hunting stamps, and to clarify the requirements with respect to the age of hunters who must possess Federal migratory-bird hunting stamps;

H. R. 5268. An act to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to authorize the payment of mileage allowances for overland travel by private conveyance outside the continental limits of the United States;

H. R. 5790. An act relating to the application in the Territory of Hawaii of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act and the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act;

H. R. 7144. An act to provide that no application shall be required for the payment of statutory awards for certain conditions which, prior to August 1, 1952, have been determined by the Veterans' Administration to be service-connected;

H. R. 7190. An act restoring to tribal ownership certain lands upon the Colville Indian Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes;

H. R. 7702. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Shenekji;

H. R. 7835. An act for the relief of Maj. Gen. Julius Klein;

H. R. 8041. An act for the relief of Clyde R. Stevens;

H. R. 8225. An act to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Pipestone National Monument in the State of Minnesota;

H. R. 8290. An act to provide for the appointment and promotion of the director and assistant directors of the band of the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8385. An act to transfer certain responsibilities of the Secretary of the Interior to the Public Housing Commissioner and the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8458. An act to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10 to provide that the widow of a veteran of the Spanish-American War (including the Philippine Insurrection and the Boxer Rebellion) who married the veteran before January 1, 1938, may be eligible for death compensation;

H. R. 8490. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Bonham, Tex.;

H. R. 8693. An act to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, in relation to the refund of reenlistment bonuses;

H. R. 8810. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct, equip, maintain, and operate a new fish hatchery in the vicinity of Miles City, Mont.;

H. R. 8837. An act to amend certain sections of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended, relating to the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 8867. An act for the relief of the estate of F. M. Bryson;

H. R. 8922. An act to provide for the relief of certain members of the uniformed services;

H. R. 9207. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands;

H. R. 9314. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Illinois and Wisconsin to enter into a compact relating to interstate public school districts where an educational community extends into both such States;

H. R. 9358. An act to require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to issue a deed to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for certain land heretofore conveyed to such city, removing the conditions and reservations made a part of such prior conveyance;

H. R. 9377. An act to provide for the sale to the Eagle Rock Young Men's Christian Association of certain real property located in Los Angeles County, Calif.;

H. R. 9451. An act to provide that certain lands shall be held in trust for the Seminole Indians and to provide that certain lands shall be designated as a reservation for Seminole Indians;

H. R. 9671. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the village of Carey, Ohio;

H. R. 9822. An act to provide for the establishment of a trout hatchery on the Davidson River in the Pisgah National Forest in North Carolina;

H. R. 9841. An act to provide that in determining eligibility of a widow or child of a deceased veteran for a pension the income limitations applicable to such widow or child shall be increased $600 for the year in which the veteran's death occurs;

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

H. R. 9842. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to hold and detain mail for temporary periods in certain cases;

H. R. 9922. An act to provide that certain veterans suffering from active pulmonary tuberculosis shall be deemed to be permanently and totally disabled for pension purposes while they are hospitalized;

H. R. 10006. An act for the relief of Vincent P. Svelnis;

H. R. 10013. An act for the relief of Sfc. Henry F. Ferry;

H. R. 10092. An act for the relief of the former shareholders of the Goshen Veneer Co., an Indiana corporation;

H. R. 10191. An act for the relief of Comdr. Cook Cleland;

H. R. 10251. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to deed certain land to the city of Grand Junction, Colo.;

H. R. 10441. An act to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 to restrict its application to insurance which has been in effect 6 months at the time benefits are sought under such act;

H. J. Res. 501. Joint resolution to authorize participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization;

H. J. Res. 605. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 606. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 609. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 228) approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress approves the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (67 Stat. 403; 68 Stat. 1044):

A-7294280, Awad, Hazem Issa.
A-7292377, Blumsztajn, Jankiel B.
E-12305, Cabanski, Edmund Stanislaus.
A-9686777, Chan, Gar also known as Gar Ding Chan.
A-6851486, Chang, Irving Beilin.
A-10135387, Chang, Amos Hwei-Cheh.
A-6703345, Chao, Ping Chang also known as Ping Chang.
A-10141758, Chao, Shou-Ting.
A-7921052, Chao, Anna-Shun-Ting.
A-8829313, Chen, Long Wen also known as Robert Chen.
A-6083615, Chen, Yu.
A-6967624, Chen, Hwei Ju Chang.
A-6236867, Chen, James Yu-Ping.
A-6620712, Chen, Marjory Liu.
A-7396904, Chen, Daniel Bo Yen formerly Bo Yen Chen.
A-7390333, Chen, Olivia An Ran (nee Ho).
V-812955, Chen, Shih-Yun (Allen).
A-7247325, Cheng, Ming Tzu.
A-9694636, Cheng, Wan Man.
A-9558812, Chia, Chee.
A-8870665, Chiang, Philomena or Chiang Yu-Ching also known as Sister Margaret Mary.
A-6848448, Chiang, Sing Pao.
A-6848172, Chien, Chien Chih.
0900-76967, Ching, Zee Yah.
A-6986484, Ching-Guee, Shia or Sister Mary Ursula.
A-10141592, Chow, Ching Te.
V-753917, Chu, Wai-Quan Chao.
A-7282145, Chu, Ro Lin Hsiung.
0300-460097, Chu, Sen Sun.
A-10141587, Chuang, Theodore Hsin-I.
A-6422502, Chung, Anthony Chi-Wu.
A-6429288, Chung, Jean.
E-084282, Deutsch, Joseph.
0300-372142, Deutsch, Sprinca or Sprinza Deutsch.
A-7244888, Diller, Izak Jakub also known as Jack Diller.
0300-322285, Dong, Lai Tong.
A-7357115, Dunnous, Jack or Yacoub (Jacob) Isaac Dunnous.
A-8876905, Fabisiak, Jane.
A-8876903, Fabisiak, Arlene.
A-8876904, Fabisiak, Martha.
A-7274363, Feng, Norma nee Wang.
A-7865108, Freund, Leopold.
A-7456034, Fried, Zolton.
A-7837290, Friedman, Efraim.
0300-351008, Friedman, Elizabeth.
A-6794982, Gensel, Aron.
A-6967503, Guee-Lung, Lee or Sister Mary Jordan.
A-7286951, Hegedus, John Steven also known as Janos Hegedus.
A-10141553, Ho, Duane Ying.
A-7299373, Ho, Louis Ting.
A-6642006, Ho, Pei-Shih.
A-7357781, Ho, Peter Wen-T'Sung.
0300-344935, Hoo, Sing Hour.
A-10141544, Huang, Jack Shih-Ta.
A-7414824, Huang, Robert Chi Tong.
A-6285850, Huang, Tsi.
A-6285857, Huang, Soo Mu.
A-6847801, Huang, Teh Cheng.
A-10141539, Hui, Kit Ming.
A-10141566, Hui, Shui Tong.
A-10141567, Hui, Sinclair Shui-Shing.
A-6986479, Hung-Sheng, Wang or Sister Mary Carina.
A-8870667, Hsia, Gau Yueh or Sister Malia.
A-6967610, Hsiang, Wen Cheng or Sister Mary Wendelin.
A-6704369, Hsiao, Shen-Shan also known as William Shen-Shan Hsiao.
A-6848557, Hsu, Chieh-Su.
A-6967722, Jung, Han Yung also known as Sister M. Jacoma.
A-7399687, Junik, Berl.
T-2056002, Kalan, Franc.
T-2056001, Kalan, Stefka.
1536/52, Kalan, Dusan Franc.
1536/53, Kalan, Darko Stefan.
A-10141576, Koo, Benjamin Yee Chieh.
A-6142215, Kuo, Hsing-Kuo.
A-3639250, Kuo, Tse-Chiu.
A-10141757, Kuo, Hsu-Hua King.
V-1525096, Kuofan, Anthony.
A-8870666, Lai, Pao Sui also known as Sister M. Theresa.
0900-57550, Lee, Chang Ling.
0900-45771, Lee, Charlotte Ho.
A-7078187, Lee, Chen-Hsi.
A-10035416, Lee, Wah Hee alias Lee Wah Hee, Leung Fung or Fung Lung.
A-6982265, Lee, Winston, Foong-Zung.
0200-86892, Li, Hon Chi.
0300-460546, Li, Shu-Hua.
0300-460547, Li, Wang Wen Tien.
A-7202726, Liang, Yu Bing.
A-6986530, Lien-Ying, Chu or Sister Mary Eugenia.
A-6851676, Lin, Cheng Shan.
A-7274382, Lin, Jean Chen (nee Chih-Ying Chen).
A-7292430, Liu, Chi Kong.
A-7436597, Liu, Joseph Tsu Chieh.
A-6737205, Lieu, Pei-Tsing.
A-6976663, Liu, Sheng Kuang.
A-10141632, Liu, Yung-Ling.
A-10141633, Liu, Tung Seng.
A-10141634, Liu, Korbin.
A-6620802, Loh, Wen Ying.
0300-398365, Loo, Jack H. also known as Loo Yee King.
A-8870414, Lu, Wan-Ging.
A-6848570, Lu, Peter Tseng-Li.
A-6986529, Luee-Hsiang, Chow or Sister Mary Francesca.
A-6986564, Ma, Chi Pei.
A-6730632, Ma, James Hsien-Ne.
A-6967747, Min, Chang Wen or Sister Mary Charlene.
A-7295516, Ming-Hsien, Wu or Linda Wu.
A-6959749, Mozes, Abram.
A-8106523, Mozes, Malke.
A-7274536, Nieh, Chung-San.
0200-86445, Nieh, Nicholas Yun-Chuan.
A-6967510, Pan, Hsi Lung.
A-7274523, Pan, Vivian Chang.
A-7913544, Pewzner, Schulim Ber.
0300-464390, Pewzner, Rachel (nee Nenanow).
0946097, Sumarin, Mikhaiovna Klavdia also known as Claudia Gregory.
A-7450208, Samarin, Elena also known as Helen Gregory.
A-7988231, Shao, William Hoyang.
A-6967665, Shen, Dora Chung-Yuin.
0300-468333, Shen, Irene I-Chuan.
0300-468335, Shen, Isabel I-Hsi.
0300-457386, Shen, Victor.
A-7292431, Shew, Bradford Shin formerly Shin Kay Shew.
A-8082801, Shih-Yu-How, Agnes also known as Sister Theresa Shih-Yu-Haw.
A-6986538, Siu-Chen, Yu or Sister Mary Stephana.
A-7415078, Sung, David Nguah Nyen or Sung Nguah Nyen.
A-7421087, Sung, Eling Waung.
A-7248500, Sung, Rhoda Yun-Yuan.
0300-459558, Szabo, Paul.
A-10141615, Sze, Marian Woo.
A-7367977, Tai, Shih Sheng.
A-7436692, Tan, Li-Te.
A-6923725, Tao, Clinton Wei-Hsun.
A-8227223, Tao, James Fu.
A-8235312, Teitelbaum, Moses.
E-084223, Teitelbaum, Jenny (nee Bergfeld).
A-6567124, Tsao, Wao-Chen.
A-8870436, Tsien, Wei Shiang.
A-6851339, Tso, Tien-Chioh.
A-6986555, Tso, Margaret Yu-Yi Lu.
A-10141601, Twanmo, Chong.
A-10141602, Twanmo, Katty C.
A-6691440, Vogel, Catherine Nai-Yung Chen.
A-6847913, Wang, Hsi-lan.
A-7391681, Wang, Kien Ming or James Kien-Ming Wang.
A-10141616, Wang, Ko Tsan.
A-10141617, Wang, Yu Er.
A-10141618, Wang, Eng Chou.
A-10141619, Wang, Don Cue.
A-10141620, Wang, You Lue.
A-10141549, Wang, Lai-Hsing.
A-7445763, Wang, Rosalind Mei-Lin.
V-1336131, Wang, Sze-Tseng.
A-7992595, Weismann, Eli.
A-6033441, Woo, Ching Chang.
A-8057901, Woo, Jeannette Kwoh Yu.
A-9825135, Wojtal, Stanislaw.
A-2225355, Wong, Tit.
A-7078167, Wu, Cheng-Kang.
A-6980066, Wu, Jen-Pei or Zung-Pah Woo.
A-10141763, Wu, Shang Ying.
A-7143986, Yang, An Tzu.
A-6699853, Yang, David.
A-7285805, Yang George Chao-Chih.
A-7910949, Yang, Dora Hsi-Chun.
A-6848670, Yang, Jen Tsi.
A-7393985, Yang, David.
A-7393986, Yang, Katherine Louise.
A-6967652, Yang, May also known as Tze-Hsin Yang.
A-7274375, Yao, Lin-En also known as Josephine Yao.
A-6703474, Yeh, Ching Siang Tang Yeh.
A-6855617, Yeh, Pai Tao.
A-6986481, Ying, Cheng Yuin.
E-094700, Yip, Kam Yung.
A-8870669, Yu, You Li also known as Sister Anna.
A-6986531, Yu-Lung, Fan or Sister Mary Fulgence.
A-8153741, Yung-Chang, Chen.
A-8039402, Yurman, Gino.
A-7184186, Bilinska, Helena Maria.
E-096405, Chan, Dai or Chan Dai or Da Chen.

0300–473418, Chan, Siu Yu.
A–4269801, Chan, Kam Shong.
0900–47509, Chan, Yuk Yung.
A–6851306, Chang, Chi.
A–6848661, Chang, Ching Chi.
A–6589870–T, Chang, Franklin Shih-Chuan.
A–7279318, Chang, Grace Dung Lien.
A–7419724, Chang, Huai-Yuan (Sister Mary Chang).
A–6848013, Chang, Shen Chin.
A–6567119, Chang, Mei Ling Wu (nee Wu).
A–6597177, Chang, Shih Yen.
A–10135727, Chang, Pen-Chun.
A–10135728, Chang, Sieu-Tsu.
A–6967614, Chang, Wan-Cheng, married name Wan-Cheng Cheng.
A–10141535, Chang, Yueh-Lien.
A–10141574, Chang, Yai-Nan.
A–10141537, Chang, Joan.
A–7296212, Chao, Julia Shih-Fan Yu.
A–6703343, Chao, Pei Chung.
0300–459052, Chou, Peter.
0300–456580, Chen, Hsiang.
A–6083606, Chen, Hsing Huan.
A–7178953, Chen, Yin Ching.
A–7991926, Chen, Wansu Wu.
A–8010541, Chen, (Frank) Minwei.
A–8010542, Chen, (David) Minwu.
A–8010579, Chen, (Philip) Minkang.
A–8870668, Chen, Tang Hsueh also known as Sister Katherina.
A–8102823, Cheng, Benny Kuo-Bin.
A–6148135, Cheng, Chiu Wan also known as Wang Cheng Chiu.
A–9578773, Cheng, Chuen.
A–10141533, Cheng, Wen Tao.
A–10141532, Cheng, Lu-I Lee.
A–10141531, Cheng, David Ta-Zun.
A–7874506, Cheng, Pao Hua.
A–7874505, Cheng, Chung Chu.
A–7874504, Cheng, Denis.
E–083251, Cheung, Kai.
0300–460538, Chew, Yee Poh.
0300–433053, Chi, Bo Heng.
A–7445429, Chi, Hu Yu, also known as Yu-Chi Hu Ma, also known as Shirley Hu.
0300–464404, Chi, Madeline.
A–6986526, Chi-Shuang, Li or Sister Mary Cyril.
A–7910846, Chin, Chung Shun.
A–7096304, Chih, Chung Ying.
E–118625, Chin, Hin.
A–7354752, Chin, Tsuan-Shek.
0300–459149, Ching, Chen Chae.
A–6986536, Ching-Guee, Liu or Sister Mary Leander.
A–6667194, Chiu, May Helen (nee May Helen Chow).
A–7274544, Cho, Ting-Li.
0300–400853, Chong, Ho or Cheong Hoo, also known as Ho Chueh.
A–9731876, Chong, Kong, also known as Gong Cheong.
0300–396049, Chong, Tan Yung.
A–10142099, Chou, Te-Chuan.
A–10142100, Chou, Nora Hsi-Feng Chang.
A–7399269, Chow, Junlin Wong.
A–7298960, Chu, Franklin You-Min.
A–6986548, Chu, (Victor) Wen-Hwa.
A–9708083, Chuck, Fung.
A–9782837, Chun, Chai Ah.
0300–458951, Deak, Niklas Charles, also known as Nicolas Carol Deak.
A–7193630, Deri, Emery.
A–7927387, Ding, Chang Ah.
0900–50655, Djordjich, Risto.
E–086433, Drumer, Lilly.
A–3920006, Durazinski, Henryk or Henry.
A–6933864, Eisdorfer, David.
A–7244889, Elinowitz, Welwel.
0300–457977, Elusalu, Johannes.
A–7274380, Euyang, Walter also known as Walter Hwa-Teh Euyang.
0300–456141, Euyang, Clementine Hoo formerly Clementine Shih-Hwei Hu.
A–7415457, Fan, Hsieh-Sen or Jason Hsieh-Sen Fan.
A–7445497, Fan, Catherine Ping-I Chang.
A–6967558, Feng, Tsun-Ying.
E–082591, Fischer, Alexander.
A–7354783, Fu, Ellen Hsiao Yen.
0300–460069, Fucheng, Hsu alias Hsu Cheng now known as Fucheng Hsu.
A–7365726, Ganz, Nisen.
A–6613745, Gfeliner, Theresa (nee Deri).
A–6959744, Giang, Sylvia H. Wu.
A–7444660, Goldstein, Hersh Meilech.
A–8031667, Goldstein, Etel.
A–7860110, Gruman, Kalman.
E–086547, Guttman, Josef.
A–7056939, Gyarmati, Geza.
A–8285615, Hafner, Mozes, or Moses.
0300–460251, Han, Ling Chen.
A–6973659, Han, Susan Su-Chin formerly Su-Chin Han.
A–6959722, Han, Yu-Wen.
A–6967491, Ho, Ching-Yu.
A–7435700, Ho, Don Tchengton.
A–8258324, Hong, Sheng-Chiao.
A–8829404, Hsia, Mitzie (nee Miau-Tze Chang).
A–10141551, Hsiao, Ching Yuen.
A–10141577, Hsiao, Helen Hui-Ying Yao.
A–10141578, Hsiao, Henry Shih-Han.
A–10141580, Hsiao, Ann Shih-An.
A–10141581, Hsiao, Dorothy Shih-Yi.
A–6849400, Hsiung, Chieh-Chang.
A–6534866, Hsu, Liang.
A–10141762, Hsu, Pao Cheng (Chang).
A–7802663, Huang, Doris Ma.
A–7802664, Huang, Victoria Tze-Fon.
A–7415175, Hsueh, Chia Ying.
0300–341751, Hsueh, Tsung Bei Wei.
A–7056498, Huei, Hsia Shu or Frances Hsia.
A–7383119, Hung, Loretta.
0300–458487, I-Giai Chung, or Ida Djung.
0300–406961, Kam, Chow.
A–7293137, Kao, Lucy Ming-Chu.
A–7244876, Katz, Sandor.
0400–43673, Ke, Ke Chuan or John Koo.
A–8057175, Kee, Tan Seng.
A–6694146, King, Myra Yin Suan.
A–7367998, Ko, Shao-Yen.
0501–20382, Koa, Chi Chang.
0501–20383, Koa, Suzanne S.
A–7247311, Krzyanowski, Kazimierz (Casimir) John.
A–6877774, Ku, Nien-Tseng.
A–10135396, Ku, Pi-Tuan.
A–7355365, Kwan, Yuk-Ying.
E–118842, Kwei, Whang Ah.
0300–462261, Kwok, Regina Yin-Han or Ying-Han Wing.
0300–468748, Labocha, Mitchell.
A–3523622, Lan, Yee or Ching Koon Yee.
E–096796, Lau, Tai.
A–7871911, Lee, Blanche.
A–6967505, Lee, Chang Yuan.
A–8189612, Lee, Yuen Hung also known as Yuen Hung Li.
A–6828793, Lee, John Chia-Chin.
A–7289348, Lee, Liang-Shen (Leo).
0300–465467, Lee, Sui Tsung.
A–6737246, Lee, William Ming-Sing alias Ming-Sing Lee or Di-Di Lee.
A–6967336, Lee, Yin Chen.
A–7934383, Lee, Ying.
A–6959876, Leonida, Madelaine (nee Ching Hun Kao).
A–6662660, Li, Ellen Hui-Chu also known as Hui Chu Li.
A–8103760, Li, Hsioh-Chien.
0300–460977, Li, Ruth Sien-Chuan.
0300–469161, Li, San Chih also known as San Chih Liu.
A–7202751, Li, Stephen Shih-Pu.
A–10141568, Liang, George Kuo-Chi.
A–10141571, Liang, Calvin Kuo-Yuan.
A–10141597, Liang, Eugene Kuo-Yu.
A–10141569, Liang, Helen Kuo-Hu.
A–10141570, Liang, June Kuo-Kiang.
A–7830590, Liang, Paolo Tao Tsun.
A–7362902, Ling, Ming Hui Chang.
E–096458, Ling, Tin Wong.
A. 7133230, Ling, Yuen-Hung Mei.
A–7184116, Li-Ting, Tsung or Sister Mary Adria.
A–7860197, Liu, Hao Wen.
A–7293130, Liu, Irene Ssu-Chin now Irene Chi-Ming Hou.
A–6970202, Liu, Julian formerly Chu-Jen Liu.
A–7436598, Loe, Agnes formerly Hsiao Chich Loe.
E–10665–T, Loong, Yu Cheng.
A–6851637, Lu, Ch'ung Tai.
A–6851635, Lu, Chi-Hui Ching.
A–6973687, Lu, Fei Pai.
A–7292414, Lu, Lydia Dze-Zau (nee Fu).
A–6847976, Lu, Lydia Keng-Yen.
A–2149500, Mah, Foo Chu.
A–6911247, Mah, Yu Ou Chen.
A–6911248, Mah, Ming Ching.
A–6911249, Mah, Ming Shu.
A–6911251, Mah, Priscilla.
A–6911252, Mah, George.
A–6911253, Mah, Howard.
0300–471609, Mao, Chun Gin.
A–6848593, Mao, Joseph T. K.
A–6848404, Mao, Tzu-Jen.
0300–459534, Mi, Miriam Deh-Fen also known as Deh-Fen Mi.
0300–457656, Mihailescu, Octavian.
A–6848122, Ming, Chu Feng.
A–7358949, Moh, Za Yu.
A–7296131, Mok, Bessie Oi-Bing.
A–7263700, Mow, Constance also known as Bik Chui Wong.
A–0946635, New, Yuh Tsung Zee (nee Yuh Tsung Zee) also known as Mrs. Way Sung.
A–7243065, Pan, Diana Yun-Ching (nee Diana P. Lu).
0900–50654, Pavlovich, Pavle.
A–7118663, Pan, Ruth Chi-Te (nee Chung).
A–7286979, Pan, Yum Hsueh.
E–083220, Petkoff, George.
A–6710400, Poon, Abigail also known as Wan-Fen Hwang.
E–79836, Popa, Augustin.
A–7421011, Schattauer, Mary.
A–8036393, Schiffman, Sandor.
A–7882491, Shao, Irene Meileng.
A–8088722, Shashoua, Elias Heskel.
A–8091352, Shing, Ng Khing also known as Eng Fong or Ng Khing Sheng.
0300–458478, Shopov, Constantine Panchev.
A–6847707, Sih, Peter Chwin-Jen.
A–7476054, Sih, Helen Hsu Chiu.
A–7863483, Sima, Lazzlo.
A–7074028, Siu, Moyra Tsu-Yu.
A–7941178, Sleszynska, Felixa or Feliksa.
A–7399277, Soo, Peter Hungteh.
A–6677301, Srych, Elizabeth (nee Bagarova).
A–6843540, Stern, Abraham.
A–7282964, Su, Chi-Hao (Kenneth).
A–7553094, Sze, Benjamin Chiatse.
A–7910997, Szentendrei, Janos (John).
A–6083791, Tan, Fang Hsia.
A–8829366, Tang, Ho-King Shao.
A–7144742, Tang, Tung-Men.
E–086276, Tao, Chew Pe.
A–8310963, Teodorovic, Svetozar.
A–6851460, Tong, Leonard Tsu-Wang, also known as Tsu-Wang Tong.
A–6545323, Tong, Patsy Lew, also known as Patsy I-Fung Lew.
A–7282984, Tsai, Frank Wei-Kang.
0300–413254, Tsang, Tom Kam, also known as Tom Kam and Tsen Kam.
A–7367943, Tsao, George Lingkwong.
A–7274652, Tsao, Peter Hsing-Tsuen or Tsao Hsing-Tsuen.
A–7277353, Tsien, Peng Lun.
0300–462355, Tsien, Richard Winyu.
A–7768053, Tsu, Kin Hsueh-Yuan.
A–6704073, Tsu, Laura Nyi Tsung.
A–6967373, Tung, Jui Hsueh.
A–6851406, Tung, Ting San.
V–754263, Tzu, Lien Chao.
V–754254, Tzu, Fei-Man Wang.
A–8012287, Unger, Jakub Isaac.
0300–380248, Unger, Esther Rojtblat.
0300–466957, Wang, Chen Ling.
V–1198214, Wang, Chung Chiang.
A–6848530, Wang, Jean (nee Yin Suen Djuh).
A–6470332, Wang, Chun-Tao Betty.
0300–465191, Wang, Lincoln, formerly Yin Tang Wang.

0300–465188, Wang, Grace, formerly Tsian Hsi-Jen Wang.
0300–465189, Wang, Henry, formerly Teh Yun Wang.
0300–465190, Wang, Stephen.
0300–463783, Wang, Nietsu.
0300–463782, Wang, Krystyma (nee Kawecka).
0300–463478, Wang, Juliana.
0300–463690, Wang, Aline.
0300–463271, Wang, Eva.
0300–463476, Wang, Danis.
A–6967724, Wang, Paul Wen-Shan.
A–1297282, Wei, Ellen.
0300–441924, Wei, Isabel Yung-Ling.
0300–382033, Whue, Lieo, also known as Lay Fay.
A–6847713, Wong, Grace, formerly Hong Yan Hung-En Wong.
0300–343829, Wong, Ying.
0300–3380021, Woo, Yen Kwong.
0300–308909, Woon, Kong Ng Yee.
A–6851709, Wu, Chao-Hsun, also known as Chris H. Wu.
A–7427748, Wu, Christine Wan-Ming.
0300–460897, Wu, Hou-Chang.
0300–460862, Wu, Jane Yeh.
0300–460861, Wu, Hsueh-Ping.
0300–460864, Wu, Hsueh-Ming.
0300–460863, Wu, Hsueh-Kun.
0300–458255, Wu, Hsueh-Shang.
0300–460865, Wu, Poansun.
A–7298489, Wu, Theodore Tsu-Wang.
0300–455917, Yah, Pao Yin nee Pao Yin Tsai).
A–10135608, Yang, Yu Feng.
A–7295488, Yang, Chi Yuan or Chi Yuan Young.
0300–429043, Yang, Yu Ying also known as Ci-Jin Yang Liu.
0300–372980, Yang, Yu Wen.
0300–450095, Yao, Sung Ling.
0300–450096, Yao, Sufan Kao.
0300–450097, Yao, Yu.
0300–450098, Yao, Tsu.
0300–450099, Yao, Pei (Pearl).
0300–450100, Yao, Ying.
0300–403211, Yeu, Josette Min Sheng.
A–7282993, Yo, Guy also known as Guy Gee Yo or Gee Yo or Guy G. Yo.
A–7486722, York, Alfred Shih Ou.
A–6877787, Yu, Mo Hsiang known as Frank Hsiang Yu Mo.
0300–329581, Yu, Natalie Lien-Tse Kwok.
A–6847782, Yu, Tom Teng-Pin.
0300–458997, Yue, Chang Ah.
A–8282335, Yuen, Chew Jun also known as Leung Yuen.
A–8098148, Adawi, Ibrahim Hasan.
A–8154184, Ausch, Desso or Deszo Ausch or Deszo Ausch.
A–7247076, Chang, Chin Bing.
A–7874959, Chang, Amy.
A–7399332, Berger, Hirsch.
A–6718370, Berke, Joseph.
0300–460118, Bien, Zue Sun.
0300–460116, Bien, Li Kuo-Kin.
0300–457204, Chang, Kin Jen.
A–7029620, Chang, Robert Lu Ling.
0300–471564, Chang, Yi.
0300–456358, Chang, Man.
0300–441601, Chang, Yuan.
E–086613, Chee, Choy.
0200–130687, Chen, Chien-Min.
A–7897614, Chen, Julia Angela, formerly known as Tseng Chen.
A–7463931 Chen, Kun Chih.
A–4527884, Chu, Kwan Sau.
A–7463932, Chen, Martin.
A–7463933, Chen, Annette.
A–6281889, Chen, Kwan Lun.
A–6704087, Chen, Ma Li.
A–7381280, Chen, Shi Chih.
A–6026501, Chen, Sze Te.
A–6848441, Chen, Tsun.
V–820003, Cheng, Lily Djeng-Ning formerly Hsiung Djeng Ning.
A–7436771, Cheng, Paul Ming-Ching.
0300–377472, Chu, Cheng-Chin.
A–6967731, Cheo, Peter Kong-Liang.
0300–318226, Cheuk, Hui Wing.
A–9504925, Cheung, Lam.
0300–468991, Chi, Helen H. formerly known as Hkiu Hsiang Chi.
A–6962886, Chia-Ching, Yeh or Charles Chia-Ching Yeh.
A–6848630, Yeh, Sally Shing-Shing (nee Liu).
A–7143027, Chiang, Allan I-Lung.
A–8103730, Chin, Cheng Hsin.
A–6851647, Chin, Grace.
A–10141604, Chin, Duck Chung.
A–10141605, Chin, Sui Ngor.
A–10141606, Chin, Jean Su-Jen.
A–10141607, Chin, William Wei-Yu.
A–10141609, Chin, Kenneth Wei-Ho.
A–10141608, Chin, Johnny Wei-Yao.
A–10068620, Ching, Tsoong Han.
0900–76968, Cho, Fat Yau.
0300–467734, Chow, Hsien-Hsien.
0300–467733, Chow, Bae-Pao Lu.
0300–467735, Chow, Gwynne Hsieh.
0300–467745, Chow, Lulu Caroline.
0300–467619, Chow, Anna Frances.
A–7436790, Chow, Mary (nee Puh Fang).
A–7777409, Chow, Vee Nai.
0300–331123, Chow, Laura Yeh-Tsung.
0301–20068, Choy, Choon.
A–10135607, Chu, Chia-Kun also known as John Chu.
A–6527758, Chu, Kung-Ji also known as Elizabeth Chu.
A–10198072, Chu, Cales Hung-Ye.
A–10198073, Chu, Rebecca (Wai Tu Chu).
A–10198074, Chu, Patricia Ann.
A–10198075, Chu, Phyllis Jean.
A–6848629, Chuan, Helen Keng-Ting.
A–6988156, Chu, Hsi-Ling.
A–9821915, Dai, Kwan.
V–754183, Dzo, Ging-Ru.
A–8099927, Eliahou, Ezra Haron Yousef.
0300–408020, Fin, Chon.
A–7846708, Frank, Fred Moshi, also known as Fouad Moshi Fraim.
A–7828313, Feldmar, Judith.
0300–233203, Friedman, Fred alias Ferdinand Friedman.
A–7988131, Fajncajg, Gitla.
A–10060369, Genger, Brocha.
0300–467887, Genger, Jeheszua.
A–7913449, Goldsand, Jakob.
0300–362178, Gluck, Elsa Friedman.
A–6055370, Grosman, Josef Aszer.
0300–329528, Grunzweig (Grunsweig), Ignaz.
A–8039224, Grunzweig (Grunsweig), Feiga.
E–6576, Gutwein, Izak.
0300–461047, Hettena, Ibrahim Khedoury Yousef.
0300–12961, Hing, Chen Shuey.
A–7174554, Ho, Julia.
A–7921878, Honovich, Antonio.
A–6831432, Hoo, Mona Yung-Ning.
A–6891822, Hsia, Hung.
A–6967367, Hsia, Eva E-Feng (nee Wu).
A–6851466, Hsiao, Chi-An.
0300–469513, Hsu, Chichang.
A–7274640, Hsu, John Tseng-Hsin.
A–7863550, Hu, Stanley Shao An.
A–7863551, Hu, Jane Chi-Jo Tsien.
A–7863552, Hu, George.
0300–454463, Hu, Leilani Shao-Tsin.
A–7125049, Hu, Susan Sze, also known as Tung-Lai Sze.
A–6847785, Huang, Tsui En.
A–6959720, Huang, Tzu Chuen.
A–7830835, Kahan, Samuel.
A–6621741, Kam, William.
A–9647122, Kan, Yip, also known as Feh Kan.
A–7274372, Kao, Irving Ke-Yung.
A–9728193, Ki, Chan or Chan Wah Sorn.
A–10066668, Kiang, Ai Chen or Anne Ai-Chen Wang.
A–6848410, King, Yung Kang.
E–085921, Kleiner, Wolf, also known as Wolf Klajner.
E–085930, Kleiner, Fredia, also known as Fredia Klajner.
E–085922, Kleiner, Mala.
A–6026389, Ko-Ching, Shih.
A–6041705, Shih, Chueh Ying Tzeng or Tzeng Chueh Ying.
A–9758472, Kokk, George.
A–7873165, Kuang, Cheng Wei known as Edmund Wei-Kuang Cheng.
A–6442514, Wei, Cheng Han Hsin, known as Dorothy Han Hsin Wei Cheng.
A–7049859, Kuchcik, Mendel.
0300–466868, Kung, Wei-Ven Yao.
0300–363444, Kung, Robert Cheng-Chung.
0300–363443, Kung, Nancy Tse-Chung.
A–7133276, Kuo-Chung, Chen.
E–6096243, Kwan, Chan.
A–7374681, Landau, Herman.
0300–323883, Landau, Serena.
0300–461751, Landau, Ervin.
E–096756, Lau Yau.
A–9235656, Lau, Kwai.
A–8259654, Lanza, Giovanni.
A–6847959, Lee, Dah Hsuan.
0300–318417, Lee, Dorothy or Dorothy Tsu.
0300–466310, Lee, Thomas Shung, also known as Lee Shung Sun.
A–6703320, Lee, Yaw Shuin.
0300–459356, Lefkovits, Irme.
A–7961287, Li, Hsiao-Jun.
A–7292450, Li, Ming Yu.
A–6958632, Li, Chou Hsiung.
A–6973662, Li, Shao Min.
A–6552719, Liang, Holt.
A–6855620, Liang, Yuan.
A–6967758, Li-Chuan, Wang.
A–6967493, Hwa, Lih or Hwa Lih Wang.
0300–360290, Lin, Frank Chang-Heng.
0300–360291, Lin, Ellen.
A–6847860, Lin, Priscilla Chung Dijh.
A–10135710, Li-Sooey, Evalina Doo.
A–7118752, Liu, Fu Tung.
A–6848072, Liu, George Bie, formerly Bie Liu.
A–6851311, Liu, Robert Yung-Yu.
0300–460252, Liu, Soo Yung.
A–7274431, Liu, Yee Yen.
A–7274432, Liu, Yen Wei.
0300–470004, Liu, Teh Ming.
A–6083659, Lo, Ching-Lung.
0300–471010, Lo, Hua-Tsing Chu.
0300–471011, Lo, Denis.
0300–471012, Lo, Sylvia.
A–6848683, Louis, Pauline Pao-Lien Soong.
A–10066444, Lu, Chin.
0300–345176, Majerholc, Edwin.
A–9731984, Mar, Chew.
A–6771870, Miao, David Cheng.
A–7295543, Moi, Peggy, formerly Peggy Wong.
A–7399331, Morozow, Szulem.
A–7355367, Mui, Chiu Ning.
0301–21592, Muscardin, Umberto.
0300–470522, Nacinovich, Romano.
A–6357633, Netupsky, Eugene A.
A–6504544, Ning, Lai Shung.
A–7462122, Nisenkiern, Samuel.
A–7244870, Noselis, Jacob.
0300–429827, Ong, Chih-Ta.
0300–471121, Ong, Ching Siu C. T.
0300–461044, Ong, Margaret.
A–7292435, Owyang, Hsuan.
A–6848503, Pei, Tseng Chi known as Chi Pei Peter Tseng.
0300–473098, Peros, Ivan.
A–7399686, Pevzner, Icchok.
A–9709852, Ping, Chan.
A–7586532, Ratajczak, Michal.
A–6848542, Ray, Hsia Pong known as Pong Ray Hsia.
A–7480707, Rubin, Simcha.
0300–375838, Sassoon, Edmond Solomon.
0300–375839, Sassoon, Yvette (nee Shayo).
A–7290185, Schonberger, Philippe.
A–7290186, Schonberger, Friderika.
A–7290187, Grunwald, Eva (nee Schonberger).
A–7290188, Schonberger, Alfred.
A–7290190, Schonberger, Tibor.
A–7366281, Schonberger, Georgette or Gyongyi.
A–8001182, Shen, James Cheng-Yee or Shen Cheng-Yee.
A–8871292, Shen, Grace Shu Hwei.

A–8871294, Shen, Christopher.
A–8871293, Shen, Patricia.
A–8871295, Shen, Michael.
0300–355800, Shen, Pearl Sung Hsu.
E–085326, Shing, Tam also known as Shing Tam.
A–5975137, Shoen, Tze Win.
0300–459063, Soo, Lum Wing also known as Frederico Lee.
A–7287952, Stoynich, Peter N.
A–6848149, Sung-Lan, Hsia known as Robert Sung Lan Hsia.
0300–460221, Susech, Giovanni.
E–10777, Svoronos, Milton Theodosios or Millon or Mittiadis Theodosios Svoronos.
A–7367944, Tai, Li Shu.
E–082730, Tak, Lee Ting.
A–8036392, Teitelbaum, Chiel Alter.
A–7115668, Thurnher, Majda Theresia.
A–1389416, Tin, Chan Chi.
A–7415104, Ting, Alice Lu.
A–6739732, Tsai, Helen Whitfield.
A–6735288, Tsai, William Wei-Lin.
T–607453, Tse, Emma Kuan Ching.
A–7290334, Tse, John Yung Dong.
A–6567126, Tseng, Hsien-Chi.
A–6967707, Tsou, Catherine Nan-Yun.
0300–464309, Tung, William L.
0300–464311, Tung, Yueh-Chiung.
0300–464308, Tung, James (Chien Min).
E–094525, Valjak, Arthur.
E–094628, Vlacich, Beniamino.
0300–420918, Vlacich, Giovanni, also known as John Vlacich.
A–6457535, Wang, Chi-Wu.
A–7846771, Wang, Da Chaw.
A–6851597, Wang, Hung I.
A–6606804, Wang, Lillian Yun-Hsia.
0300–463121, Wang, Loo Ing How.
A–6845064, Wang, Pei.
0300–462256, Waung, Tze-Kong.
0300–337048, Ching-Chyu, Wong.
0300–461685, Hsi-Fong, Waung.
A–8057928, Wojda, Stanley (or Stanislaw).
0300–336237, Woo, Alice Chia-Ying, also known as Alice Ching Woo.
A–0010333, Wong, Yok.
A–7247101, Wu, Ray Jui.
A–6689188, Wu, Robert Tze-Chun or Robert T. C. Wu.
0300–469639, Yang, Nai Chen.
A–10135775, Yang, Te-Fang.
0300–361326, Yang, Tien-Yi.
A–6849457, Yao, Eleanor Shin-Yee.
A–7265816, Yen, Yaa Tai or Anthony Yen.
A–9164094, Yeung, Yik.
A–7133285, Yien, Edward Yuen-Chiang.
A–6461101, Ying-Pe, Chang or Roy Ying-Pe Chang.
0300–329694, Yip, Lam Chun.
A–7274558, Yong, Pao Chung Ma.
A–8875522, Yu, Choi Kun.
A–6848711, Yu, David Chien-Seng formerly Chien-Seng Yu.
A–6848482, Yu, Teh Chi.
A–6848483, Chen, Siao-Fen.
A–6877754, Yu, Tsi-Van.
A–6848103, Yue, Soy Chung.
A–9686706, Yuen, Ben.
A–10135599, Zia, Zung Jai.
A–10135601, Zia, Hsu Chin.
A–9553245, Adolfijs, Alfred.
A–7385344, Beloerol, Franciszka.
A–6819166, Berger, Kato (nee Gluck).
A–7244887, Brook, Gershon.
0300–352716, Brook, Szyna (nee Gottlieb).
0300–329371, Bui, Ying King.
A–7913548, Chai, Ling Chi (nee Mao).
A–7124539, Chang, Chen Chi.
0300–448764, Chang, Nien Tze.
0300–366462, Chang, Henry Kunghui.
0300–419940, Chang, Hsi Huan, also known as Peter Chang.
A–7538671, Chang, Hsin Hai.
A–7295511, Chang, Hsin-Pao.
A–8065822, Chang, Huei-Yuen.
A–6848015, Chang, I-Chen.
0300–421485, Chang, Jimmy H.
A–7277488, Chang, Robert Mai-Hsien.
0300–335529, Chang, Sai-Cheng.
A–10141560, Chang, (William) Kwang Pao.
A–7436600, Chang, (Catherine) Shiao Chin Lu.
A–7416447, Chang, Yung Shan.
0300–461559, Chao, Marie I-Wei Lu.
0300–461560, Chao, Yung Yun also known as Shirley Chao.
0300–461562, Chao, Hsieh Lung also known as Thomas Chao.
0300–461561, Chao, Yung Hsia also known as Helen Chao.
A–7427944, Chao, Chung Yuan.
A–6704086, Chao-Hwa, Feng or Chao Henry Feng.
A–6236864, Chen, Hsuen-Ping Dorothy.
A–10141582, Chen, King Pao.
0501–19305, Chen, Mary Barbara also known as Ching Zen Chen.
A–7483722, Chen, Rose.
A–7841932, Chen, Vincent Vesin or Vesin Chen.
A–6905336, Chen, William Keh-Ching.
A–7053874, Chen, Elizabeth Dji-Shuh.
A–6163785, Cheng, George C. also known as Chi Chang Cheng.
A–6251492, Chen, Franklin Shou Chiang formerly Shou Chiang Chen.
0200–121730, Cheng, San-Hsi.
0300–423721, Cheng, Yung alias Cheng Yung.
A–6847880, Cheo, Pen Ching.
A–6958995, Cheo, Helen Ching Lan.
A–7435701, Cheung, Lok-Tin (Happy)
A–10193622, Cheung, Lydia Chi-Yan Lee.
A–6027148, Chi, Nung-Cheh.
A–6896402, Chi, Jean Ching-Chin.
0300–456510, Chi, James.
0300–391909, Chiang, Chun Lin.
0300–469810, Chiang, Yue-Tsing Huang.
0300–469814, Chiang, Yvonne or Yee Foong Chiang.
0300–469815, Chiang, Jane.
0300–469811, Chiang, Millard.
0300–469812, Chiang, Alice.
A–8870726, Chien, Dawn Sing or William S. Dawn.
A–8870724, Chien, Dawn Tze or Robert C. Dawn.
A–7417144, Chi-Hua, Wu Vivian also known as Vivian Chia-Hua Moh.
A–6843441, Chin-Hsu, Liu.
A–6534334, Liang, Huang or Liang Huang Liu.
A–8125645, Ching, Julia Chia-Yi (Sister Agnes Therese).
A–9948146, Chong, Lai also known as Leong Kow Kow.
A–6271454, Chu, Kuang-Han.
A–0933425, Chun, Hong Cha.
A–0933428, Chun, Kyung Shien Sung.
0300–366830, Chun, Sze Yung.
0300–366918, Chung, Mo Nan.
0300–344329, Dao, Sue Shing.
A–8870723, Dawn, Shin Yuan.
A–8870727, Dawn, Dunn Mei-Lih.
A–8870725, Dawn, Wei Mei or Victoria W. Dawn.
A–6377727, Djang, Su Dzung.
A–7282150, Su, Ruth Ching-Hsing (nee Tien).
0300–456769, Dimini, Stanislao.
A–6967498, Dun-Jen, Li.
0300–456942, Dzung, Kenyon Danlee.
0300–456938, Dzung, Nyui Sung.
0300–355990, Eu, Mary Jane Soong.
A–10141559, Fang, Siu Chun (nee Siu Chun Lai).
A–6760587, Feldstein, Aron.
A–7383072, Fisher, Max.
A–7399117, Friedman, Erno.
A–8065816, Friedman, Edith.
A–7913543, Gluck, Arthur.
A–6934982, Goldberg, Joseph formerly Jozef Goldberg.
A–7197344, Guo, (James) Tse Menglin.
A–7197345, Guo, (Lois) Rujen Wang.
0400–54898, Guo, (Grace) Hui-ping.
E–094784, Haber, Elias or Eliasz Haber.
0300–319444, Hardoon, Rouben Shaoul.
0300–460905, Hardoon, Marcelle.
0300–328520, Hardoon, Kathleen.
A–7197634, Henkin, Ella.
E–119220, Ho, Lau.
A–2418469, Ho, Pang Yung.
A–6077100, Hoo, Chin.
A–6916672, Houn, Franklin Willington.
A–7835199, Houn, Frances Lu.
A–7355369, Hsi-Kuang, Chi or Henry Hsi-Kuang Chi.
0300–371805, Hsi, Te-Ping.
A–6848376, Hsu, Jeng Mein.
A–8245936, Hsu, Priscilla C. Y.
A–10141598, Hu, Pei-Ying Beatrice.
A–6608765, Hu, Quang Hsi.
A–6851600, Huang, Aileen Yueh.
A–6986571, Huang, Chaang.
A–6967359, Huang, Wei Jen.
A–7286961, Huang, Irene Hwei-Lin nee Chang.
A–5941361, Hung, Wu Gee.
A–8829316, Huo, Peh Ping.
0300–471204, Ivanicek Franjo.
0300–325626, Jacob, Solomon Hillel.
0300–325694, Jacob, Helen.
0300–466392, Jankovich, Ladislav.
A–10067874, Jin, Kor Shiang also known as Madeline Jin.
E–118777, Jogis, Konrad Walter.
A–7297266, Jungreisz, Lipot.
A–7297267, Jungreisz, Laura.
0300–429358, Jungreisz, Antal.
0300–429359, Jungreisz, Izsak.
0300–452110, Jutrowski, Klemens Jan.
A–8870715, Kai, Chou Ven or Victor Ven-Kai Chou.
A–6851293, Chou, Clarice Hsi or Hsi Yao.
A–7961261, Katz, Marton.
A–8245999, Katzman, Zelig.
A–8246000, Katzman, Hilel.
A–9728194, Keam, Tan.
A–7244872, Kercer, Wolf.
A–9561968, Kiang, Tang Ching.
0300–473479, Konig, Joseph.
A–10035686, Kwei, Thomas Chen-Ying alias Chen Ling Kwei.
A–10035639, Kwei, Randolph Chen-Chi alias Chen-Chi Kwei.
A–7828712, Kwiatkowski, Czeslaw.
E–084349, Lau, Hung.
A–6815524, Lee, Helen Pao Hsin Tsao.
0300–472541, Lee, Hong Cheuk, also known as Richard H. C. Lee.
A–6775603, Lee, Justin.
A–6958991, Lee, Julia.
0300–374187, Lee, Laan-Fong.
A–2677372, Lee, Yen Shuang.
A–7297991, Leitao, Maria Stela.
A–5805395, Lew, Suie.
A–6851429, Liang, Chen Yu known as C. Y. Yu.
A–7285802, Liang, Robert Ting-Wei.
A–6962966, Liang, Emily Shui-Men.
A–7424932, Lin, Wei Shu now William S. Lin.
A–7841087, Chen, Tsai Chu now Jean C. Lin.
A–7841088, Lin, Annie.
A–7841089, Lin, Fu Ming now Dinah Rita Lin.
A–7841090, Lin, Cheng Lie now Dick Lin.
0300–277173, Ling, Chen Ping.
A–8001637, Ling, Homer Chuen-Cheng alias Chuen-Cheng Ling or Yung-Shen Ling.
A–7483978, Ling, Fidelia Hsu (nee Fidelia Pei-Lan Hsu) alias Pei-Lan Hsu.
0300–41791, Ling, Wong or Lun Wong or Wong Lun.
A–6744416, Loh, Yih H.
0300–456581, Loh, Mabel H. C.
0300–451406, Lok, Chung Sing.
A–9512598, Luk, Ng.
A–7202743, Lung, Yuan or Edward Lung Yuan.
A–6967574, Ma, Bernard Sing-Lu.
A–10141583, Ma, John T. T.
A–10141584, Ma, Mary Yong.
A–10141561, Ma, Joanna.
A–7945460, Mamczak, Julianna.
T–1866563, Mao, Kathleen (Kai) Lin.
A–7456082, Miller, Kalman Jacob.
A–7985644, Miller, Eda.
A–8871291, Ming, Hsu Yin or Doris Yin Ming Hsu.
A–7886505, Nieckarz, Alojzy.
A–8090380, Oiber, Hersch.

A–8057925, On, Young Man also known as Man on Young.
A–7269682, Ouyang, Mariana Tsao.
A–7118691, Owyang, Gilbert Hsiaopin.
A–8282962, Patock, Lverka.
E–1073, Peebo, Johannes.
0300–445130, Perich, John or Giovanni.
E–081290, Pien, Hsia Si.
0300–473086, Pui, Wong.
A–8154183, Rosenberg, Samuel.
0300–464312, Shen, Alexander or I-Shang Shen.
A–7957895, Shen, Chi Meng.
A–10015075, Shen, Ping Wen-Wu.
A–6083862, Shen, Roderick Chung-Chao.
0300–374307, Shen, Shih Hua.
0300–465579, Shen, Pao Kwei.
A–7274371, Sheng, Alice Tung-Fun (nee Alice Tung-Fun Kuan).
A–7184115, Shu-Ching, Suee or Sister Mary Ceciliana.
E–082521, Simon, David Salem.
A–737469, Soong, Hwa-Yu or Soong Hwa-Yu known as William Hwa-Yu Soong.
0400–52651, Spitzer, Gyula.
0400–52690, Spitzer, Ilona.
A–9825134, Sroka, Leon Stefan.
A–7860207, Ssutu, Edwin A.
A–6848027, Sun, Wu Tze.
A–7358509, Szasz, Joseph.
A–7961263, Tang, Kou Nan.
V–753791, Tang, Oscar Liu-Chien.
A–6083753, Tsai, Sydney Sung or Sung Tsai.
A–7483931, Tsai, Christina or Pei-Ching Chang Tsai.
0300–461764, Tsai, Jackson or Chieh Sung Tsai.
0300–455209, Tsai, Mason or Mei Sung Tsai.
A–7435716, Tsai, Wen Ying.
A–7285799, Tsang, Stella Shu-Ming Tai.
0300–457501, Tseng, Benjamin or Tseng Chao Ko.
A–7832588, Tsou, Ying also known as Anthony Y. Tsou.
A–7095971, Uranyi, Joseph.
A–7095973, Uranyi, Gabriella.
A–7193594, Uranyi, Gabrielle Margaret.
A–9099909, Vilusi, Villu.
A–8091658, Vosilla, Vittorio.
A–7778553, Wang, Cheng Fu.
0300–466141, Wang, Aimei.
0300–322737, Wang, Chi Chuan.
0300–322762, Wang, Yuan-So Cheng.
0300–326117, Wang, Yien Koo.
A–6877783, Wang, Hsin-Hui.
A–7643498, Wang, Shih Hua.
A–6986585, Wang, Mu (Diana) Cheng.
A–7367966, Weingarten, Adolph.
0300–314825, Weingarten, Anna.
A–7444635, Wen-Jhun, Chiang known as Helen Wen-Jhun Chiang.
A–9764838, Wong, Chin.
A–6407196, Wong, Gen Ching.
A–7809002, Wong, Han Min.
A–8021418, Chang, Jacqueline W. T.
A–6967663, Wong, Mary Ruth.
A–10141528, Wong, Shou-Fa.
A–8198495, Wong, Virginia also known as Bei Fung Wong.
A–6967532, Woo, William Chi-Wen.
A–10145013, Wu, Hou Cheng.
A–10145014, Wu, Kina Fu Yier Liao.
A–10135612, Wu, Jack Hsueh-I.
A–6849846, Wu, Pei-Hsing Lin.
0300–432370, Yak, Ah Sam also known as Yak Ah Sam.
A–6667949, Yank, Chuan Ying alias Yong Yang Chuan-Ying.
A–9798750, Yang, Margaret Wei-Chin.
A–6967741, Yang, Nien-Chu.
A–8015589, Yang, Shih-Ching.
0300–346772, Yang, Dorothy Tsae-Ling Fei.
0300–330626, Yang, Kiang-Si.
A–7392524, Yang, Tieh-Sung.
A–6847989, Yeh, John Chiung or Yeh Chiung.
0300–43062, Yen, Betty Hsin-Lien.
0300–391473, You, Wong King also known as Wong Ying.
A–7903279, Yu, Maria Hsieh-Yueh Chang.
A–7835340, Yu-Chen, Li.
0300–474919, Yueh, Shiela Hsuan Wen.
A–8198530, Chang, Li-Hsain.
E–079940, Chin, Tom.
A–6958642, Loh, Pichon P. Y.
A–9520221, Park, Hom.
A–7286680, Shen, Richard Tsu Hsun.
A–7133260, Tung, Yun Ming.
A–7975781, Chu, Boa-Teh.
A–8922049, Hing, Yuan Ying.
A–6846912, Kaminski, Henryk.
A–10143319, Schejbal, Dobruska Ann.
A–10143320, Schejbal, Dusan Josef.
A–6195641, Schejbal, Josef.
A–6159640, Skala, Hugo Michael.
A–7491761, Skala, John Paul.
A–7802497, Skala, Marie Hana.
A–6813127, Skarzynski, Stanislaw.
A–10042650, Chuan, Pai Shiu.
A–7948694, Maar, Julius (Gyula) I.
A–6967495, Li, Pei Chao.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 230) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on H. R. 5550 for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

Resolved, by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 2,500 additional copies of the hearings on H. R. 5550, a bill authorizing the President to accept membership for the United States in the Organization for Trade Cooperation, held by the Committee on Ways and Means for the use of the said committee.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 232) extending greetings to the American National Red Cross on the occasion of its 75th anniversary, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

Whereas the American National Red Cross is now receiving congratulations from all over the world upon the occasion of its 75th anniversary; and

Whereas in the period following the adoption of the first Treaty of the Red Cross in 1864, to which the United States Government adhered in 1882, the name and emblem of the Red Cross has come to be recognized throughout the civilized world as a symbol toward which those in need can repair and under which all peoples dedicated to the impartial relief of human suffering can enlist; and

Whereas the obligations of this Government and its people under the Treaty of the Red Cross justified the establishment by the Congress of the American National Red Cross as the official agent of this Government to assist in the discharge of such obligations and to engage in other activities for the welfare and relief of the Armed Forces and the prevention and alleviation of human suffering resulting from disasters and emergencies at home and abroad; and

Whereas more than 50 years ago the Congress determined that the work of the American National Red Cross was of such importance to the Government and people of the United States and to the preservation of the dignity of all human beings that provision should be made for its operation under such grant of authority and such Government supervision as would impart official status and thus invite the confidence and support of all the peple, but that, to preserve and safeguard its impartial, nonpolitical character, it should carry out its duties solely by means of the voluntary contributions of funds and services by the peoples; and

Whereas the present American Red Cross membership of over 23 million, the record during the past half century of voluntary contributions totaling more than $2,350,000,000 and countless billions of hours of selfless Red Cross volunteer service, all devoted to the mitigation of human suffering in every country of the world, attests to the accomplishment of the intended purposes of the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress extend its greetings and felicitations to all the members of the American National Red Cross on the occasion of its 75th anniversary, express to them its appreciation for their services to humanity, and urge the continued voluntary participation by the American people in the work entrusted to the organization by the Congress and the Government.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 419. An act for the relief of Eli E. Hood;
S. 637. An act to provide for the conveyance of Camp Livingston, Camp Beauregard, and Esler Field, La., to the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes;
S. 885. An act for the relief of Alice Elizabeth Marjoribanks;
S. 2267. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the city of Henderson, Nev.;
S. 2851. An act to transfer certain lands from the Veterans' Administration to the Department of the Interior for the benefit of the Yavapai Indians of Arizona;
H. R. 1835. An act for the relief of the Board of Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kans.;
H. R. 1989. An act for the relief of George D. Hopper;
H. R. 2338. An act for the relief of Charles F. Bullette;
H. R. 2717. An act for the relief of Giles P. Fredell and wife;
H. R. 2736. An act for the relief of Roy M. Butcher;
H. R. 2924. An act for the relief of David J. Dase;
H. R. 3638. An act for the relief of Joseph H. Washburn;
H. R. 3639. An act for the relief of Ralph Bennett and certain other employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs;
H. R. 3725. An act for the relief of Herman F. Gierke, Jr.;
H. R. 3975. An act for the relief of Rev. Boniface Lucci, O. S. B.;
H. R. 4902. An act for the relief of Martin F. Kendrigan;
H. R. 5787. An act to authorize settlement of claims for residential structures heretofore erected at the expense of patients on the grounds of the Public Health Service hospital, Carville, La.;
H. R. 6452. An act for the relief of William H. Foley;
H. R. 7583. An act for the relief of Mary Viola Jones;
H. R. 7993. An act to authorize the construction and conversion of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes; and
H. R. 9132. An act to provide for the approval of the report of the Secretary of the Interior on the Ainsworth unit of the Missouri River Basin project.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

H. R. 877. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rose Amoresano and her children;

H. R. 2045. An act for the relief of Joe Bargas;

H. R. 3532. An act for the relief of Seymour Robertson;

H. R. 4141. An act for the relief of Vivencio Fernado Raymundo, Bienvenida Raymundo, Lolita Raymundo, Agnes Raymundo, Henry Raymundo, and Fred Raymundo;

H. R. 7702. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Shenekji;

H. R. 7835. An act for the relief of Maj. Gen. Julius Klein;

H. R. 8041. An act for the relief of Clyde R. Stevens;

H. R. 8867. An act for the relief of the estate of F. M. Bryson;

H. R. 9314. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Illinois and Wisconsin to enter into compact relating to interstate public school districts where an educational community extends into both such States;

H. R. 10006. An act for the relief of Vincent P. Svelnis;

H. R. 10013. An act for the relief of Sfc. Henry F. Ferry;

H. R. 10092. An act for the relief of the former shareholders of the Goshen Veneer Co., an Indiana corporation;

H. R. 10191. An act for the relief of Comdr. Cook Cleland;

H. J. Res. 605. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 606. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 609. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2840. An act to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas;

H. R. 8490. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Bonham, Tex.

H. R. 9358. An act to require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to issue a deed to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for certain land heretofore conveyed to such city, removing the conditions and reservations made a part of such prior conveyance;

H. R. 10251. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to deed certain land to the city of Grand Junction, Colo.; and

H. R. 10441. An act to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 to restrict its application to insurance which has been in effect 6 months at the time benefits are sought under such act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H. R. 2845. An act to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-incurred disability of loss or loss of use of both buttocks;

H. R. 7144. An act to provide that no application shall be required for the payment of statutory awards for certain conditions which, prior to August 1, 1952, have been determined by the Veterans' Administration to be service-connected;

H. R. 8458. An act to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10 to provide that the widow of a veteran of the Spanish-American War (including the Philippine Insurrection and the Boxer Rebellion) who married the veteran before January 1, 1938, may be eligible for death compensation;

H. R. 9841. An act to provide that in determining eligibility of a widow or child of a deceased veteran for a pension the income limitations applicable to such widow or child shall be increased $600 for the year in which the veteran's death occurs; and

H. R. 9922. An act to provide that certain veterans suffering from active pulmonary tuberculosis shall be deemed to be permanently and totally disabled for pension purposes while they are hospitalized; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 3897. An act to relieve the Secretary of the Interior of certain reporting requirements in connection with proposed National Park Service awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof;

H. R. 7190. An act restoring to tribal ownership certain lands upon the Colville Indian Reservation, Washington, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8225. An act to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Pipestone National Monument in the State of Minnesota;

H. R. 8385. An act to transfer certain responsibilities of the Secretary of the Interior to the Public Housing Commissioner and the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8837. An act to amend certain sections of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended, relating to the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 9207. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands; and

H. R. 9451. An act to provide that certain lands shall be held in trust for the Seminole Indians and to provide that certain lands shall be designed as a reservation for Seminole Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 5256. An act to provide for the redemption by the Post Office Department of certain unsold Federal migratory-bird hunting stamps, and to clarify the requirements with respect to the age of hunters who must possess Federal migratory-bird hunting stamps;

H. R. 5790. An act relating to the application in the Territory of Hawaii of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act and the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act;

H. R. 8810. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct, equip, maintain, and operate a new fish hatchery in the vicinity of Miles City, Mont.; and

H. R. 9822. An act to provide for the establishment of a trout hatchery on the Davidson River in the Pisgah National Forest in North Carolina; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 5268. An act to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to authorize the payment of mileage allowances for overland travel by private conveyance outside the continental limits of the United States;

H. R. 8290. An act to provide for the appointment and promotion of the director and assistant directors of the band of the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8693. An act to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, in relation to the refund of reenlistment bonuses; and

H. R. 8922. An act to provide for the relief of certain members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 9377. An act to provide for the sale to the Eagle Rock Young Men's Christian Association of certain real property located in Los Angeles County, California; and

H. R. 9671. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the village of Carney, Ohio; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 9842. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to hold and detain mail for temporary periods in certain cases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. J. Res. 501. Joint resolution to authorize participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences of the North Atlantic Treaty Organizations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following concurrent resolutions were referred as indicated:

H. Con. Res. 228. Concurrent resolution approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary;

H. Con. Res. 230. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on H. R. 5550 for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means; to the Committee on Rules and Administration; and

H. Con. Res. 232. Concurrent resolution extending greetings to the American National Red Cross on the occasion of its 75th anniversary; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the following committees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations.

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour, for the transaction of routine business, subject to a 2-minute limitation on statements.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS FOR CIVIL DEFENSE PURPOSES

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Battle Creek, Mich., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Federal contributions for civil defense purposes for the quarter ended March 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

RELOCATION OF NATIONAL TRAINING SCHOOL FOR BOYS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the relocation of the National Training School for Boys, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PURPOSES

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts negotiated for research and development purposes, for the period July 1 through December 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF BUREAU OF MINES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Bureau of Mines, for the calendar year 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON AUDIT OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

A letter from the Executive Secretary, The American Society of International Law, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on financial transactions of that society, for the year ended December 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT ON NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL

A letter from the President, National Safety Council, Chicago, Ill., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the financial transactions of that council, for the year 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress to enact legislation to waive certain charges against an employer relative to unemployment insurance

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which would authorize State unemployment insurance agencies to waive any charges against an employer where it would adversely affect his experience rate if the unemployment is caused by the curtailment of business resulting from hurricanes, floods or other acts of God; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

A memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Memorial 12

"Memorial requesting the Congress of the United States to investigate the wasteful expenditures of the Helium Division of the United States Bureau of Mines

"*To the Congress of the United States:*

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"The Helium Division of the United States Bureau of Mines is presently spending $6 million at Excell, Tex., to extract small amounts of helium from natural gas. This process is hazardous, due to possible explosion, and in addition is very costly. The Bureau of Mines is now asking for an additional $10 million for another plant to be constructed in 1959.

"The demand for helium far exceeds the supply and it is now rationed by the United States Government which is presently the only supplier of helium. The Hoover Commission has recommended that the production of helium be turned over to private industry. It costs the Federal Government over $14 per 1,000 cubic feet to process helium from natural gas.

"Apache County in the State of Arizona has the world's only virgin helium-nitrogen wells. There are 2 wells completed that produce 8½ percent helium and 89 percent nitrogen (nonexplosive), and the total flow of both wells can now supply more helium than all the combined sources of the United States Government with no danger of explosions. A third well will be completed within 60 days, at which time it is intended to build a helium plant.

"The United States Government could save millions of dollars a year by assisting private industry to set up a plant in Arizona since it is the only source of virgin helium and nitrogen in the world. Such a plant can produce helium for 50 years. Moreover, nitrogen would be a byproduct and by building an anhydrous-ammonia plant it would supply Arizona with much needed nitrogen fertilizer, thereby aiding Arizona's expanding agriculture.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, prays:

"That the Congress of the United States, in view of the current expenditure by the Bureau of Mines for the production of helium, study carefully the prospect of assisting private industry in producing helium in Apache County in the State of Arizona, for the purpose of obtaining a greater supply of helium and at the same time reducing costs substantially."

A letter from the American Tariff League, Inc., New York, N. Y., signed by Richard H. Anthony, executive secretary, transmitting memorials signed by sundry officials of companies and agricultural groups, as well as labor unions and employees, remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (H. R. 5550) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the administration of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; to the Committee on Finance.

A telegram in the nature of a petition, signed by Elois P. Parham, of Houston, Tex., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 3760) to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs, and for other related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION OF GENERAL COURT OF COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on March 29, 1956, and adopted in concurrence by the house of representatives on April 11, 1956.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and, under the rule, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions memorializing Congress to enact certain legislation

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary for establishing proper flood-control measures in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; reducing the age at which women may receive benefits under the Social Security Act from 65 to 62; reducing the age at which widows may receive such benefits from 65 to 62; reducing the eligibility age of persons entitled to old-age assistance to 60 years; providing for a study of the number of Veterans' Administration general medical and general surgical hospital beds within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, with a view to increasing such facilities; providing that paid-up policies of insurance be issued to such veterans of World War I who have paid into the Treasury of the United States premiums in excess of the amount of the face value of such term policies and that thereafter all premiums thereon shall be waived; providing for two deliveries of mail daily by the Post Office Department; providing that a pension of not less than $100 be paid monthly to citizens who are over the age of 65 and have retired; providing that no concession be granted on the import of textiles from foreign countries; granting loans to private and public utilities so that they may place all cables and lines underground as a precautionary measure against the effect of storms and hurricanes; establishing a system of disaster insurance to protect against loss or damage of homes and industries caused by flood, hurricane, or other disaster; providing for the construction of Federal housing projects in the west, south, and north end sections of the city of Boston; providing for the establishment of a national health insurance plan; repealing the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, commonly known as the McCarran-Walter Act, and enacting an immigration act in which there shall be no quota system based on national origins; granting aid in the form of arms to the Government of Israel; preventing racial discrimination and to see that such laws are enforced, particularly in certain Southern States; establishing a program of Federal grants to States or political subdivisions thereof as an aid to education, whereby the reimbursement or payment of a specific sum be made to each student being provided with formal education; incorporating the Franco-American war veterans; and pertaining to the repeal of a treaty relative to the prosecution of members of the Armed Forces of the United States serving in foreign countries for alleged violations of the law of such countries; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States take such action as may be necessary to insure that the Postmaster General issue a postage stamp in memory of the late Herman Melville, author of Moby Dick, the classic American novel of the sea and the whaling industry, and a postage stamp commemorating the 150th anniversary of the founding of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each member thereof from this Commonwealth.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE—RESOLUTION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution which was unanimously adopted at a meeting of the American Lithuanian Council on Febru-

ary 19, 1956, at Norwood, Mass., in commemoration of the 37th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence by Lithuanian people.

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

Unanimously adopted, after due deliberation by the Lithuanian Americans of the city of Norwood, Mass., gathered for the purpose of commemorating the 38th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania, held under the auspices of the local chapter of the Lithuanian American Council on February 19, 1956:

"Whereas there can be no harmony and peace in the world as long as millions of people are refused elementary human rights and are forced to live, write, believe, and to think as the Moscow Communist dictators order; and

"Whereas Soviet Union regardless of International Treaties made by her, create unrest and provoke armed conflicts in all corners of the world, and with proposed political agreements seek only one purpose: mislead free nations and win time for her feverish military preparation, spying and Communist fifth column infiltration to steal more military secrets from western nations for her ultimate goal; conquest of the world by armed force and treason; and

"Whereas our fathers and forefathers homeland Lithuania with her neighbors Latvia and Estonia and many other countries in Europe and Asia, Soviet Union converted into colossal slave camps forcing their people to work in dreadful conditions for her armament and enslavement of other nations; and

"Whereas people in Lithuania and other countries occupied by Soviet Union, for their adherence to freedom are massacred or deported to slow death in Siberia concentration camps on a scale unheard heretofore: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That this mass meeting of Lithuanian Americans of the city of Norwood, Mass., reaffirming their strong will to support the Federal Government in all its efforts to strengthen our beloved freedom-country America, and achieve lasting peace in the world, plead for further dynamic and positive foreign policy defending all nations' right of self-determination and human rights in Lithuania and other countries enslaved by Soviet Union; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Lithuanian Americans gathered here today voice their deepest gratitude to the administration and both Houses of Congress of the United States for the moral and material help given to Lithuania and her people in their fight for freedom and existence."

JOHN M. PECHULIS,
President.

POVILAS TYLA,
Secretary.

NORWOOD, MASS., *February 19, 1956.*

REORGANIZATION OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION—RESOLUTION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I present a resolution adopted by the board of trustees of the Jewell-Mitchell Cooperative Electric Co., Inc., of Mankato, Kans., expressing opposition to the adoption of the Hoover Commission recommendations on the reorganization of the Rural Electrification Administration, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 15, 1956.

Whereas the board of trustees of the Jewell-Mitchell Cooperative Electric Co., Inc., a borrower of the Rural Electrification Administration, serving approximately 5,000 farmsteads, has become quite concerned during the past months concerning the recent recommendations of the Hoover Commission regarding Government lending agencies, with special reference to the Rural Electrification Administration; and

Whereas, to determine the opinion of the members of the cooperative concerning the above-mentioned Hoover Commission recommendations, the board of trustees requested written statements from the members concerning the continuance of the Rural Electrification Administration as it now exists; and

Whereas, in reviewing the written statements received from the members, it was determined that 89 percent of those members answering this request was very definitely opposed to the adoption of the Hoover Commission recommendations regarding the Rural Electrification Administration and urged that the board of trustees vigorously oppose such action by the Congress; 4 percent of those answering this request stated that the board of trustees should request that the Congress adopt the recommendations of the Hoover Commission and that this cooperative should seek future financing elsewhere. Seven percent of the returns made no definite statements, but cited generally the benefits of central station electric service to the farmer, made possible by the establishment of the Rural Electrification Administration: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the board of trustees of the Jewell-Mitchell Cooperative Electric Co., Inc., do, this 15th day of March 1956, urgently request that you, as a Member of the legislative body of our Government, do everything in your power to oppose the adoption of Hoover Commission Recommendations on the reorganization of the Rural Electrification Administration which would, without question, cripple the rural electric program by increasing the retail rates of electricity to the members of REA borrowers.

G. W. CHRISTOLEAC,
President.

JOE M. HEIDRICH, *Secretary.*

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—PETITION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a petition signed by Rev. J. F. Williamson, and sundry other citizens of Blackwell, Okla., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 923, to prohibit all interstate alcohol advertising.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as follows:

BLACKWELL, OKLA., *May 6, 1956.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned, members of the local Evangelical United Brethren Church, wish to go on record as endorsing the Senate bill 923 to outlaw all interstate alcohol advertising, including magazines, newspapers, radio, and TV, as introduced by yourself.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I also present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a petition in favor of the so-called Langer bill, to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce. The petition is signed by some fine citizens of the State of New York.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as follows:

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition you to exercise the proper discretion vested in you by passing legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air, a practice which nullifies the rights of the States under the 21st amendment to control the sale of such beverages. At a time when 1 out of 10 drinkers is becoming an alcoholic there should be no encouragement to increasing the use of such beverages. Children and youth are being misled to consider them harmless, especially by the powerful audio and visual suggestions of radio and television.

ANNIVERSARY OF ENACTMENT OF FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT—RESOLUTION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Corn Industries Research Foundation commemorating the 50th anniversary of the enactment of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the Meat Inspection Act.

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

Whereas June 30, 1956, is the 50th anniversary of the enactment of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the Meat Inspection Act; and

Whereas these laws and their administration over the past 50 years have served to promote high standards in the production and marketing of foods, drugs, and cosmetics and have thus served to promote both consumer confidence in the products of the regulated industry and fair methods of competition; and

Whereas the 50th anniversary of the enactment of these significant laws is being commemorated by regulatory, consumer, and industry groups through varying activities on a nationwide scale: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Corn Industries Research Foundation, Inc., participate to every practical extent in the commemoration activities of the various organizations and encourage its members to do likewise; and be it further

Resolved, That the foundation commend, and hereby does commend, the regulatory officials for their conscientious and effective administration of these laws, and assure them, and hereby does assure them, of this industry's continued cooperation and support.

READJUSTMENT OF SIZE AND WEIGHT LIMITATIONS ON FOURTH-CLASS PARCEL POST MAIL—RESOLUTION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, several measures pending at this session of Congress would readjust size and weight

limitations on fourth-class parcel post mail.

This proposed legislation has been brought to my attention again by several Pacific Northwest apparel manufacturers.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted recently by the Pacific Northwest Apparel Manufacturers Association.

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

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF H. R. 9566

Whereas the existence of an efficient, economical parcel post system is essential to the pattern of life of our citizens and businesses in both rural and urban areas; and

Whereas the present discriminatory parcel-post size and weight limitations seriously disrupt the service once enjoyed by all at great and unnecessary cost and inconvenience; and

Whereas there is no nationwide substitute for parcel post that can and will serve all citizens regardless of address; and

Whereas the present size and weight limitations have been both a financial and an administrative burden to the Post Office Department: Be it

Resolved, That the Pacific Northwest Apparel Manufacturers Association, representing 17 businesses in Portland and Seattle, favors immediate enactment of H. R. 9566 and restoration thereby of uniform parcel-post size and weight limits. It is respectfully requested that Senator MAGNUSON insert this resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that he request the chairman of the Post Office Committee to schedule hearings now on parcel post size and weight so that the citizens of Seattle, Wash., and Portland, Oreg., may have relief from the present law before the current legislative session is concluded.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. 3638. A bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States by amending the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.); with amendments (Rept. No. 1959).

REPORT ENTITLED "PROPOSAL TO CREATE AN ADMINISTRATIVE VICE PRESIDENT" (S. REPT. 1960)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I submit the report of the Committee on Government Operations, made by its Subcommittee on Reorganization, upon the proposed creation of a position of Administrative Vice President in the Executive Office.

Members of the subcommittee will recall that former President Herbert Hoover last January recommended that the Congress establish such a position to relieve the President of the United States of some of his administrative burdens.

Hearings were held upon this proposal on January 16, 24, and 25, 1956. After thoroughly weighing the evidence presented at these hearings, the subcommittee, as the report I am filing at this time indicates, concluded unanimously that for the present no action should be taken on this proposal. This decision is based upon the following factors:

First. The evidence received by the subcommittee establishes conclusively that there are already sufficient appropriate officials within the executive branch to whom statutory administrative functions suitable for delegation may be assigned; and

Second. The administration has not indicated to the Congress any existing need for the creation of a position of Administrative Vice President in the executive office to relieve the President of administrative details at this time.

As the report points out, it is the conviction of the subcommittee that the Congress should always proceed with the utmost caution in its consideration of proposals affecting the President's office. The American Presidency was not intended by its creators, nor regarded by the majority of those who have held that office, as primarily a ceremonial or coordinating job, with its most essential responsibilities delegated to nonelected officers. The Congress, therefore, should not take the lead in diluting the President's responsibilities in order to lessen his burdens, unless such authority is actively sought by the President.

Although the subcommittee is not recommending the creation of the office of an Administrative Vice President, in my opinion, former President Hoover has rendered another great public service by focusing attention upon the administrative burdens shouldered by the President in the discharge of his official duties.

As the report I submit indicates, the administration has undertaken an extensive review of the entire structure of the Presidency to determine how its functions can be more efficiently performed.

I ask that the report be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation three lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon, pursuant to law.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Albert F. Nufer, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of the Philippines, vice Homer Ferguson;

Willard L. Beaulac, of Rhode Island, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Argentina, vice Albert F. Nufer; and

Cecil B. Lyon, of New Hampshire, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Chile, vice Willard L. Beaulac.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3802. A bill requiring Federal penal and correctional institutions to maintain a supply of Bibles and religious literature to be furnished to any Federal prisoner at his request; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3803. A bill providing for the retroactive payment of old-age insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act to farmers who retire after having attained more than 65 years of age; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 3804. A bill to amend section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the donation to the Bureau of Prisons of commodities acquired through price support operations; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 3805. A bill to increase the equipment maintenance allowance for rural carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. LANGER when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 3806. A bill to clarify the Internal Revenue Codes of 1939 and 1954 with respect to the allowance of percentage depletion in the case of sand and gravel extracted from navigable waters;

S. 3807. A bill to clarify the jurisdiction of the Tax Court in abnormality relief cases arising under the World War II Excess Profits Tax Act; and

S. 3808. A bill to provide for the income-tax treatment of indebtedness discharged more than 20 years after the date on which it was incurred; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3809. A bill to provide for the establishment of a new fish hatchery at Cedar Bluff Reservoir; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3810. A bill to amend the Act of August 26, 1950, relating to the suspension of employment of civilian personnel of the United States in the interest of national security; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. LONG:

S. 3811. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to prescribe certain qualifications for persons appointed as members of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 3812. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Illinois and Wisconsin to enter into a compact relating to interstate public school districts where an educational community extends into both such States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 3813. A bill for the relief of Dr. James R. P. Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 3814. A bill for the relief of Guiseppina Coppola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 3815. A bill for the relief of Kuo Cheng Wu and his wife, Edith Wu, and their two sons, Hsiu-Kwang Wu and Hsiu-Huang Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 3816. A bill for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARRETT (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. 3817. A bill to amend the act of May 21, 1930, relating to the leasing of oil and gas deposits in or under railroad or other rights-of-way; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PURTELL (for Mr. IVES):

S. 3818. A bill for the relief of Mutsuko Miyaji; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 3819. A bill relating to the transfer of Veterans' Administration hospitals; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. ALLOTT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 3820. A bill to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3821. A bill to authorize the construction of two prototype ships, and the conversion of one Liberty ship, by the Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GORE (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 3822. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 3823. A bill to require that collectors of customs and certain other officers of the Bureau of Customs be appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 3824. A bill for the relief of Marcial Moreno Pascual; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3825. A bill to amend section 204 (c) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 3826. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Columbia Basin Project Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. BYRD):

S. 3827. A bill to authorize the construction of a shellfish research laboratory and experiment station in the Chesapeake Bay area; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUTLER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 3828. A bill to clarify the law relating to the grant of certain public lands to the States for school purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KERR:

S. 3829. A bill to authorize the establishment, maintenance, and operation of auxiliary communication networks composed of licensed amateur radio operators for military radio communications; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to establish a commission to study and report to the Congress on inequalities and inequities in the Federal tax laws; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LONG:

S. J. Res. 168. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prescribing the term of office of members of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. J. Res. 169. Joint resolution to establish a joint committee to investigate the gold mining industry; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON STUDY OF ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 77), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary 1,000 additional copies each of parts 6, 7, and 8, of the hearings held by the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly on a study of the antitrust laws of the United States, and their administration, interpretation, and effect.

INCREASED EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE ALLOWANCE FOR RURAL CARRIERS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce a bill providing for an increase in the pay of rural mail carriers. In view of the fact that the cost of equipment has gone up, as have other expenses, in connection with the delivery of mail, and in view of the fact that rural mail carriers have to deliver the mail in rain, shine, or storm, I believe their compensation should be correspondingly increased.

I ask that the bill may be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3805) to increase the equipment maintenance allowance for rural carriers, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

FISH HATCHERY AT THE CEDAR BLUFF RESERVOIR, KANS.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would authorize and direct the Secretary of Interior to construct, equip, maintain, and operate a new fish hatchery at the Cedar Bluff Reservoir.

The site of the dam is located about 7 miles west of the Trego-Ellis County line and was completed in 1951. The reservoir formed by the dam has a total control storage capacity of 377,000 acre-feet and is an ideal location for a warm water fish hatchery.

Ross Beach, Jr., of Hays, Kans., chairman of the Kansas State Fish and Game Commission, has written me in regard to the possibilities of the authorization of this hatchery, and I can assure the Department of Interior that our State agency will be most pleased to cooperate with the Department in any way it can.

This location of a hatchery could serve a large area in several States in supplying fish for lakes and streams, of which we have large numbers, and the program for additional construction of recreational areas is expanding rapidly in our State.

Recently when the appropriation for the Fish and Wildlife Section of the Department of Interior was before the Senate, I called to the attention of the chairman, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the need for this hatchery, and he assured me once the authorization was secured, the Appropriations Committee would be pleased to look further into the matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3809) to provide for the establishment of a new fish hatchery at Cedar Bluff Reservoir, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SUSPENSION OF EMPLOYMENT OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL IN THE INTEREST OF NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would amend the act of August 26, 1950, relating to suspension of employment of civilian personnel of the United States in the interest of national security.

As a member of the subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee which held rather extended hearings last year in regard to our present national security, I believe that the approval of this amendment would not only be fair and just to the individual employee, but one that would greatly alleviate some of the injustices as a result of the program.

Section 1 of the present act requires that in all cases brought pursuant to it an officer or employee must be suspended without pay before he may be granted a hearing.

This mandatory requirement of suspension in many instances works an undue hardship on an officer or employee, without benefit from the standpoint of the national security.

This proposal would make discretionary the exercise of the power of suspension prior to hearing. The Government could suspend where suspension was considered necessary in the interest of national security, but on the other hand they would be given sufficient leeway to carry the officer or employee on the payroll where the circumstances did not warrant immediate suspension.

It is legislation I sincerely hope we can approve in this session of Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3810) to amend the act of August 26, 1950, relating to the suspension of employment of civilian personnel of the United States in the interest of

national security, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

QUALIFICATIONS AND TERMS OF OFFICE OF MEMBERS OF SUPREME COURT

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment limiting the terms of the Justices on the Supreme Court to 12 years. I also introduce for appropriate reference a bill to require that at least half of the judges hereafter appointed to the Supreme Court shall be required to have more than 6 years' prior experience as a judge on a court of record.

During the past 30 years we have had the opportunity to see the Supreme Court exercise powers beyond those which any of our Founding Fathers ever anticipated. For example, the Supreme Court's interpretation of the general welfare clause and the interstate commerce clause during the past two decades has had the effect of changing the form of our constitutionally Federal Government from one of closely limited powers to one of almost unlimited power.

On momentous issues we have seen the Court repeatedly hand down decisions completely at variance with its prior decisions, to the astonishment and surprise of the overwhelming majority of the attorneys of our Nation.

I am confident that the vast majority of level-headed persons, familiar with our history and our laws, will agree that the Supreme Court of recent years has exercised powers far beyond those intended by our Founding Fathers. When the Supreme Court interprets a provision of a statute in a way that is not consistent with the intention of the Congress, then the Supreme Court is assuming to make law. When it interprets a provision of the Constitution to have a meaning different from that which was intended by the authors of the provision, then the Supreme Court is actually amending our Constitution without the consent of the people, although the consent of the people is intended by law.

Personally, I am not one of those who believe that the clear intention of the Constitution or the meaning of the laws passed by Congress change with the times. I recognize that there are some who feel that this should be the case. Even if it should be the case, such persons should agree that the power to amend the Constitution and to change the meaning of the statutes of the United States should not be an unlimited power vested in men who are appointed to serve for life. Like every other power in our Government, it should be subject to the checks and balances intended by our Founding Fathers.

It is true that much of the demand for a change of the meaning of our Constitution and our laws at the national level has come from groups who regard themselves as racial minorities. These minority groups would do well to remember that the rights which they enjoy in this Nation could be endangered if the majority of the people should turn against them.

The rights enjoyed by minorities would be much more secure were our Supreme Court composed of men who had demonstrated through the years their ability to dispense justice fairly and impartially. Likewise, the rights of all Americans would be more secure were they able to depend upon a Court that would follow the precedents. A court that decides cases in response to considerations apart from the actual purposes and meaning of the law can wipe out minority rights, in response to political pressure, just as easily as it can establish such rights.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill and joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill and joint resolution, introduced by Mr. LONG, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 3811. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to prescribe certain qualifications for persons appointed as members of the Supreme Court; and

S. J. Res. 168. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prescribing the term of office of members of the Supreme Court.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of certain aliens. I may say that there appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, part 1, page 934, a statement I made in relation to a similar bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3816) for the relief of certain aliens, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TRANSFER OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to protect the interests of our veterans who need and are entitled to medical care. It is similar to a bill introduced by Representative WEAVER in the House of Representatives on March 2, 1956, H. R. 9729.

The purpose of the bill is to require a 90-day period for congressional review before the Veterans' Administration could transfer a veterans' hospital to any other agency of the Federal Government. It would require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to submit any such proposed transfer to the Congress together with the reasons for doing so. Such transfer could then take effect at the end of a period of 90 calendar days of continuous session of the Congress, but only if between the date of transmittal and the expiration of 90 days there has not been passed by either of the two Houses, by an affirmative vote of a majority of the authorized membership of that House, a resolution stating that that House does not favor the proposed transfer. It would take effect with respect to all transfers occurring on or after January 1, 1956.

I believe this measure is broad enough to allow adequate administrative control, and at the same time insure that no veterans' hospitals are thus eliminated from use by veterans without the consent of the Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3819) relating to the transfer of Veterans' Administration hospitals, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

SHELLFISH RESEARCH LABORATORY AND EXPERIMENT STATION IN CHESAPEAKE BAY AREA

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the construction of a fish research laboratory and experimental station in the Chesapeake Bay area. Knowing of Senator BYRD's keen interest in such matters, after drafting the bill I sent it to him for his consideration. He has given it his careful consideration and has done me the honor of joining with me as a cosponsor.

The United States Fish and Wildlife Service has been studying the shell fisheries in the Chesapeake Bay for the last 10 years. Their laboratory has been located in Annapolis, housed in a recreation building of a temporary Federal housing installation. This building is almost one mile from the nearest water and dock. Under these conditions the research work has been limited to field studies.

The Service is planning to expand its shellfish research work on the Chesapeake Bay. They will include studies on hard and soft clams as well as expanded research on oysters. Additional personnel are in process of being transferred to carry on this work.

The Fish and Wildlife Service has shellfish research installations operating out of Woods Hole, Mass.; Milford, Conn.; Beaufort, N. C., and Pensacola, Fla. The oyster production from Maryland and Virginia waters totals in excess of 6 million bushels valued at $18 million to the catcher. After processing the value of the product increases to more than $30 million annually. This production is greater than any other area in the United States.

It is my strong feeling that the quality and extent of research would be greatly improved by the construction of an adequate marine laboratory. As I understand, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service is of the opinion that improved facilities such as those contemplated and to be authorized by this bill are essential for it to carry out an expanded research program.

The cost of construction of a laboratory to provide the building and facilities needed will approximate $250,000, I am reliably informed. I am confident that such an expenditure will result in findings which will repay this investment many times over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3827) to authorize the construction of a shellfish research labora-

tory and experiment station in the Chesapeake Bay area, introduced by Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. BYRD), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT ON THE NIAGARA RIVER—AMENDMENT

Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1823) to authorize the construction of certain works of improvement in the Niagara River for power and other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT-OWNED MANGANESE ORE FACILITIES TO SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3453) to transfer certain Government-owned manganese ore facilities to the Secretary of the Interior, to provide for the erection of one or more beneficiation plants to treat manganese ores, to stimulate the production of certain strategic and critical minerals, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 7225) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 7225, supra, which were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 7225, supra, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS, ST. JOHNS COUNTY, FLA.—AMENDMENT

Mr. MORSE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 7471) to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the Board of Commissioners of St. Johns County, Fla., which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I submit amendments to the bill (H. R. 10660) the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, which is aimed at increasing the productivity, enjoyment, and usefulness of our national forest and national parks by expanding the existing roads within those areas.

The purpose of the amendments is to add to the version of the Federal Highway Act which was approved by the Senate Committee on Public Works, the amounts previously adopted by the House of Representatives for road building in four different categories: for forest highways, forest development roads and trails, national parks highways, and Federal parkways.

The amendments would provide the following amounts, which, as I pointed out previously, have already been approved by the House: for forest highways, $25 million; for forest developments roads and trails, $27 million; for national parks highways, $13 million; for Federal parkways, $16 million.

The amounts authorized by the House are fully justified by the increased demands on our forest and parks systems. The sound management of national forests for lumbering, recreation, and other uses, requires construction of roads to improve accessibility.

I would like to point out that these roads are not financed from gas tax or other highway-user levies, but from funds derived from the sale of timber harvested from the national forests. The record shows that this has been a favorable procedure for the Federal Government. The forest road-building programs of the past have provided $2 in revenue for every $1 invested by the Federal Government. In addition, these forest roads are built by private contractors and increase the revenues received at Federal timber sales by making harvestable timber available to a larger number of prospective purchasers, thereby increasing the activity of bidders.

A collateral benefit of improved forest access roads accrues to the millions of hunters, anglers, hikers, recreationists, and others who vacation in the national forest areas. The additional construction will open new areas to the vast numbers who seek relaxation in the forested slopes of the public domain.

The same is true of the national parks and national monuments, which are being visited each year by more and more vacationists. Without more adequate roads in the vast Federal recreation areas, our stepped-up Federal highway program would be much like building a dead-end boulevard. More and better roads in national forests and parks are vitally needed so that the millions of pleasure-seeking American motorists will have some place to go when they travel the improved Federal road system of the future. The increase authorizations constitute a realistic approach to attainment of this beneficial objective.

I am pleased to submit the amendments on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. I ask unanimous consent to have the amendments printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendments will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments are as follows:

At the proper place in section 106 (1) strike out the figure "$22,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$25,000,000", and (2) strike out the figure "$24,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$27,000,000"; and

At the proper place in section 107 (a) strike out the figure "$12,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$16,000,000", section 107 (b) strike out the figure "$11,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$16,000,000."

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I am delighted to join in sponsoring this amendment to the highway bill with my colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], who is a member of the Public Works Committee.

Several weeks ago, the Senators from Oregon testified on the House side for increases on timber access roads and we secured them over there. Chairman BUCKLEY wrote me that the testimony the junior Senator from Oregon and I gave, plus the letters of support from our distinguished majority leader, LYNDON JOHNSON, and Senators MAGNUSON, JACKSON, MURRAY, SYMINGTON, SPARKMAN, SCOTT, HUMPHREY, KEFAUVER, LEHMAN, and DOUGLAS, was instrumental in developing House support for the increase they provided.

We are interested in quickly passing a highway bill and I do not propose to argue the merits of the modest increase proposed by the amendment, against the long-range increases in forest roads that we need.

Favorable action by the Senate will be helpful. We have had a total absence of a real program presentation from the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. This is a crying shame when we consider that the roads covered in these authorizations bring substantial revenues into the Treasury above their cost.

If we want to increase revenues and keep our economy healthy, this program is one of the best steps we can make toward this goal.

EXTENSION OF SUGAR ACT OF 1948—CHANGE OF CONFEREE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] be excused from further service as a conferee on the bill (H. R. 7030) to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes, and that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] be designated to serve in his place.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

Speech delivered by him at Carnegie Hall, New York, N. Y., on September 29, 1955.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

Statement prepared by him relative to the 100th anniversary of the Order of the Sisters of Providence in the Pacific Northwest.

By Mr. WILEY:

Address on engineering research and development, delivered by him before a section of the American Society of Tool Engineers, at Madison, Wis., on April 20, 1956.

By Mr. STENNIS:

Remarks by Senator SCOTT before the Senators' breakfast group on May 9, 1956.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON H. R. 9424, S. 3341, AND S. 3424, BILLS AMENDING THE CLAYTON ACT RELATING TO MERGERS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the standing subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary on antitrust and monopoly legislation. I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, May 23, 1956, beginning at 10:30 a. m., in room 424 Senate Office Building, on H. R. 9424, S. 3341, and S. 3424, bills amending the Clayton Act by requiring prior notification of corporate mergers.

Prior to the above mentioned date all persons interested in the proposed legislation should file with the committee such representations as may be pertinent, or communicate their desire to be heard.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and myself, chairman.

NOTICE OF RESUMPTION OF HEARINGS ON VARIOUS CIVIL RIGHTS PROPOSALS BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that the Committee will resume hearings on the various civil rights proposals beginning at 2:30 p. m., Wednesday, May 16, 1956, in the committee room, Room 424, Senate Office Building.

Persons desiring to be heard should notify the committe in order that a schedule of witnesses may be prepared.

PAYMENT TO CROW INDIAN TRIBE FOR TRANSFER OF CERTAIN RIGHT-OF-WAY

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives respecting Senate Joint Resolution 135.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) for payment to Crow Indian Tribe for consent to transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That from funds appropriated to the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, for the Missouri River Basin project, there shall be transferred in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Crow Tribe of Indians, Montana, to be available in accordance with the act of June 20, 1936 (49 Stat. 1543), the sum of $1,500,000 as just compensation for the transfer to the United States as hereby provided of the right, title, and interest of the Crow Tribe in and to certain tribal lands required for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Yellowtail unit, Missouri River Basin project.

SEC. 2. (a) Subject to the provisions of this section, there is hereby transferred to the United States the right, title, and interest of the Crow Tribe in and to lands situated in the Big Horn County, Mont., hereinafter described under the headings "Parcel A" and "Parcel B" and in and to such lands, additional to parcels A and B, as the Secretary of the Interior, hereinafter referred to as the Secretary, determines to be required for the construction thereon of minimum basic recreational facilities for the accommodation of the public visiting the Yellowtail unit.

PARCEL A

Lots 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12, northeast quarter of the southwest quarter and the east half of the southeast quarter of section 18; lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter, southeast quarter of the northwest quarter, and the northeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 19, all in township 6 south, range 31 east, Montana principal meridian, and containing 573.84 acres, more or less.

A tract of unsurveyed, unallotted Indian land described as follows: Beginning on the westerly side of the Big Horn River at a point on the west line of lot 9, section 18, township 6 south, range 31 east, Montana principal meridian, said point being at elevation 3,675; thence running upstream along a contour line whose elevation is 3,675, to a point of intersection with the east line of the southeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 22, township 6 south, range 30 east, Montana principal meridian; thence southerly along the east line of said southeast quarter of the northeast quarter to a point on the east line of said southeast quarter of the northeast quarter, whose elevation is 3,675; thence running upstream along a contour line whose elevation is 3,675, to a point of intersection with the south boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation on the westerly side of the Big Horn River; thence easterly along the said south boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation to a point of intersection with the middle of the thread of the Big Horn River; thence running upstream along the middle of the thread of the Big Horn River to a point of intersection with the south line of township 9 south, range 28 east, Montana principal meridian; thence easterly along the south line of said township 9 south, range 28 east, to a point on the south line of said township 9 south, range 28 east, Montana principal meridian, whose elevation is 3,675 feet; thence running downstream along a contour line whose elevation is 3,675 to a point of intersection with the west line of township 6 south, range 31 east, Montana principal meridian; thence northerly along the west line of said township 6 south, range 31 east, to the point of beginning, and containing 4,771.6 acres, more or less.

Also, a parcel of land lying along the south boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation, further described as follows: Beginning at a point where the 3,675-foot contour to the left of the Big Horn River intersects the south boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation, said point being approximately 5,400 feet westerly of the point of intersection of the Big Horn River and the south boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation; thence running upstream on the 3,675-foot contour to a point where the 3,675-foot contour intersects the south boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation; thence running easterly along the south boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation to the point of beginning and containing 5.7 acres, more or less.

Also, a parcel of land lying along the south boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation and along Hoodoo Creek further described as follows: Beginning at a point on the south boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation where the 3,675-foot contour on the east bank of Hoodoo Creek intersects the south boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation; thence running upstream on the 3,675-foot contour to its intersection with the middle of the thread of Hoodoo Creek; thence running downstream on the 3,675-foot contour to a point where the 3,675-foot contour intersects the south boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation; thence easterly along the south boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation to the point of beginning and containing 1.3 acres, more or less.

The total area above described is 5,352.44 acres, more or less, situated in Big Horn County, Mont.

PARCEL B

Lots 1, 5, and 6 of section 18, lots 4, 6, 7, and 8, and the south half of the northwest quarter of section 17, lots 6 and 7, section 16, all in township 6 south, range 31 east, Montana principal meridian, containing 325.50 acres, more or less, and situated in Big Horn County, Mont.

(b) There is reserved from the right, title, and interest transferred as to parcel B, the Indian Irrigation Service canal and appurtenant facilities, Big Horn unit, Crow Indian Irrigation Department, as now constructed or as they may be hereafter modified, until such time as said canal and appurtenant facilities may be replaced.

(c) Except as to such area as the Secretary determines to be required for the dam site and the construction and operating camp site, the right, title, and interest transferred shall be exclusive of the rights to minerals, including gas and oil beneath the surface: *Provided*, That no permit, license, lease, or other document covering the exploration for or the extraction of such minerals shall be granted by or under the authority of the Secretary except under such conditions and with such stipulations as the Secretary deems adequate to protect the interests of the United States in the construction, operation, maintenance, and use of the Yellowtail unit.

(d) The members of the Crow Tribe shall have the right to hunt and fish in and on the Yellowtail Reservoir and its shoreline, subject, however, to regulations, in the interests of conservation and proper operation, governing the corresponding use by members of the public generally.

SEC. 3. Unless suit to determine whether an additional amount to that specified in section 1 hereof is due as just compensation is brought in the Court of Claims by the Crow Tribe within 3 years after the effective date of this joint resolution, the sum provided by section 1 hereof shall constitute full, complete, and final settlement of any and all claims by the tribe on account of the trans-

fer to the United States, as therein provided of the tribe's right, title, and interest in and to the lands referred to in section 2 hereof. In the event of such suit, the court shall have jurisdiction as under section 1505, title 28, United States Code, and in determining just compensation shall take into account the sum specified in section 1 hereof and the rights reserved to the tribe by subsections (b), (c), and (d) of section 2 hereof. The amount embraced in such judgment, if any, as may be entered against the United States shall be deposited in the Treasury to be available in like manner as the sum specified in section 1 hereof. Review of the judgment entered shall be in the same manner, and subject to the same limitations, as govern in the case of other claims cognizable under the aforementioned section 1505.

And to amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution for payment to Crow Indian Tribe for right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming."

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on Monday the House amended Senate Joint Resolution 135, providing for payment to the Crow Indian Tribe for transfer of the right-of-way for the Yellowtail Dam unit of the Missouri River Basin project. The House amendments are in the nature of a substitute for the language approved by the Senate, and make drastic changes in the philosophy and approach of the joint resolution as passed by the Senate, as well as in the amounts involved.

Mr. President, the Senate Interior Committee held exhaustive hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 135. At the hearings, representatives of the several factions of the Crow Indians, as well as spokesmen for the representatives of the executive agencies and all other interested parties, were heard at length. The committee then voted to amend the joint resolution in the light of facts brought out at the hearings, and reported to the Senate what the Members of the Committee considered an equitable bill which safeguarded both the interests of the Indians and those of the Federal Government. The Senate accepted the Committee amendments, and passed the joint resolution.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House to Senate joint resolution 135, and request a conference thereon; and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. MURRAY, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. MALONE conferees on the part of the Senate.

ALBEN W. BARKLEY, OF KENTUCKY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as were all other Members of the Senate, I was deeply shocked by the death of the beloved Senator from Kentucky, Alben Barkley. His passing marks the end of one of the great statesmen of our time. Although I shall miss his personal counsel and his great leadership, I am grateful for having had the opportunity of serving in the Senate with such a fine man.

Shortly after news of Senator Barkley's death was flashed over the radio, Mr. Edward R. Murrow gave his nightly comment on the news over the Columbia Broadcasting System. His tribute to Senator Barkley expresses better than anything I can say the sense of loss which all of us felt so deeply. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an excerpt from Mr. Murrow's commentary.

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

In the woods, when a great and ancient tree that has weathered many storms suddenly comes crashing down, there is the noise of smaller trees snapping back into position, the rustle and cries of small creatures, and the descending noise of twigs, branches, and bits of moss falling to the ground. And then there is silence, more complete and oppressive than any silence that went before. Frequently this happens on a dead calm day, for no apparent reason. So it was today with Senator Alben Barkley of Kentucky. He was making the keynote speech at Washington and Lee University. The occasion was their mock democratic convention. The Senator had just said: "I would rather be a servant in the House of the Lord than sit in the seats of the mighty." He collapsed and was pronounced dead 10 minutes later.

It was altogether typical of the man that he devoted his last hour to politics and to youth. He was a man without cant, without rancor; a politician respected and admired, even by his opponents. In defeat he was resolute, and in victory indeed magnanimous. Few men have ever so endeared themselves in the hearts of their fellow men. He had humor, but seldom used it to hurt. He was a man who wore both power and popularity loosely, almost carelessly, like an old cloak. He was tolerant of most things, except intolerance. He had been in politics since 1905. He was helpful to young men. He was a tireless political campaigner. And he was an orator of what is generally called "the old school." Anyone who heard his keynote speech in Philadelphia in 1948, or his brilliant performance at Chicago in 1952, heard political oratory at its best. At Chicago he had thought the presidential nomination to be within his grasp. He lost it, knew he had lost it, and then went before the convention, shrugged his broad shoulders and proceeded to demonstrate how a good politician and a good loser should act and speak.

He served as Vice President under Mr. Truman, became known as the Veep, and was always the gentleman from Paducah. He loved the cut and thrust of parliamentary debate. He was known during his years in the Senate as the ready man, ready at the drop of a gavel to deliver a brilliant and lengthy speech, without benefit of notes or ghostwriters. While he was Vice President he refused to have a bodyguard, saying: "I'm a big boy now, and who would want to harm a young man like me, anyway?"

He was loyal to his party, but did not hesitate to break with Roosevelt in 1944 when the President vetoed a tax bill.

He was a man with manners, who liked people, who enjoyed good stories, some of them were old, but they were reinvigorated by the Barkley telling. After he finished his term as Vice President, he spent a couple of years in Kentucky and then went back to politics. He was elected the State's junior Senator for the term beginning in January of last year. So he went back to Congress where he had first arrived as a Representative in 1913. He once said he hoped to keep on politicking to the end—and he did.

The tributes, the expressions of shock and sorrow, are already coming in. Senator KNOWLAND, of California, says: "The country and Kentucky have lost a great citizen and a great Senator." Senator LEHMAN, of New York, says: "Senator Barkley's death is a great shock to me, and a national disaster. His place in history is secure, but his place in our hearts will never be filled." MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas: "The Nation has lost a great man; one of the most beloved men in America." ELLENDER, of Louisiana: "He was a great American and a great statesman. We have suffered a very grievous loss." Former President Truman called him a citizen that the United States can always be proud of. President Eisenhower said: "The Nation is the poorer by this tragic event."

To this reporter Senator Barkley was always a man who took his duties and his responsibilities seriously, but who was always able to laugh, both at himself and his opposition. There will be many tributes to his ability, his loyalty, and his humor. Some of them will be eloquent. But mostly they will resemble the sound of smaller trees snapping upright, branches, twigs, and moss falling to the ground—after a giant tree has come crashing down.

POLAND'S CONSTITUTION DAY: IN COMMEMORATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I send to the desk, and ask to have the clerk read, a short statement which I have prepared in regard to Poland's Constitution Day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the statement will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like, at this time, to make a rather belated statement in commemoration of Poland's constitution day. The Polish constitution of May 3, 1791, is a document of liberty and freedom. Like our own Constitution, it placed sovereignty in the people and based government on the consent of the governed. It is a remarkable document, and ever since its proclamation it has been an inspiration to freemen everywhere. The same high principles stated in this early constitution of Poland remain the goals to which the Polish people even now aspire.

Constitutional reform in 1791 was not an easy step for the Government of Poland. The roots of democratic government go back a long way in Poland's history. The first complete code of laws ever to exist in Christian Europe was established by Poland in 1347. Then, as early as 1430, laws were passed which safeguarded the security of the individual. Those laws were later broadened, and eventually became the basis of political and religious liberties in Poland.

Before the constitution of 1791 could be formulated, there was much deliberation in the Polish Diet on what its character should be. The constitution when completed contained many reforms reflecting the advanced thinking of the leaders of the liberty-loving Polish people. The people rejoiced and the world rejoiced at Poland's great progress. But Poland's joy was short-lived, for her strong neighbor, Russia, invaded her territory shortly thereafter. Liberty was submerged for many years in Poland, although the ideals burned even more brightly in the hearts of the people.

As a condition of the treaty of peace bringing about the end of World War I, America's President Woodrow Wilson called for the establishment of a new

and democratic government in Poland. This new freedom took effect on March 17, 1921, but this, too, proved to be but a brief period for democratic growth. For Poland was the first country to feel the weight of Hitler's aggression. Even though she knew full well that this resistance meant her obliteration, Poland courageously stood up against the Nazis and later against the Russians.

Today freedom is completely suppressed in Poland. If the Polish people dared to take note of this occasion of the anniversary of their constitution, they would most certainly risk imprisonment and death. And it is simply because this constitution is a document of liberty and freedom that it cannot be celebrated.

We know that the overwhelming majority of the Polish people are today unyieldingly opposed to Communist domination, they are our friends and allies, even though their Communist leaders are not. We will never recognize as legitimate or permanent that regime whose rule is based on police power, treachery, and brutal conquest. We hope and pray that Poland and the other East European nations may soon take their proud and rightful places as independent nations.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, May 3, which was the 165th anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution of Poland, is known as Poland's Constitution Day.

Once again it becomes our honor to send words of warm and prayerful encouragement to all of the people of Poland who are held captive by the Communists, and whose liberties, as set forth in the Polish Constitution, have been taken from them by force.

But liberty burns brightly in the hearts and souls of all of our friends in Poland. They live for the day when they can again be freemen, enjoying the dignity of man, as stated in their constitution.

It is most appropriate that we repeat the undying and traditional friendship of the people of our country for the people of Poland.

Certainly, the people of Poland have proven to the world their unyielding determination to again attain the status of freemen. Their country has several times been partitioned by more powerful states, and at times Poland has been occupied, but the people of Poland have continued their struggle, in the face of almost incredible adversity. With patriotism, loyalty, and faith they have carried on with increasing determination.

In sending our prayers and encouragement to our friends in Poland, we can well add that America has a profound faith in their final victory.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, May 3 marked another anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared commemorating that event.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HRUSKA

Mr. President, it is an honor to remind the Senate of another milestone in man's eternal struggle for freedom. May 3d is the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791.

Although the Polish Constitution was adopted in the same decade as the United States Constitution and the French Declaration of the Rights of Man, it was not preceded by violent revolution. But, even without a blood bath, the revolution of ideas was no less significant than in France and America.

The Polish King, Stanislas, was a major instigator of the movement to adopt a new constitution. President George Washington noted that "Poland, by the public papers, appears to have made large and unexpected strides toward liberty, which, if true, reflects great honor on the present King, who seems to have been the principal promoter of the business."

The Constitution of 1791 established a constitutional monarchy and parliamentary system similar to that in England. Checks were put on the King by a cabinet which was made responsible to the parliament.

The promise of the Polish Constitution never was given a chance to fulfill. Czarist Russia could not tolerate democracy so near its borders and Catherine the Great ordered her armies into Poland less than a year later. Poland was partitioned and the new constitution abolished—branded a "dangerous novelty."

After 123 years of subjugation, Poland regained her freedom in 1918 but again in 1939, her democracy threatened dictators and was snuffed out in invasions from east and west.

A savage suppression was needed to quell the Poles. The Nazis quartered half-a-million troops in Poland in a futile attempt to keep a powerful underground in check. In the first 20 months of their occupation of Poland, Red Army officers deported more than 1.5 million people to Russian slave labor camps.

The memory of that dangerous novelty—freedom—still burns bright in Poland. New hope comes to enslaved Poles with the Kremlin's de-Stalinization campaign. In trumpeting the crimes of Stalin, the Kremlin tyrants betray the uneasiness of their rule.

Encouraged by Americans of Polish extraction and spearheaded by freedom-loving Poles behind the Iron Curtain, the spirit of the dangerous novelty still lives after 165 years. The flame of freedom will again burn as bright in Poland as it does in the hearts of her countrymen everywhere.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the anniversary of an event which took place 165 years ago is of particular significance to all of us in this country and to the lovers of freedom and justice everywhere.

It was on May 3, 1791, that the people of Poland instituted a constitution which was an expression of the Polish people's belief in individual liberty. Coming as it did only a few short years after the adoption of our own great Declaration of Independence and Constitution, the Polish Constitution was another step forward in the never-ending fight for human liberty. We might particularly note and cherish that principle of the Polish Constitution which states that:

All power in civil society is derived from the will of the people.

We in America continued to fight for and strengthen our democracy through the ensuing years, but the gallant Poles were not so fortunate. Long a battleground of Europe, Poland was repeatedly overrun and subjugated—physically, but not in spirit. The people fought heroically against overwhelming odds on many occasions, and Poland was the first nation in Europe to stand up against the Nazis. It was cruelly betrayed by the Communist dictators, and today Poland suffers under the Russian yoke.

However, the spirit of the Poles as evidenced by the constitution of 1791 has not died. The constitution continues as a symbol of the day when Poland again will be free. And, with the help of God, Poland will again be free.

SUCCESS OF CHEMICAL PROGRESS WEEK IN PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the celebration of Chemical Progress Week in Pennsylvania was most outstanding, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a brief statement which I have prepared on this important subject.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MARTIN ON CHEMICAL PROGRESS WEEK

The growth of our chemical industry in America has been one of the great phenomena of our age, enriching the lives of all of us.

During the week of April 23 to 28, the chemical industry marked Chemical Progress Week for 1956.

The purpose of the week was to make better known to the American people the significance of chemistry and the chemical industry in the terms of the daily life of the individual.

The week was especially successful in Pennsylvania and I take this opportunity of congratulating the chemical industry.

The State chairman for the activities was Mr. George M. Walker, executive vice president of Koppers Co., Inc., Pittsburgh.

It was brought out that—

1. Sales of chemicals and allied products have grown fivefold since 1939.

2. The chemical industry, in terms of assets, is now the Nation's fourth largest.

3. The chemical industry has created new industries and hundreds of thousands of jobs through the introduction of new synthetic fibers, plastics, rubbers, and chemicals of all kinds.

4. The chemical industry expends over $360 million annually in research.

5. Today over 8,000 different chemical products are available.

6. The chemical industry is the Nation's largest employer of scientific and technically trained people.

7. Pennsylvania ranks fifth in chemical manufacture. The value added by manufacture in Pennsylvania exceeds one-half billion dollars.

8. In 1955 there were 800 chemical plants in the State with payrolls of nearly a quarter billion dollars.

9. In terms of expansion, during the 10-year period ending June 1955, Pennsylvania ranks second in new industrial plant contracts, with total investment of $380 million.

10. Pennsylvania is the most important State in the Union in the production of chemicals from coke-oven byproducts, which go into the making of pharmaceuticals, dyes, plastics, and resins.

COMMENTS BY AMERICAN LEGION IN OPPOSITION TO REPORT OF COMMISSION ON VETERANS' PENSIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I know that my colleagues share concern which I, for one, feel over the implications of the report of the Commission on Veterans' Pensions.

I have always believed that the ex-servicemen of our Nation are entitled to the program of rights which a grateful Congress and people have conferred upon them. I believe this program should be strengthened, rather than weakened.

As an indication of the deep feelings on the subject of the Commission by America's largest and greatest veterans' organization, I ask unanimous consent that a release from the American Legion's national public relations division be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

WASHINGTON, May 9.—The American Legion charged before the House Veterans Affairs Committee today that the Bradley Commission's report on veterans pensions is a "scare document * * * and in many material respects factually unsound."

Donald R. Wilson of Clarksburg, W. Va., a past Legion national commander and chairman of a special Legion group appointed to study the report, told committee members that the Bradley report should be "promptly relegated to the obscurity it deserves."

He said the report is filled with "cliches, self-contradictions, inaccuracies, looseness of expression, nonsequiturs, statistical monstrosities, and thrilling discoveries of the obvious. It is a disappointing piece of work."

The Wilson committee was apointed in April 1955 by then National Commander Seaborn P. Collins, of Las Cruces, N. Mex., to study the same subjects covered by the Bradley Commission. The present national commander, J. Addington Wagner, of Battle Creek, Mich., continued the committee when he assumed office last October.

Wilson accused the Bradley Commission of being "tragically preoccupied with extolling the virtues of the goddess of social security, not for what it is but for what it may be at some indeterminate time in the future." He said:

"It is on this altar that the veteran is to be stripped of the dignity of a special status which throughout the history of our country has always been accorded to him.

"Now, under a new concept, arbitrarily and unnecessarily announced by a mere commission of the executive branch of the Government, the veteran is told that since he performed no special service, the Government owes him no obligation in his declining years other than to give him a general right, if properly employed, to buy and pay for social security like any other citizen."

Wilson said the presumptuous nature of the Bradley report is practically an insult to the Congress which has developed the veterans program over 150 years.

He said "there is nothing" in the report which should deter the House Veterans' Affairs Committee from taking action on pending veterans' legislation now before it. Last month the Committee announced it had put off action on pending legislation until after it had made a study of the Bradley report.

(A Legion bill in committee (H. R. 7886) proposes raising monthly disability benefit rates, increasing income limitations, and making veterans age 65 and over automatically eligible for payments if they meet income limitations.)

He said the report is "discouraging and dangerous—discouraging because it belittles the contribution of the veteran to his country—dangerous because, by stealth cloaked in compliments, it exalts the welfare state and denies that there is any room in such a state for according to the veteran a special dignity because of service to country."

Wilson said the most radical departure the Bradley Commission has made from the philosophy of veterans' benefits is their contention that military service is an obligation of citizenship and should not be considered a basis for future Government benefits. He said:

"It is in making this statement that the Bradley Commission has cruelly departed from the philosophy of veterans benefits and has laid the foundation for a wholesale assault on the veterans' program."

Wilson said, however, the Legion recognizes that service in the Armed Forces discharges an obligation of citizenship. But, he added, the fact which has escaped the Bradley Commission is that there are some who discharged this obligation and others who have not. He said:

"So long as we maintain our Armed Forces, so long as we call them defenders of the country and so long as we subject them to the necessary disciplines and deprivations which an adequate military establishment must demand, we have created for them special obligations, duties, hazards or responsibilities which set them apart from the role which they would play as citizens alone.

"By reason of their peculiar sacrifices and hazards, they become a class of citizens select in nature and distinguished by peculiar service. No governmental commission, no amount of sophistry can deprive them of the special status."

Wilson said much of the Bradley report is a concentrated effort to establish a preconceived notion that the social-security program has become an adequate substitute for veterans' pensions.

"This is a significant and hostile part of the report," he said. It reflects little sound or honest thinking, but it does mirror the antagonism long noted in certain sections of the administrative branch of the Government toward veterans' programs."

He said, for example, social security is merely a form of compulsory insurance to which an employed must contribute. Veterans' pensions, he said, are not based upon a contractual relationship with the Federal Government.

"The veteran, who as any other citizen, has fulfilled his social-security contract, is entitled, as a matter of law, to receive the benefits of that contract. It is a tragic error to say that he is entitled to nothing more."

Wilson pointed out that the Bradley Commission recommended that social-security benefits should be considered as income that would count in determining a veterans need for pension purposes. He said:

"It is not funny that a distinguished Commission proposes that the law be changed to make it what it already is."

Wilson said the American Legion is concerned with the Bradley Commission's intimation that the Government has discharged its entire obligation to the non-service-connected disabled veteran through education, training, and readjustment programs.

He said the Government has an acknowledged, continuing obligation where need exists," and charged the Bradley Commission with being factually in error in saying these programs have eliminated need.

"So long as need exists there is a void for pensions to fill," Wilson said. "No amount of Bradley Commission statistics will change this concept."

He said, however, that because of these programs the numbers of veterans in need will be fewer, and hence, the Commission's general pension scare is considerably discredited.

NEED OF ADEQUATE AIR SERVICE FOR THE NEW ENGLAND AREA

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, on May 3, there appeared in the Houlton Pioneer Times, of Houlton, Maine, an excellent editorial entitled "A New England Issue," concerning the need of adequate air service for the New England area. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

A NEW ENGLAND ISSUE

The entire New England States area has an interest and a concern in the outcome of the appeal made by Northeast Airlines to have set aside the adverse decision of a CAA examiner on its petition to extend its service southward from its present New York City terminus, to Miami, Fla., and to substitute therefor affirmative action on its original application.

This interest and concern has nothing to do with any bias in favor of air carriers as opposed to other means of transportation. Rather it should be, in our judgment, construed as an objection to what appears very much like discrimination against the New England States. Most of us will now agree that airlines, as a factor in the transportation of humans as well as freight, are here to stay.

Northeast is the only airline that serves all of New England. As such its successful operation and the reasonable expansion of its services can have a considerable influence on the economy of this area as well as being incidental to the normal industrial and commercial progress of these six States.

One of the exhibits which might well have been given more consideration than it apparently was was the fact that Northeast, of all the airlines petitioning for the Florida run, was the only line which had ordered a large fleet of airplanes especially for use on this extended run. This should have been taken as convincing evidence of the determination of the carrier to give the utmost in service to its patrons and its willingness to back up its confidence to compete successfully, with the investment of a staggering number of dollars.

The seasonal factor was another sound argument which seemingly received little attention. Northeast operates on a peak schedule basis during the summer months but its loads per plane are considerably smaller in the winter season. Extension of its lines to Florida would have enabled the line to achieve greater operating stability by being able to shift planes from southern runs to northern runs, and vice versa, when the demands of the season dictated. The effect on net earnings of such an arrangement is obvious.

As we understand it, Northeast, like many other airlines, is the recipient of substantial Government subsidy, probably through mail contracts. Its limited operation thus far has made this necessary in order to maintain its service in its area of origin. If it continues to be confined to that same area, it is evident the subsidy will also have to be maintained. However it is reliably reported that the extension of its line to Florida might be expected to make a material difference in its overall financial picture, with the result that the subsidy might possibly not be needed.

There were many other angles to the appeal which it is hoped will induce the entire CAA board to reverse the decision of its examiner and award the franchise to Northeast who, in our opinion, of all the petitioning carriers, made out a stronger case. This, of course, in addition to the normal desire to see New England fairly treated and not either bypassed or ignored.

SOCIAL SECURITY FOR LAWYERS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the Senate will soon consider a revision of

portions of the Social Security Act. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an address entitled "Social Security for Lawyers," delivered recently by my colleague from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] before the Order of the Coif, in Omaha, Nebr. My colleague formerly served on the Ways and Means Committee in the House of Representatives; and in the 83d Congress he was chairman of the subcommittee on social security legislation. His address is a very well prepared one, and I believe it will be helpful in connection with our consideration of revision of the Social Security Act, which shortly will be before the Senate.

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

SOCIAL SECURITY FOR LAWYERS

(Speech of Senator CARL T. CURTIS before the Order of Coif, Omaha, Nebr., October 7, 1955)

In discussing the question, "Social Security for Lawyers," it is not my purpose to present an argument for or against the establishment of a national social-security system in the United States. To present a brief, and to make an oral argument, either lauding or condemning the enactment of the Social Security Act of 1935, and subsequent amendments which have extended the system to most of our population, would be to engage in a moot question.

The Social Security Act was passed. Its burdens now extend to practically all our population. Its benefits have been committed to a great portion of our population. Our economy has been called upon to bear the load of a social-security program. All occupations are now covered by social security, except dentists, lawyers, doctors, and policemen and firemen, and other governmental employees who have their retirement system.

In my opinion, there are many shortcomings in our present social-security system. I am not championing the cause of social security, or additional social programs of any kind to be carried on by the Federal Government. The word "extension" of social security is a two-pronged word. It raises two questions. The one question is, should our social-security system be expanded to include more benefits, higher benefits, disability benefits, compulsory health insurance, and all of the other programs that would add up to what has been called cradle to the grave security or the welfare state. My answer to that question on expansion of social security in that direction is "No." To amplify adequately that "No" would call for not only another speech but several speeches.

The other question is, should the social-security program which we now have, which already covers the great majority of our people, be extended to that very small minority of our population not now so covered? In answering this question, we must remember that social security consists of both burdens and benefits. Since our social-security system is not one whereby the individual pays for his own benefits, the cost falls on all producers. If our economy must carry the burdens of a social-security program, its benefits should be available to all occupational groups.

It should be borne in mind that many valid criticisms can be made of our social-security system. It is lacking from the standpoint of sound financing. The question of trust funds is generally misunderstood. The cost of our social-security system is going to be very, very heavy 40 or 50 years from now. It is a political system and just before the last several elections, the Congress has raised the benefits and usually provided for new and additional benefits. There is nothing on the horizon that would indicate that Congress will not continue to so legislate just before future elections even at the risk of acting irresponsibly.

But let us turn our attention back to the question of whether or not our present social security system should be extended to lawyers, and to dentists and doctors. Can we stop unsound trends in social security and bring about desired reforms in the program by withholding social security from lawyers, doctors, and dentists and by continuing social security coverage for our editors, architects, corporation executives and, generally, all other groups? I think not. It is not that simple. The problems in social security are the problems of all the American people and deserve the serious and immediate consideration of all the people.

The Social Security Act contains a number of titles. Title 2 of the act is called "Old Age and Survivors Insurance," and it is referred to as OASI. Usually when individuals are talking about the general term of social security, they are referring to title 2, which is the OASI program.

Old Age and Survivors Insurance (OASI) is not insurance. It is a system whereby a social benefit is paid to the aged and the orphans. These benefits are paid by a special tax on employees and employers and on the self-employed. At the present, the tax is 2 percent on both employer and employee, and 3 percent on the self-employed on wages and earnings up to $4,200 per year.

A beneficiary or an individual who will become a beneficiary in the next several years has paid or will pay only a small portion of the cost of his benefit. The benefits are largely paid by the young and middle aged. For this reason, coverage under social security of any group cannot be extended on a voluntary basis to the individuals. All must be brought in under the system to make it more workable.

The social security tax is imposed upon the first $4,200 paid in wages or earned as self-employment income. Under existing law, the rate of tax is 2 percent until 1960 on wages with a like amount to be paid by the employer. For the 5 years following 1960, the rate goes up to 2½ percent, or a total of 5 percent. The total tax rate on employer and employee from 1965 to 1969 will be 6 percent, from 1970 to 1974 7 percent, and for 1975 and thereafter 8 percent. The self-employed, which would include lawyers, were they to be covered, is one and one-half times the employee rate, or three-fourths of the total employee-employer rate. These rates are, of course, subject to change by the Congress at any time.

Benefits are paid out not in a flat amount, but are based upon the average wage or average self-employment income, with a provision for dropping out any 4 years since 1951 in determining that average.

Individuals to whom social-security coverage was extended before they were advanced in age, are required to be under social security for a period of 10 years to be what is referred to as fully insured. Those who are already advanced in years when social security is extended to them are required to be covered for a period less than 10 years which varies to as little as, in the case of the self-employed, 2 years. The spouse of a social security primary beneficiary, on reaching the age of 65, is entitled to a benefit of 50 percent of the primary benefit. Upon the death of a primary beneficiary, the widow, if 65, receives three-fourths of the primary benefit.

OASI also provides for survivor benefits. Upon the death of a person covered by social security, a benefit is paid to the widow and children until the youngest child reaches 18 years of age. Benefits are then discontinued, but are resumed for the widow when she reaches the age of 65, if she has not remarried.

The average benefit paid to an aged couple in February 1955 was $112.50 a month. The total expected value of such a benefit is estimated to be about $17,200. This benefit might be paid by reason of as little as $65 being paid in taxes by the husband and a like amount by his employer. The most that the husband could have paid in taxes for this benefit is about $425 with a like amount by his employer.

If OASI were to be extended to lawyers, based on existing law, a young lawyer now 25 years of age, earning $4,200 per year, would pay $3,550 in taxes in the next 40 years, and if he retires at the age of 65, according to present law, the benefits to be received would have a total expected value of $28,460. A lawyer now 40 years of age would pay in the next 25 years $4,725 in taxes, if he was 55 years of age at the present he would in the next 10 years pay $1,418 in taxes, a 62-year old lawyer would only pay in $378 in taxes in the next 2 years, and a 65-year old lawyer would have to pay in a total of $252 over a period of 2 years. The total expected value of the benefits in each case, including the wife's benefits, would be the same; to wit, $28,460. These figures are arrived at by using averages and are based on the United States white male and female life tables for 1949 and 1951 and, of course, are based on existing law which is always subject to change.

Were we to extend social security to lawyers right now and the lawyer continued to practice, earning at least $4,200 a year until he was 70 years of age and then retired, the total amounts paid in in taxes would be as follows: for the lawyer at age 25 $9,765, age 40 $4,985, age 55 $2,360, age 62 $1,003, and for age 65 $662. This, of course, is because he would continue to pay taxes for a period of 5 years longer. His monthly or annual benefits would be the same, but the total number of years that he will receive those benefits will be 5 years less. Consequently, the average benefit for a lawyer and his wife who would retire at age 70, based on these same figures, would be $22,450.

Of interest to younger lawyers are the benefits paid under OASI in the case of their death, should they die leaving a widow and small children. The amounts of these benefits vary, but I can give you a typical case based, of course, on existing law and upon averages.

If an individual comes under OASI at age 25, earns $4,200 per year, and dies at age 30, leaving a widow and 1 child, age 1 month, and 1 child age 1 year, they will receive a benefit until the youngest child is 18 years of age. If the widow lives to be 65 and does not remarry, she will then be eligible to draw a benefit. These survivor benefits will have an average total expected value of $45,200. The total taxes paid by the deceased husband, if a self-employed lawyer, would be $630.

In any consideration of social security, there are a few basic statistics that are helpful. The average life expectancy of a man aged 65 is 12 years. The life expectancy of women aged 65 is 15 years.

As of the first of this year, we had approximately 14 million individuals over 65 years of age. Of these 14 million, about 5⅓ million were OASI beneficiaries.

As of the first of this year, there was in the trust fund in cash and bonds a little over $20½ billion. By the time it is paid out, there will be an interest accrual bringing the total up to about $22 billion. However, to pay the future benefits of those beneficiaries already on the rolls as of January 1 last will require an estimated sum of about $34 billion. In other words, there is no money or bonds in the trust fund to pay the individuals who will reach retirement age tomorrow or any time in the future, or to pay the benefits of those already eligible for benefits who have not applied. These figures are based on the assumption that Con-

gress will never again raise the benefits, which assumption I do no choose to follow.

In citing figures for consideration in reference to social security for lawyers, we have dealt with the case of lawyers making as much as $4,200 a year. If their income is less than that, the benefits, of course, will be less. They can qualify for benefits if their self-employed income would be as much as $400 per year. In other words, were we to extend social security as of now to lawyers, a lawyer who is 65 or nearly so could, by earning $400 annually for a period of 2 years, qualify for benefits. In that case, he would pay a total tax of $24. He would then be eligible for the minimum benefits of $30 a month, with half that amount for his wife if she was 65. Based on averages, the combined benefits for the beneficiary and his wife would have a total expected value of $8,400.

The proposition is often advanced that the Jenkins-Keogh bill should be passed for lawyers and others in lieu of social security. The Jenkins-Keogh proposal is one which would give a present tax benefit for current income set aside for one's later retirement. It is a proposal with much merit. It is not a substitute for social security. In substance, it is designed to permit individuals to do for themselves tax-wise what corporations can do for their officers and employees, which is in addition to social-security coverage.

In closing, we return to the question as to whether or not social security should be extended to lawyers. Inasmuch as the cost of our social-security program is a burden upon all of our economy we cannot deny the benefits to a few selected groups. Inasmuch as the cost of benefits are not at the present time and for a long time to come paid by those who receive them, there is no sound argument for not requiring all producers in the country to share their just portion of the load.

There are some very practical reasons why social security should be extended to lawyers. Many lawyers are already covered by the program. If a lawyer is a director or an officer in a bank or building and loan company, or some other corporation, his fees received for such services are considered wages under the Social Security Act and he is covered. Other laywers are already covered by the program if they serve a client on a salary basis in the capacity of an employee. In many communities practicing lawyers also are abstracters, and in some cases insurance agents. Income from these two sources is covered by social security, as well as the executors' and administrators' fees. Thus we have a situation where part of our lawyers are covered by a program that does not cover them all. To extend coverage to the lawyers would not only add to the workability of the program, but it would provide equal treatment to all.

And may I add a few general truths that must never be lost sight of:

1. The greatest security that can be maintained for the American people is to have a sound and solvent Government.

2. More public enlightenment, more restraint, and more concern for the future taxpayers are basic reforms that are sorely needed in social-security financing and in governmental financing generally.

3. The Government cannot give an individual anything. All the money the Government has is that which it takes away from its citizens.

CELEBRATION OF BOOTSTRAP WEEK IN PUERTO RICO

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, this week, in Puerto Rico, the Puerto Ricans are observing what they call Bootstrap Week, to celebrate the opening of the 400th new industry since the launching of what the gallant and imaginative Governor of that island, Luis Muñoz-Marín, named "Operation Bootstrap."

I think we on the mainland and we in the Congress should pause to take note of the signal accomplishments which have been achieved by the initiative, energy, and ingenuity of the government of Puerto Rico and the leaders of the Puerto Rican people, in cooperation with businessmen on the mainland and businessmen in Puerto Rico, too.

Just think of it. Four hundred new industries have been started in this little island alone since Operation Bootstrap was begun a little more than 10 years ago. Puerto Rico has surely raised itself by its own bootstraps. A very considerable number of new jobs have been created; but even more important than the actual jobs created has been the entire economic impact on the island. Almost everyone in Puerto Rico has benefited. Certainly not the least of the benefits of this program has been the impact on the morale of the people. Some unemployment and some economic distress still exist in Puerto Rico. The standard of living is much lower than I consider desirable for any area under the American flag. But there has been a forward movement, characterized by a dynamic spirit. There are those who laughed at "Operation Bootstrap"; but I think that the entire Carribean area and all of Latin America have taken note of the forward strides which have occurred in Puerto Rico as a result of Operation Bootstrap.

The Puerto Rican people have reason to be proud. As a Senator from New York, which contains several hundred thousand people of Puerto Rican birth and descent, I want to say here on the floor of the Senate: "Congratulations to the people of Puerto Rico and to their leadership, and especially to Governor Muñoz-Marín. I will be glad to see the infant industries which have started in Puerto Rico continue to grow and to multiply, so that the standard of living in that island will rise steadily higher."

NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF DEATH OF FRIEDRICH SCHILLER

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, yesterday we commemorated the anniversary of the death of Johann Christoph Friedrich von Schiller, the great German poet, dramatist and historian. We do well, in this day and time, when tyranny covers half the earth, to recall Friedrich Schiller and to repeat for all the world his call to embrace freedom and to turn away from despotism and corruption.

Before all else Schiller is remembered as one of the greatest playwrights of the European tradition. Yet he stood out in the minds of those of his own day who knew him and who read and saw his plays, as the symbol of liberty and of individual freedom. The decadence of the contemporary political and social world of the Europe of the late 18th century distressed Schiller. He condemned the rulers for their despotism and the aristocracy for their political and moral corruption. In strong, impassioned language he expressed his lofty ideals of the genuine worth of mankind.

Schiller sought to express himself first in philosophy and later in the art of his drama and poetry, but always with complete intellectual integrity. His direct truthfulness makes him the most straightforward and open of writers.

His conviction of the ultimate worth of the individual never allowed him to be cynical. For, to Schiller, the esthetic form was not of value in itself; he made use of it as an expression of his deep moral concern for the future of mankind. He urged his fellow men to adopt a responsible attitude toward life and to hold to their values in spite of all the disillusionment of individual experience and in spite of all the reverses in the history of mankind.

Thomas Carlyle has called Schiller's play "William Tell" the celebration of the first arrival of freedom in our modern world. Schiller's love of freedom and his sense of moral responsibility were his guiding principles. His accent on liberty gave his lifework a universal ideal. It has many times been said that Friedrich Schiller contributed in a major way to the forward march of the forces of liberty.

We know that Schiller strongly influenced the German people of his own day. Even in the early day in which he lived, Schiller called for the unification of the German states. He, of course, did not live to see the fruition of this desire and if he could see his country today, divided, and perhaps more dangerously than ever before, he would surely be saddened by the sight.

For today half of Germany is free and half is enslaved.

We know that it is only a question of time before the nation can be unified and completely free. For the German people have not forgotten the call of such men as Friedrich Schiller to individual liberty and unity.

It was not long after Schiller died that my own father came to America from Germany. He brought with him the ideals of individual freedom and dignity which Friedrich Schiller helped to spread in Germany and abroad in that time.

Today we in the United States should pledge ourselves, as we observe this anniversary of Schiller's death, to the ideals both for Germany and ourselves, which Schiller breathed into his immortal works.

In terms of the issues of this day, this means that we should support the unification of Germany as a free democratic nation and at the same time support the cause of liberty and of international brotherhood which Schiller so nobly typified. We must ever seek to strengthen all free nations in common bonds of brotherhood.

ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE AT CONVENTION OF B'NAI B'RITH

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, last night, at the banquet of the triennial convention of the Supreme Lodge of B'nai B'rith, the Secretary of State, Hon. John Foster Dulles, delivered an important address on the subject of our foreign affairs, particularly with relation to the situation in the Middle East.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in full in the body of the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN FOSTER DULLES, SECRETARY OF STATE, AT THE BANQUET OF THE TRIENNIAL CONVENTION OF THE SUPREME LODGE OF B'NAI B'RITH (INTERNATIONAL) WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 8, 1956

I greatly appreciate the opportunity to speak before this organization. It stands for human values which are honored wherever men believe in the spiritual nature of man. You believe in the dignity of the human individual and in the brotherhood of man without regard to race or religion. You find in your religion basic truths which are also enunciated by all the world's great religions.

The law of your prophets was "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," and that was accepted by Jesus when He said "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets." And the Buddha said "Hurt not others in ways that you yourself would find hurtful;" and the prophet of Islam taught "No one is a believer until he desires for his brother that which he desires for himself."

It is these fundamental truths taught by all the great religions that your organization practices. You engage in acts of compassion. In doing so, you are helping to lay the only dependable foundation for the world society of peace and justice for which we strive.

I have just returned yesterday afternoon from a meeting in Paris of the foreign ministers of the 15 North Atlantic Treaty countries. That treaty and its organization called NATO is one of the means designed to promote peace with justice. So far it has sought to do so primarily by setting up a military shield which would deter armed aggression and behind which moral principles could take root and grow strong and bear good fruit. We primarily dealt with the question of whether or not our countries were, in fact, doing all that they could or should to develop their own unity behind the military shield which was the initial and, so far, the dominant purpose of NATO.

I want to talk primarily about this problem of developing the Atlantic community. But before getting on to that I will mention one other topic of great interest to all Americans at this time which was discussed at the NATO Council meeting—that is the situation in the Near East.

That area is of intimate concern to the Atlantic community. For many generations, indeed for many centuries, the western nations have had close ties with the Near East. In recent years there has developed a large measure of economic interdependence affecting the very nature of the daily lives of the people of both areas.

The members of the NATO Council were acutely conscious of the problem of maintaining peace in the Middle East. When the Palestine mandate came to an end, the United States and other western nations supported United Nations consideration on the future of Palestine which resulted in the creation of the State of Israel. As members of the United Nations, we all intend that the State of Israel shall be maintained in its independence. Also we want friendly political, cultural and economic relations with all of the nations of the area on a basis of impartiality. We do not believe that these goals are incompatible.

There was grave concern that the Soviet Union had sought to further its ends by playing fast and loose with peace in the area. There was the feeling that that very fact made it more important for the Western nations to act with firm deliberation and with care.

There was recognition at Paris that wide discrepancies in armed strengths would be likely to create tensions. There was also a conviction that the safety of the countries of the Middle East is not to be found in an arms race, particularly one which tended to pit great world powers against each other.

It seemed particularly important to avoid a situation where great military powers confronted each other, by proxy, under conditions which would engage their respective prestige in a manner ominous for peace, not only within the area but possibly throughout the world.

There was a belief that reliance should, above all, be placed upon the processes of the United Nations, and that we can, perhaps, do so now with somewhat greater confidence, since the Soviet Union seems increasingly aware of the dangerous consequences of reckless action, and has indicated that it too would be prepared to support a solution through the United Nations.

We all welcomed the active part now being taken by the United Nations Security Council to preserve the integrity of the armistice agreements and we are encouraged by the fact that the Secretary General's mission to the area seems to have produced some initial positive results.

We believe that solid reliance can be placed upon the principles of the United Nations Charter and that no nation of the area which conforms internationally with those principles will stand alone. President Eisenhower made it clear, in his statement of April 9, 1956, that so far as the United States is concerned there could not be aggression with impunity.

Past efforts to move toward a settlement of the substantive issues in the Middle East have encountered serious obstacles. The task remains complex and no real solutions will be easily come by. But progress there is as necessary as it is difficult and there are grounds for hope that it may be possible to maintain the momentum now established by Mr. Hammarskjold's current efforts.

Let me turn now to the problem which particularly concerned us in Paris and that was the development of the Atlantic community into something more solid than is now the case.

All who know and share western civilization can take great pride in its accomplishments. It was based upon the Judeo-Christian conception of the spiritual nature of man. Out of this faith came individual resourcefulness and a sense of mission which brought much of good to much of the world.

But when we think with pride of what western civilization has accomplished, we must also think with regret of the fact that it has never yet found the way to live within itself at peace. If today the West is seriously challenged by believers in an atheistic creed, it is largely because two world wars, coming in quick succession, drained off the lifeblood of our finest and bravest youth and gravely impaired the economic strength of the West. Also the West has lost in moral authority because while professing a religion of peace it has not found a sure way to make peace a permanent reality within its own membership.

Since the end of World War II great strides have been taken to create unity at various levels within the Atlantic community. All these measures have been taken within the framework of the United Nations Charter which recognizes the inherent right of collective self-defense and which encourages development along regional lines.

The broadest effort at unity is represented by the North Atlantic Treaty itself, now embracing 15 nations, including 2 from this hemisphere, Canada and the United States. Under this treaty, great progress has been made, particularly in military terms. There is an integration of military forces on the Continent of Europe, including contributions from Great Britain, Canada, and the United States, the like of which has never been seen before. The newly developing forces of the Federal Republic of Germany will share that integration.

The military unity under NATO is supplemented by the new (1954) treaty for Western European Union which unites France, Germany, Italy, the United Kingdom, and the three Benelux countries under a system for limitation of armament and of armament supervision and control which is the most thorough and extensive that has ever yet been put into force. Thus, on the military front there has developed a unity and common organization which is of immense value and which has produced a morale which is itself of great unifying value.

In addition to these efforts on the military front, there is the Coal and Steel Community whereby France, Germany, Italy, and the three Benelux countries deal with the production of coal and steel. This is the first time that European nations have subordinated national powers in favor of a truly European organization.

There is the Council for Europe, where ministers and parliamentarians of European countries regularly meet for discusison of matters other than defense. There is the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC), and the European Payments Union, which contributes greatly to easing trade as between the members. These are some of the many steps which have been taken to establish unity within all or part of the Atlantic Community.

But at Paris last week we had to ask ourselves whether what has been done is good enough. There has been a marked development of the consultative process. But it still remains the fact that matters of vital importance to the Atlantic Community are not being given timely consideration on a community basis.

I have already referred to the problem of the Middle East which had never been seriously discussed by the North Atlantic Treaty Council, even though the future of Western Europe is deeply engaged by developments there.

We have seen in North Africa where serious disturbances within a part of the North Atlantic Treaty area have brought about a shifting of forces from continental Europe which alters the capability of defense as against a possible aggression from Eastern Europe.

There is the problem of Cyprus which deeply concerns three parties to the North Atlantic Treaty, the United Kingdom, Greece, and Turkey.

I do not suggest that any of these problems should today be made a matter of common consideration around the NATO Council table. At the point to which these particular problems have now developed, there can reasonably be questions as to whether consultation is or is not desirable. Neither do I imply any criticism of the past, for there has never been agreement or understanding that problems of this type should be discussed. But surely the Atlantic Community is not adequately organized if matters of this nature, which could shake the community to its foundation, develop over the years without any effort at broad consultation between the members.

Then there is the problem of the reunification of Germany. That subject was discussed by the NATO Foreign Ministers at special meetings which were held just prior to the Geneva "Summit" Conference with the Soviet rulers and before the Four Power Foreign Ministers' Conference which followed. But, as we know, the Geneva agreement by Messrs. Bulganin and Khrushchev on "the reunification of Germany by means of free elections" has been ignored by them, and they now unashamedly continue the division of Germany as though they had

never agreed to the principle of reunification. Most of the Western Powers have said, and rightly said, that there cannot be lasting peace and security in Europe unless Germany is reunified. But has the Atlantic Community as a whole sufficiently focused world opinion on the moral aspects of this problem?

Then we have the problem of the relation of the Atlantic community to the newly independent nations of the world. They now represent upwards of 650 million people composing 18 independent nations and more non-self-governing peoples are at the threshold of independence or knocking at the door. What has happened is an amazing tribute to the basic beliefs of the West in the rights of man and in government by consent. Nevertheless, it would be a great mistake to conclude that because these newly independent peoples have peacefully won their independence from the western powers that relations are in all respects good. In many cases there remain unresolved problems between the newly independent countries and the colonial powers. Above all, there remain barriers in terms of sensitiveness to racial arrogance which has at times been practiced by some persons of the West.

One-third of the world's population is ruled by Communist despots. Another third are new nations which are today the special target of the predatory tactics of international communism which seeks to stimulate the prejudices and to appeal to the aspirations of these peoples.

The members of the Atlantic community have so much to offer in the way of genuine brotherhood, they can do so much to strengthen the political and economic institutions of the newly independent peoples, that it is tragic that the outcome is anywhere in doubt. Certainly, as was often said at our Paris meeting last week, NATO, until now primarily military in its nature, is no proper organ for implementing political and economic policies between the Atlantic community and the newly independent countries.

But the community does contain within its own membership nations which themselves have been through the experience of being colonies and winning their independence. Also it contains colonial powers who have demonstrated and are illustrating great statesmanship in promoting evolution from colonialism to independence. Surely the members of such a community could generate greater dynamism to help, in acceptable ways, to sustain political and economic independence elsewhere. Also we should be able to help to find relationships expressive of true brotherhood and recognition of the fact that other civilizations than our own have immense values. We perhaps have material and technical things to give. They also have things to give. And if we are wise enough to perceive and to take what other civilizations have to offer, the balance struck between us will not be one-sided by any true measure of values, and will be consistent with the equal dignity of all the parties.

It may be said that the North Atlantic Treaty members already have a permanent council where problems can be discussed which vitally affect the welfare and integrity of the Atlantic community. There is a council composed of permanent representatives who are men of stature and great ability. In theory, they could discuss any problems of common concern. The fact is that, as they are now established, their discussions often have been merely reports of actions already taken or decisions already made. That is because the governments concerned have never taken the basic decision to have a council to which problems affecting the Atlantic community would normally and regularly be brought. If that decision were taken, it would greatly alter the entire character of the community relationship. It would not require different personalities at the council table, but a different approach and far greater "depth" in terms of political advisers than is now the case. But above all is the basic decision to take seriously the unity of the Atlantic community and seek to promote it, not by supergovernment but by common counsel.

Such a decision has not yet been taken, except in military terms.

This was the problem which was most actively discussed at Paris during the past week. In that connection we discussed the Soviet threat; the acts of violence which had marked Soviet foreign policy until recently and the latest changes in that policy. We recorded the fact that it was our joint military efforts which had successfully deterred Soviet aggression in Europe and contributed to the adoption by the Soviet Government of the so-called policy of coexistence. Our joint communique said that to the extent that this Soviet policy involves a certain easing of tension and the admission by the Government of the Soviet Union that war is not inevitable, it is welcomed by the Atlantic Powers. But also we recorded our joint conclusion that the reasons which gave rise to the Atlantic military alliance have not disappeared and that the Western Powers cannot relax their vigilance while many outstanding problems have not been solved and when there is no effective disarmament plan. Therefore, we said, "Security remains a basic problem and the Atlantic Powers must continue to give priority to the maintenance of their unity and strength. However, present prospects seem to leave scope for further peaceful initiatives on the part of the Atlantic Powers."

Then we went on to record what may prove to be a historic decision. The communique said that "the Atlantic Council considered it timely and useful for the members of the Atlantic Community to examine actively further measures which might be taken at this time to advance more effectively their common interests." And the foreign ministers went on to designate three of their members to advise "on ways and means to improve and extend cooperation in nonmilitary fields and to develop greater unity within the Atlantic Community." The three ministers were asked to submit their report as soon as possible.

It is significant of the importance attached to this matter that the task of exploration was given to, and assumed by, three foreign ministers themselves—the Foreign Ministers of Canada, Italy, and Norway. They are each men of wide experience, each of whom personally believes in the development of the Atlantic Community both on a broad base and, within the framework of that broad base, as between groups of members which can in certain respects work together with greater intimacy than can the whole. These three ministers will be conferring with each of the 15 governments during the coming weeks and, in the light of what they learn, will submit a report, perhaps early next fall, which the governments then can further consider from the standpoint of further action.

It would, I think, be prudent to note that there is as yet no clear definition of the concept of closer Atlantic unity. And we could hardly expect acceptance in advance.

The United States perhaps can visualize that concept more readily because of its membership in the Organization of American States. That organization traces its origin back 66 years to the foundation of the Pan American Union. It is not only the oldest but by far the most effective regional organization which has been created. It deals effectively with problems as between its members and has conspicuously done so within the last year or two in relation to the broad threat of international communism, and in relation to particular situations such as those that arose in Guatemala, in Costa Rica and as between Ecuador and Peru. It seeks to develop hemispheric international law.

It is obvious that the Organization of American States, which has developed in a particular environment to deal with problems typical of this hemisphere, cannot usefully be duplicated in detail as regards the Atlantic Community. Each community is distinctive. But the experience which the United States has had, in cooperation with the other American Republics, enables us perhaps to see more clearly the possibilities inherent in the Atlantic Community.

Speaking on April 23 prior to this last meeting of the NATO Council I said, "The North Atlantic Treaty already serves as an indispensable and vital instrument of the Atlantic Community, but the time has come, I believe, to consider whether its organization does not need to be further developed if it is adequately to serve the needs of this and coming generations. If that be the common desire of the NATO member nations, the United States will join eagerly in exploring the possibilities which now beckon us forward."

It is gratifying to report that it is the common desire of the NATO member nations at least to explore these new possibilities. That decision was taken not lightly, but after a discussion which prolonged our meeting of Friday and Saturday into the early hours of Sunday morning. It was recognized by all as being a decision which could be of historic importance, since it could contribute mightily toward erasing what has been the great weakness of the West, namely, its disunity. To erase that disunity, which has given birth to so many tragic consequences, is one of the greatest tasks of postwar statesmanship. Much has already been done. But much remains to be done. And the fact that that task is now being undertaken can give us all grounds for solid satisfaction.

REVERSAL OF ADMINISTRATION'S POSITION ON INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION CONVENTION CONDEMNING FORCED LABOR

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "United States Shifts Stand on Forced Labor." The article, which was published in the New York Times of today, is to the effect that the administration has reversed its position on the proposed convention of the International Labor Organization against forced labor, and that, instead of opposing it, as in the past, it will, according to Secretary Mitchell, now favor it. If this report be true, as I believe it to be, Secretary Mitchell deserves credit for convincing the administration that its former attitude was wrong. I wish to praise Secretary Mitchell most sincerely for his attitude on this subject.

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

UNITED STATES SHIFTS STAND ON FORCED LABOR—WILL BACK ILO CONVENTION CONDEMNING PRACTICE—VICTORY FOR MITCHELL

WASHINGTON, May 8.—The administration reversed its position today and decided to support an International Labor Organization convention condemning forced labor.

James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor, said:

"The United States Government has decided that at the forthcoming conference of the ILO, it will favor an appropriate convention which would outlaw forced labor and which would include a provision specifically prohibiting the products of forced labor in international trade."

Mr. Mitchell's views thus prevailed over those of the State Department. It was believed that the Secretary had taken his case to the White House.

His stand had been strengthened by Democratic pressure in Congress. Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, is sponsoring a resolution calling on the executive branch to exercise leadership in the ILO toward condemning forced labor.

At a hearing April 27 before a Senate Labor Subcommmittee, Francis O. Wilcox, Assistant Secretary of State, said forced labor was not an appropriate subject for treaty-making process. He said the State Department favored an ILO recommendation condemning forced labor.

Mr. Wilcox used the words "convention" and "treaty" interchangeably. Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, the chairman, quarreled over this.

A treaty is subject to ratification by the President and approval by the Senate. But under the ILO constitution, Mr. DOUGLAS noted, the United States has other courses available in the case of a convention.

It may submit the convention to the Senate for approval, to Congress for consideration, or to the States.

Mr. Wilcox told the subcommittee he understood the administration's decision to support a recommendation rather than a convention had been arrived at jointly by the State and Commerce Departments. Secretary Mitchell said later, however, that the subject was still under discussion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. By far the greater share of the credit should go to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who, in January, submitted a resolution calling upon the United States to support the convention against forced labor.

At a public hearing on April 27, the absurdity and falsity of the State Department's position was quite thoroughly exposed.

An Assistant Secretary of State then tried to identify the convention of the International Labor Organization as being identical with a treaty, although the constitution of the International Labor Organization specifically provides that such convention may be submitted to the Senate, the treaty-ratifying body, but also to the Congress, or to the States individually.

As the New York Times article states, the hearing which was held on this subject was very influential in enabling Secretary Mitchell to obtain a reversal of the position of the administration.

I am also happy to announce that the Subcommittee on Labor has reported to the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare a resolution calling upon the Executive to take steps effectively to eliminate forced labor. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] was very helpful in drafting the language of the resolution.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on April 25, 1956, I testified in support of Senate Joint Resolution 117, Senate Concurrent Resolution 75, and Senate Resolution 248, before the Subcommittee on Labor of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. These resolutions would call upon the Government of the United States to exercise leadership in the International Labor Organization to develop and adopt an international convention to outlaw forced labor.

I ask unanimous consent that my testimony be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TESTIMONY BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY ON INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

Mr. Chairman, the committee has before it this morning Senate Joint Resolution 117, which would call upon the Government of the United States "to exercise leadership in the International Labor Organization to develop and adopt an international convention which will effectively outlaw forced labor for political and economic purposes."

It has occurred to me since the introduction of Senate Joint Resolution 117, that an alternative form for expressing the sense of the Congress on this matter, without requiring a Presidential signature or veto, would be a concurrent resolution. Hence the Committee also has before it this morning, Senate Concurrent Resolution 75, which would achieve this purpose. Since the Senate has a special role in the coordination of foreign policy with the Executive, a third alternative might also appeal to this committee—the alternative of a simple Senate resolution. I have introduced this measure recast in that form too, as Senate Resolution 248, so that the committee may have it also for consideration in executive session.

Mr. Chairman, the primary question we must ask ourselves this morning is this: How can the United States expect to assert leadership among the world's forces for freedom, while refusing to cooperate in the efforts of the International Labor Organization to stamp out slave labor? As I shall show during the course of my remarks, almost all interested and articulate groups in America, with the exception of the State Department, enthusiastically support our cooperation with the ILO on this forced labor issue.

The American Federation of Labor initiated the whole international study of this question by its request to the United Nations in 1947. Following that request, a UN–ILO ad hoc committee conducted a comprehensive survey of forced labor conditions around the world. It completed and released a well-documented report in 1953. This report is the authoritative work on the subject. It shows in detail that the Soviet Union and its satellites have used forced labor on a major scale as an instrument of political terrorism and to provide a cheap, organized work force for major economic development programs. We know that Communist China has done the same. The account also shows that workers in Africa have in certain instances been subject to forced labor, but that conditions in many parts of Africa have improved in recent years.

Since its release, this UN–ILO report has been the basis for discussions in the Economic and Social Council in which the United States has joined. It has been the basis of a United Nations General Assembly resolution which we have supported. It has provided the documentation for our anti-forced-labor information programs, a constant element in our overseas broadcasts.

Yet when the ILO now prepares to implement its findings by circulating questionnaires among its member governments preparatory to proposing a new instrument or convention against forced labor, the United States refuses to respond. What kind of leadership is that in our fight for freedom in the world? How does that place us in the eyes of countries looking for leadership against communism, and, even more important, in the eyes of countries still uncommitted, still weighing us in the balance?

Mr. Chairman, I think the administration's foot-dragging on this issue is unpardonable. I think the Congress should so indicate.

The arguments for our participation in the ILO forced-labor convention are manifold, but they can be summarized under three headings: the moral arguments, the legal arguments, and the practical arguments. Let me briefly summarize all three.

MORAL ARGUMENTS

Mr. Chairman, I think the following moral arguments should persuade us to cooperate with the ILO on the forced-labor convention:

1. We must not abdicate our moral leadership in an issue that goes to the heart of the struggle between democracy and communism. Yet the State Department is putting us in the preposterous position of resisting the most practical proposal we have had for dealing with the most brutal of Communist practices, and for focusing a steady international spotlight on this abuse of basic human rights.

2. The United States should assume the leadership in the fight for human dignity if it is to be true to its own tradition. We fought a war to abolish slavery. Our statutes prohibit slave labor now. Indeed we prohibit the sale of goods in the United States which are produced by forced labor anywhere in the world.

3. We cannot ignore 15 million persons in inhuman slave-labor camps behind the Iron Curtain and elsewhere, merely as a gesture of political expediency toward neo-isolationist, right-wing domestic agitators, who entertain misconceived views about the United States Constitution and the treaty power.

4. The Catholic Association for International Peace has recently stated: "Our Government, employer and worker delegations should seize the opportunity to use the ILO as a forum to promote social progress and to stimulate the improvement of social and economic conditions in less-developed countries. It is time to go forward and assume leadership, not to withdraw and allow the Communist bloc to benefit from our default. Our Government should accept, not evade, this responsibility in the matter of conventions on labor standards."

LEGAL ARGUMENTS

Mr. Chairman, I think the following legal arguments should persuade us to cooperate with the ILO on the forced labor convention.

1. If the United States Government really believes that the ILO convention would undermine our constitutional practices, we should oppose, not merely abstain, from the adoptions of such conventions.

2. In the ILO the convention device is the major functions of the ILO conferences and a principal form of international cooperation provided for in the ILO constitution. To say that we cannot participate in the ILO conventions is tantamount to saying that we cannot participate in half of the ILO's work.

3. The ILO constitution provides that conventions dealing with Federal-State matters shall be regarded as recommendations by the United States, and not considered for ratification. This special provision was made for member countries with Federal constitutions to avoid the very problem the advocates of the Bricker amendment people worry about. ILO conventions dealing with subjects within the authority of States or other political subdivisions rather than the Federal Government can also be referred to the States for consideration as recommendations. The ominous fears that an ILO forced labor convention would supplant our domestic legislation and circumvent our constitutional processes are thus unfounded for various reasons, and the administration's acquiescence to pressure from the champions of such arguments is inconsistent and most unfortunate.

4. The State Department position disregards the provisions of the ILO constitution, which was accepted by the President in behalf of the United States on August 2, 1948, pursuant to Public Law 843, 80th Congress, 2d session. That public law authorized the President to accept the 1946 instrument of amendment to the ILO constitution. Congress noticed and approved the ILO constitutional provision providing for conventions to have the status of recommendations on Federal-State matters.

5. Hence under these circumstances, an ILO convention, even if it is adopted, cannot legally proceed further toward fulfillment in the United States unless it is framed in such a manner to be acceptable by us. No alien philosophy can be engrafted on a country without its consent. The ILO has no n eans of imposing its decisions.

6. The American Bar Association's standing committee on peace and law through the United Nations endorses the ILO convention procedure as appropriate.

7. The house of delegates of the American Bar Association has not only endorsed such convention procedure but expressly advocated that the ILO convention framework be used as a model for other participation of the United States in international measures to promote human rights.

8. Inconsistently, the President and the State Department as recently as May 26, 1955, have transmitted 4 conventions and 8 recommendations to the Congress pursuant to our obligations under the ILO Constitution with language expressly agreeing to the ILO constitutional provisions that these conventions and recommendations need not be ratified. The administration now takes the opposite position regarding the forced-labor convention, and refuses to explain why.

PRACTICAL ARGUMENTS

Mr. Chairman, I think the following practical arguments should persuade us to cooperate with the ILO on the forced-labor convention:

1. The whole idea of action through the U. N. and the ILO was an American idea, initiated by the AFL in 1947 and endorsed officially by the United States Government in the Economic and Social Council session in 1949. Forced labor was condemned by U. N. General Assembly vote on a resolution of which we were a sponsor.

2. The evils of forced labor in Communist countries have been a major theme of United States propaganda for years.

3. The U. N.-ILO ad hoc committee issued its comprehensive report on forced labor in 1953. Since then the ILO has been intimately involved with the assignment to implement its findings, and it will have to resolve the issue with or without cooperation from the United States.

4. Every European country, Communist and non-Communist, except France and Poland, has replied favorably to a questionnaire from the ILO inviting support for a forced-labor convention. France and Poland are expected to reply favorably soon. ILO sources believe that the United States will soon be the only major industrial country not on record in favor of a convention outlawing forced labor. Hence there is remarkable unanimity on the need for action, and majority favor the convention method.

5. The governing body of the ILO has decided to place the question of forced labor on the agenda of the 39th session of the International Labor Conference which will meet in June in Geneva. It is imperative that our position be clarified before then.

6. The ILO will support its proposed forced-labor convention by the overwhelming vote of a majority of the world's worker, employer, and government delegates, regardless of the opposition of the United States Government.

7. The United States has nothing to fear internally from a ban on forced labor for economic and political purposes.

8. Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell has expressed himself as favoring United States Government support of an ILO convention against forced labor. Yet he, despite the fact that he has more reason to appreciate the value of such a convention than any other high administration figure, has been constantly overruled. His position has the practical endorsement of all articulate American labor groups.

9. The official administration position generally is supposed to be one of support for increased United States participation in the ILO now that the U. S. S. R. has returned to that organization. Hence this is not the time to dissipate our influence.

10. The administration position here, however, will isolate the United States at the forthcoming ILO conference, disillusion others about our motives and objectives, and foster Soviet leadership. It will undermine our efforts, public and private, to fight Communist influence in the trade union movement everywhere.

11. United States failure to support the adoption of the forced labor convention on alleged legal grounds, will be taken to mean that we do not support the substance of the antiforced labor position, and that we are seeking a technical way of avoiding such a commitment. Soviet propaganda will assiduously foster this impression.

12. Moreover, it is official administration policy to encourage the elimination of substandard conditions elsewhere in the world which may be promoting unfair competition in international trade. The administration attitude towards the ILO convention contradicts this policy.

13. It is official policy to support measures to improve working and living standards in other countries. The administration attitude towards the ILO convention contradicts this policy.

Mr. Chairman, whichever way you look at it, morally, legally, practically, the administration's position on the ILO forced labor convention is indefensible. I endorse the judgment of the New York Times editorial of February 7, 1956, which said in part:

"How ironic for the United States to be on the outside looking in, while the Soviet Union and the Communist block solemnly register their opposition to the forced labor of which they are the world's prime exponents. Whatever the Communist motives for endorsing this convention, what reason could there possibly be for the United States to disapprove or even to drag its feet as it is now obviously doing? * * * How can the State Department put this country in the position of opposing, or blocking, or hesitating on a convention against forced labor? * * * Such a policy may satisfy Brickerism, but it happens to put the United States in an absurd and untenable position."

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, it is not yet too late for the administration to extricate itself from this "absurd and untenable position." If it refuses to do so, at least through the means of the resolution this committee has before it, the Senate or the Congress can register its disagreement and protest, and help reassure the world of the decency of American intentions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the purpose of my resolution is to encourage our Government, particularly the State Department, to take the active leadership in the adoption of a convention outlawing forced labor in the forthcoming conference of the International Labor Organization.

At the time I introduced the resolution, the State Department opposed such action, and it registered its objection to a convention declaring our official position on the outlawing of forced labor.

I participated in the hearings on two occasions. At one hearing I testified. At another hearing I participated in a discussion with the representative of the State Department, the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Wilcox.

I am happy to note this morning that according to an article in the New York Times our Government has now concurred with the position outlined in the resolution I introduced. The headline of the New York Times article reads: "United States Shifts Stand on Forced Labor—Will Back ILO Convention Condemning Practice—Victory for Mitchell."

The Mr. Mitchell referred to in the article, of course, is the Secretary of Labor, James P. Mitchell.

I wish to give Mr. Mitchell all due credit, and I am delighted that he has seen fit to support the convention procedure. At the same time, I should like to suggest that it is my view that the testimony before the committee by a large number of witnesses had a great deal to do with the reversal of what I considered to be an untenable position of our State Department. I am therefore delighted to note that our Government has at long last recognized the need for its exercising leadership in this field, instead of dragging its feet in connection with a very worthy cause.

Mr. President, the controversy over the administration's failure to support the prospective convention against forced labor has brought forth a number of comments in the foreign press. An interesting discussion of the Soviet position is contained in the April 1956 issue of the Journal of the German Federation of Trade Unions. An article written by Sigurd Paulsen has been translated from this journal, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

[Summary translation]

THE ATTITUDE OF THE U. S. S. R. ON FORCED LABOR

(The Gewerkschaftliche Monatshefts (the Journal of the German Federation of Trade Unions) for April 1956 contains the following interesting article on the probable attitude of the U. S. S. R. on the question of forced labor. It is writen by Sigurd Paulsen.)

While the governing body was discussing forced labor in Rome, reports began to come in about strikes in forced labor camps in Russia, mainly because of disappointed hopes of an amnesty after the death of Stalin. This led to certain reforms or concessions by the authorities during 1954.

The Soviet Union has always spoken of "penal labor and labor as a means of education" and has denied the existence of slave or forced labor in that country. It could clearly be foreseen that the efforts of the ILO to secure the complete abolition of forced labor would soon lead to an improvement in Russian labor camps and a reduction in the number of inmates (estimated at some 15 million in 1953). The purpose would be to enable the Eastern bloc to press for the abolition of the remnants of forced labor in colonial and semi-independent territories.

It is now one of the primary aims of "world labor policy" to utilize the existing situation to secure as much improvement

as possible. It is hoped that the convention to be adopted in 1957 will mark an important step forward, although it would be optimistic to hope that it would provide a complete cure.

The conclusions of the ILO Report to the Conference propose a convention prohibiting 3 types of forced labor and a recommendation imposing certain restrictions on 3 other types. The recommendation will leave countries a certain freedom to define what they consider as "work forming part of normal civic obligations" and to determine the nature of the courts which can impose a sentence of forced labor. This is already clear from a careful study of governments' replies.

In February 1956 the surprising announcement came from Moscow that as far back as 1953 the authorities had abolished the secret police court which formerly had power to impose forced labor without trial and as a purely administrative measure. Henceforward there must be due process of law. The official Russian statement says that the dissolution of the court was linked up with the amnesty for forced laborers in the weeks following Stalin's death. The fact that the announcement was not made until 3 years after the event shows that it is a move to strengthen the negotiating position of the Soviet delegation at the ILO Conference.

Everyone can recall the repeated Communist denials of the existence of forced labor camps and the sensational revelations during the trial of David Rousset in France in 1950, all of which were still stoutly denied. Now the news of the abolition of the special court of the secret police provides proof that the allegations of forced labor without trial were in fact true; the amnesty of 1953 was in some sense a practical expression of contrition on the part of Stalin's successors.

In working toward a new convention, it is important to bear in mind that substantial changes have taken place in Russia with regard to forced labor. Information from German prisoners who only recently returned from Russia shows that a number of improvements have taken place since 1953. The reign of terror exercised by the criminal elements in conjunction with, or with the connivance of, the camp guards has been checked. Wages are higher and more fairly distributed within each work group. Inmates can write letters and receive visits and parcels.

The amnesty brought release by degrees to all within certain age groups and to the sick and infirm. Deportees belonging to national minorities, while not generally allowed to return home, were gradually given increased freedom, although still compelled to settle in specified areas (Omsk, Tomsk, etc.). The penalties on recalcitrant prisoners are less severe. In view of the necessity to continue the production of coal from the Arctic zone and gold and wolfram from northeast Siberia, recourse has been had to the "voluntary" migration of hosts of young workers to replace the lost labor from the forced-labor camps.

These are changes of methods rather than of principle, but it must be borne in mind that this process of more humane treatment which has been going on for over 2 years is not yet at an end and that in due course the bill will be presented. The West will be asked to pay mainly by granting better working conditions in colonial and dependent territories. It is significant that the U. S. S. R. reply to the Office questionnaire calls for the abolition of all forms of forced labor, including indirect compulsion. The U. S. S. R. points out—obviously with colonial territories in mind—that work can be considered as a "normal civic obligation" only if it is required of all adult citizens irrespective of their property status, race, nationality, etc. On the other hand Portugal, in replying to the same question, considers it undesirable to list such obligations, as the list would probably not be all-embracing.

There is a great likelihood that the Russian answer to the ILO's efforts in this field will be a worldwide propaganda offensive for improved labor legislation, especially in Asia and Africa. This is confirmed by certain passages in Khrushchev's address to the 20th meeting of the party, where he mentioned that in the past 10 years over 1,200 million people had been freed from colonial or semicolonial dependence. He went on: "One of the most urgent and acute problems now facing us is the complete abolition of the shameful system of colonialism." This must be interpreted in the West not simply from the narrow angle of foreign policies; it is the announcement of a policy of worldwide moral competition in the field of labor law. When a new convention on forced labor is adopted, the Eastern Powers will launch an unceasing stream of criticism against "indirect" forms of this abuse, such as the compulsion to work for natives of Portuguese Africa (with only very inadequate social protection) or the system in the Belgian Congo, where natives may be obliged to work in default of payment of money tax. The existence of a very slightly increased modicum of legal security for workers in the Soviet Union will be used as the basis for a campaign of "moral rearmament" in the colonies.

It is a mistake for the West to imagine that the policy of more humane treatment in the Soviet forced-labor system is due either to the pressure brought to bear by the sanguinary disturbances in certain camps in 1953 or to the need to improve the productivity of the camp inmates. These are only partial explanations. In part also it is a question of general policy, as will soon become apparent at the International Labor Conference.

It is gratifying to note that the preliminary work of the ILO seems to be based on a recognition of this situation. The Western colonial powers, whether advanced or backward, will not be able simply to evade the challenge by pointing out that "penal labor" can continue to exist in Soviet Russia in place of "forced labor," particularly in Arctic Siberia. Such countercharges will "cut no ice" with the indigenous peoples who are subject to Western labor law.

One particular reason for drawing attention to this situation is the demand of the NAM, in February 1956, that the United States Government should investigate the allegedly recent more intensive Communist activity within the ILO. There is no need to overestimate the importance of the NAM threat to send no delegates to the conference after 1956 unless "there is a change for the better." It will be recognized that this is not unconnected with the quarrel between the ICFTU and certain influential employers in Venezuela and in the Netherlands Antilles. Nevertheless, the threat of absence from the 1957 session, at which the final decision on forced labor will be taken, has a somewhat ominous ring. If this decision should be maintained, or if by any chance a similar tendency should gain ground in United States Government circles, it would be an extremely serious matter. Whether it likes it or not, the West constitutes a single unit in the work at Geneva. During the years to come it is particularly important that it should play its part in the competitive effort of the world to secure decent conditions of employment everywhere. Every effort should be made to insure that the new international convention on forced labor is not drawn up without the participation of American trade unionists and employers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Recent indications from the Soviet Union suggest that the U. S. S. R. is prepared to manipulate and turn to its own advantage our failure to provide leadership on this subject. It is Kremlin's strategy to embarrass other western countries, too, on the relationship between forced labor and colonialism.

Hence I am also delighted to learn this morning that the Senate Labor Subcommittee has favorably reported my resolution, Senate Resolution 248, to the Senate Labor Committee.

I am very happy to see a victory for justice and good sense, and I hope that our delegates to ILO will now proceed forthwith to seize the initiative in this matter and actively proclaim the American position.

Mr. President, I would ask that the article published in the New York Times, to which I have referred, be printed in the RECORD at this point, but I understand it has already been printed in the RECORD on request of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

CARROLL BINDER, OF THE MINNEAPOLIS TRIBUNE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on May 1 one of Minnesota's most illustrious citizens and one of the Nation's most talented journalists passed away. I refer to Mr. Carroll Binder, editorial editor of the Minneapolis Tribune.

The career of Carroll Binder was marked by many achievements and honors. He served as foreign editor and director of foreign service for the Chicago Daily News. He served his Government as an American representative with the United Nations—once as vice chairman of its subcommission on freedom of information and then as a member of the Executive Committee of the United States National Commission for UNESCO. The editorials which appeared in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of May 2 and the Minneapolis Star of May 1 state beautifully and succintly the high regard, respect, and affection with which Carroll Binder was held by his associates and neighbors. I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of May 2, 1956]

CARROLL BINDER

Carroll Binder was truly a citizen of the world. He traveled widely across the face of it. He knew its peoples, its governments, its leaders, and its diplomats. He had lived under ruthless dictatorships in Russia, Italy, and Germany and he had breathed the good air of freedom in many lands.

To the affairs of the world, he brought a relentless curiosity and an extraordinary capacity for objective analysis. When Mr. Binder died, the Tribune editorial page lost a distinguished editor and the world witnessed the passing of an able writer who had reported and evaluated the story of this troubled era for more than three decades.

Mr. Binder was outstandingly successful in his field for many reasons. He had a keen, incisive mind. He had an insatiable hunger for facts. He had a sense of compassion and understanding which embraced the peoples of the world. His outlook was one of unlimited horizons, encompassing both the future and the past.

But most of all, Mr. Binder was a painstaking, honest craftsman. Only those who

worked most closely with him could fully appreciate his passion for thoroughness or his insistent striving for the objective point of view. Mr. Binder never guessed; before he wrote, he explored every available source of information, and assembled his facts in orderly array. The fund of personal experience and observation on which he drew seemed almost inexhaustible, and he enriched it constantly by travel, by reading, and by contacts with friends and former associates throughout the world.

For Mr. Binder the challenge to be well informed never ended. For him, life was a perpetual process of enlarging those world horizons on which he looked each day with new enthusiasm.

It was not surprising, therefore, that his life was full of honors and achievements. As foreign editor and director of foreign service for the Chicago Daily News, he gained an enviable reputation for those very qualities of craftsmanship and penetrating thoroughness which he later brought to this editorial page as its director. On two occasions he served in posts connected with the United Nations, once as vice chairman of its subcommission on freedom of information and later as a member of the executive committee of the United States national commission for UNESCO.

Mr. Binder won numerous honors during the period of more than a decade he was associated with these newspapers. Among these was the distinguished award for editorial interpretation he received in 1953 from the English Speaking Union. His native State of Pennsylvania honored him. For many years, he was in constant demand as a lecturer. His opinions on international affairs were widely sought. In newspaper circles, few men could match his reputation as a perceptive student of world problems. Almost none had a deeper knowledge of the Communist revolution, or the insidious forces which sprang from it.

To his immediate associates, Mr. Binder was first of all a loyal friend. But they admired him for his intellectual integrity and cherished the loyalty he gave them in generous measure. He had a sense of fairness which left a deep impression on this editorial page. His faith in the essential decency and nobility of his fellow men illuminated many of his writings. While his interests ran primarily to world affairs, he could write with great authority in many other fields. But whatever he wrote received the searching analysis of his scholarly and well disciplined mind.

The news of Mr. Binder's death will be received with sorrow by friends in many lands today. Among newspaper colleagues especially, there will be reminiscences touching the life of a man who took deep pride in his profession and honored it profoundly.

As for his colleagues on the Star and Tribune, our sense of loss is very heavy. We have all profited from the privilege of working with him and this page will miss his presence greatly.

[From the Minneapolis Star of May 1, 1956]

CARROLL BINDER

This is a sad day in these newspaper offices, for a valued colleague and friend is gone. We were proud of Carroll Binder, the editorial page editor of our associate publication, the Tribune, who was nationally and internationally known for his close study and intelligent interpretation of foreign affairs. In this field he had few peers and the many tributes paid him were well deserved.

He was an individual of integrity, and that, to those who knew him, seemed the keynote of Carroll Binder. He always wanted to be sure he had learned the facts about a situation before he expressed an opinion. To that end he was a constant reader, a frequent traveler abroad and a persistent questioner of all who could contribute to his knowledge—and thus to the understanding of his readers—of world events and background. He tried always to be fair. His professional ethics were in the finest traditions of journalism.

He was an upright man in the best meaning of the term—devoted to his ideals, his work, his family, his friends, his Nation. He was a gentle-natured though resolute person who had walked with the great and the humble of the earth and never lost his sense of perspective. We will miss his good counsel and kindly presence.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was my privilege to know Carroll Binder as a friend. Only a few days before his death, we had a good heart-to-heart visit. Despite the fact that he had been ill for several months, his mind was alert and his spirits good. He was here in Washington attending the American Society of Newspaper Editors' annual convention. I am sure that he knew even then that he had but a short time to live, but he faced the future with courage and undaunted optimism. His great faith and serenity of mind left no room for fear or weakness. I shall always consider it an honor and a special privilege to have known this fine man. The Minneapolis Tribune has lost a great editor; Minnesota and the Nation have lost a great citizen.

An article which appeared in the Wednesday, May 2, issue of the Minneapolis Tribune reveals the philosophy of life that marked Carroll Binder's career. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of May 2, 1956]

NEVER-ENDING SEARCH FOR TRUTH STAMPED CARROLL BINDER'S LIFE

Carroll Binder's 35-year career as a working newspaperman, as revealed in some of his writings, was devoted to a search for truth, tempered by responsibility and scorn for sensationalism.

His interests ran the gamut of domestic and foreign affairs. His first love was reporting of the international scene—a task he performed with warmth and humanity.

His foreign correspondence and his more recent editorial commentaries were distinguished by a clear statement of the facts and an insistence that the public could be served only by the whole truth.

Mr. Binder's varied interests reached fruition in his 3-year fight within the United Nations committee on freedom of information.

There he brought the full force of his experience to support the proposition that "the fundamental principles of freedom of information cannot be the subject of compromise."

His belief that without freedom of information "a democratic society and (its) way of life cannot thrive" was based on the people's right to know, rather than an abstract right to publish.

"Freedom of information," he once told the United Nations committee, "is the right of every person to have access to all available facts, ideas and opinions, regardless of source—and not only to the information approved by his government and his party."

Mr. Binder found himself among the minority in the United Nations committee. Representatives of other nations stressed the "responsibility" of the press—a responsibility which they interpreted as necessitating strict censorship and governmental controls. Mr. Binder replied:

"The press does have one great responsibility. It is the responsibility to seek the truth and to report its findings as comprehensively and objectively as possible."

Mr. Binder often complained that sources of world news were stopped up even as international communications facilities became more widespread.

"When I first became a foreign correspondent," he wrote in 1952, "my colleagues and I could travel and report freely in most parts of the world.

"We encountered some censorships but they were open, that is, we took our dispatches to an official who promptly examined them and told us what—if anything—could be sent.

"We felt we were badly put upon by such censorships, which happily were not numerous. But when I think of the restrictions existing today I realize that those were halcyon days, the like of which I shall not see again in my lifetime."

"Large parts of the world," Mr. Binder went on, "no longer permit independent correspondents to visit their countries or so severely circumscribe their movements and contacts that they cannot possibly know what goes on."

Mr. Binder's defense of journalistic independence did not blind him to its defects. He once labeled as a weakness in world news gathering its failure to develop traditions of objectivity.

"In the straight telling of the facts," he said, "lies the quickest solution of the problems which so frequently are laid at the doorstep of the newspapermen—the promotion of peace, the promotion of racial and religious friendships, and tolerance and respect for human rights."

He disdained governmental controls as a remedy for shortcomings of the press.

"The remedy," he declared, "lies in the development of a greater sense of responsibility."

Mr. Binder's knowledge of the problems faced by correspondents did not carry over to tolerance for what he considered shoddy reporting.

When the Pulitzer Prize Committee in 1947 awarded Eddy Gilmore, Associated Press Moscow correspondent, its prize for international correspondence, Mr. Binder protested publicly that Gilmore's reporting was sugary and soft and that the AP writer often had left unreported the seamy side of Russian news.

His long experience both as a foreign correspondent and chief of a worldwide news service gave Mr. Binder a keen and prophetic insight into international events.

More than 2 years before World War II got under way, Mr. Binder was sounding the note of alarm, urging that the United States prepare for eventual participation in the coming struggle.

He scorned the isolationists of that period as men who "would have us lift our national skirts lest they become polluted as we pass through a sinful world."

However, Mr. Binder could record with satisfaction a decade later that American isolation was a thing of the past.

"The American people," he noted in 1948, "have learned the hard way that they are permanent members of the world community and that they must take the lead in mobilizing the freedom-loving nations of the world to resist Russian attempts to sovietize them by infiltration, by the creation of chaos, or by armed aggression."

Mr. Binder brought to his task as an observer of international affairs his hard-earned experience as one of the Nation's first specialists in reporting labor affairs. As a result, his dispatches from abroad often

reflected his keen perception of the economic issues which underlaid political events.

His interest in economics led him in 1941 to assemble facts disclosing the extent of forced labor in the Axis countries.

In his personal philosophy, Mr. Binder depended on what he once described as "one of the great secrets of friendship." This was to regard "each person with whom one associates as an end in himself, not as a means to one's own ends."

"The less one requires of material possessions," Mr. Binder said in his personal credo, "the better situated one is to stand up to changes of fortune."

Mr. Binder once said he sought to limit his ambitions "to goals within my probable capacity to attain."

"I have seen much inhumanity, cheating, corruption, sordidness, and selfishness," he declared, "but I have not become cynical.

"I have seen too much that is decent, kind, and noble in men to lose faith in the possibility for a far finer existence than yet has been achieved.

"I believe the quest for a better life is the most satisfying pursuit of men and nations."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Carroll Binder's neverending search for truth and his complete dedication to freedom of information are qualities of character and professional ethics that gained for him everlasting respect and admiration.

Early this year, February 20, Carroll Binder celebrated his 60th birthday. Just a few days before that occasion, I sent a letter to Carroll Binder, which was included with others in a document of testimonials and presented to him on that occasion. This letter expresses my heartfelt and sincere reflections on the character and life of my late and departed friend Carroll Binder. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

FEBRUARY 11, 1956.

Mr. CARROLL BINDER,
Editorial Editor, Minneapolis Tribune, Minneapolis, Minn.

DEAR CARROLL: Some of your friends were kind enough to inform me that February 20 will be your 60th birthday. I am pleased and honored to be permitted to participate with your many friends in their expressions of congratulations and best wishes.

The opportunity of knowing you and sharing in your friendship is indeed a privilege. I regret, however, that our visits have been all too infrequent and our time together all too short. You possess those endearing qualities of a warm heart and friendly spirit, combined with great intellect and the ability to translate your ideas into the written word. Yes, Carroll, your prowess as a journalist is second to none. Your insight into the complex problems of our generation has commanded the attention of your contemporaries.

We are particularly indebted to you for the high standard of your writings and for the intellectual and moral courage that you have always demonstrated. Your personal integrity manifests itself in each aspect of your life—your column, your civic service, and your relationships with your associates.

I particularly want to thank you for your outstanding services as an American representative on the Freedom of Information Commission.

Well, Carroll, you have had many years of interesting experience. Your writings would fill many books and your friends are legion. We who know Carroll Binder, know him as teacher, historian, public servant, philosopher, as journalist and a learned observer and commentator on international relations.

Added to all of this is your fine family. You have every right to be proud and happy. Your 60th birthday is of special significance primarily because it finds you in good health, good spirit, with a vigorous and alert mind.

Again let me express my gratitude for all the advice and counsel you have given me. Your words of encouragement have been a source of inspiration and strength.

As ever,

Your devoted friend,
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Carroll Binder has gone to his heavenly reward, but his works and deeds, his philosophy and his words live on. Like his soul and spirit, they are immortal.

ASWAN DAM PROJECT IN EGYPT

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD an incisive and provocative article written by a distinguished writer, Mr. Morris Cunningham, the Washington representative of the Memphis Commercial Appeal. I ask that the headline and the byline be also printed in the RECORD.

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

TAX DOLLARS DENIED TVA WOULD BE GIVEN TO EGYPT UNDER ADMINISTRATION PLAN—FOES OF PUBLIC POWER ARE ANXIOUS TO FINANCE ASWAN DAM ALTHOUGH PROJECT POSES THREAT TO AMERICAN COTTON EXPORTS

(By Morris Cunningham)

WASHINGTON, May 5.—Midsoutherners would appear to have more than their share of interest in the gigantic Aswan Dam project in Egypt that the State Department is now pressuring Congress to approve.

To be built in a granite-lined gorge on the Nile River, the dam would be 2½ times bigger than any such project now in existence anywhere in the world.

It would require 15 to 18 years to build and would cost $1.3 billion, of which $400 million would be supplied in direct grants by the United States and England and $200 million would be supplied by the World Bank, to which the United States is the biggest contributor.

When completed, the dam would generate one-half as much electricity as the entire Tennessee Valley Authority, including all of the TVA's many dams and steam-electric plants—one of which, Kingston, is now the world's largest.

POWER APLENTY FOR CIVILIANS

Considering that more than half of TVA's output goes to the Atomic Energy Commission and other defense installations, this means that the Aswan Dam would produce more electricity than is currently being used by civilians and civilian enterprises in the entire TVA area.

But this is only a minor part of the significance the huge undertaking holds for midsoutherners. Its greatest potential is its effect on world cotton production and markets.

The State Department has admitted that the great dam would provide water to irrigate an additional 2 million acres of land in a region where, like the South, cotton is the main crop.

With irrigation American cottongrowers have proved that two bales or more can be made to an acre. And, in Egypt, it is said that the climate is such that with irrigation three crops can be made in 2 years.

EXPORTS ALREADY DWINDLING

Thus, the huge undertaking confronts southern cotton farmers with the serious prospect of large quantities of additional cotton being dumped upon already sagging world markets.

This would come at a time when American cotton exports are dwindling, in the face of rising foreign production and competition, and now have reached an alltime low of less than 2 million bales a year.

Small wonder that southern Congressmen are looking askance at a proposition that calls for the tax dollars of many of their constituents to be used against what appears to be their own economic interests.

Representative JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Democrat of Mississippi, an early and continuing critic of the State Department's apparently consistently generous disposition toward foreign agricultural competition, spoke out against the project last year.

Senator JOHN STENNIS, Democrat of Mississippi, and JAMES O. EASTLAND, Democrat of Mississippi, also have questioned its wisdom. And, more recently, Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, Democrat of Georgia, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has announced his opposition.

FARMERS WILL BE AFFECTED

They have pointed out that within recent years thousands of American families have been forced off of American cotton farms because of continuing acreage cutbacks which, in large part, have been forced by the decline in exports.

At recent hearings before the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senator STENNIS, a member, outlined the situation in forceful terms. "I do not think I can overemphasize the importance of this cotton question," he said.

This, of course, is aside from the notable contrast between the administration's benevolent attitude toward the Aswan project and its consistently tough policy toward TVA.

"WE'LL WIN FRIENDS"

The Aswan project would be owned by the Egyptian Government and apparently would be another example of "creeping socialism," such as President Eisenhower has described TVA.

Yet only last year, when the administration was formulating its contribution to the Aswan project, it was denying TVA $6.5 million to start a new steam plant near Memphis, an action that—coupled with the Dixon-Yates deal—forced Memphians to start building its own plant.

The State Department, in arguments for the Aswan project, has not mentioned the contrasting power policies. But it has sought to minimize the possibility that any large part of the newly irrigated lands will be planted to cotton.

The burden of the Department's arguments has been that American aid for the project will win friends for the United States, will help ease tension in the Middle East, and will eliminate the possibility that Egypt may turn to Russia for help, if American aid is denied.

These arguments will probably gain wider support in other sections of the Nation than they will in the Midsouth.

PLANS FOR CREATION OF A FOOD STOCKPILE—DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS COTTON

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I invite attention to an article published in today's issue of the New York Times which quotes an anonymous high administration official to the effect that members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization are studying plans for the creation of a food stockpile as an emergency

measure. As a Member of the Senate, Mr. President, I am interested in knowing the prospects of this program. It would be interesting to the Senate, to this Member of the Senate, at least, to know what high official spokesman brings this word and what are the plans. Perhaps it offers an opportunity to dispose and to make good use of farm surpluses which are piled high in our country. I do not envision in this program, however, very much opportunity for the disposal and sale of surplus cotton, since it is not a food commodity.

I should like to invite the Senate's attention to the fact that on February 28 the distinguished Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Ezra Taft Benson, made a public announcement with respect to the sale of cotton on the world market. I should like to refer to the reported commitments and promises made during the consideration of the farm bill by the Senate. Those commitments and promises are not being lived up to. I do not wish to be severely critical in this regard, but rather to express the hope that on the next sale an arbitrary floor will not be placed on cotton held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, with the effect of defeating and preventing the sale of cotton which is being sought by the world market. Other opportunities for the sale of American held surplus cotton will soon be available. I hope the administration will take advantage of the opportunities, that arbitrary measures will not be thrown in the way, and that the commitments will be kept. If not, Mr. President, perhaps the Senate will find it necessary to write into the farm bill which is soon to be before this body provisions of law to facilitate the sale of surplus cotton abroad.

PULITZER AWARD TO CHARLES L. BARTLETT

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate the fact that a distinguished young newspaper reporter, Mr. Charles L. Bartlett, Washington representative of the Chattanooga Times, has been accorded one of the highest honors which can come to a newspaper man. He was awarded the Pulitzer prize for national reporting. He is one of the youngest men in the newspaper fraternity ever to receive this high award.

Mr. Bartlett is a facile writer who is capable of incisive analysis and provacative presentation. He is indefatigable in his search for news, and is dedicated to the belief that Government business is public business, and that the duty of a free press is to inform the public of the actions of their Government, the actions of their officials.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the Chattanooga Times entitled "Pulitzer for Bartlett," together with a news article published in the Chattanooga Times, written by Mr. Henry Trewhitt, under the headline "Bartlett Calls His Award Result of 'United Effort.'"

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chattanooga Times]

PULITZER FOR BARTLETT

Charles Leffingwell Bartlett at 34 years old has won for this newspaper its first Pulitzer prize—the most coveted honor in journalism.

The award to him of the trophy for national reporting, based upon his coverage of the story which led to the resignation of Harold Talbott as Secretary of the Air Force, gives us natural pride in his outstanding work as the Times' Washington correspondent and in the honor he has done himself and us.

There were, as always, many pieces of reporting that have merited the awards established by the late Publisher Joseph Pulitzer in a grant to the graduate school of journalism at Columbia University. For Mr. Bartlett's selection we are fortunate, humble, and grateful.

In many other facets Charley Bartlett has done what we consider to be an exceptional job—alone in grueling competition with the most high-powered news-gathering agencies in the world. These include a 25-man bureau of our big city cousins, the New York Times (1955 payroll: $28,543,700; newsprint cost: $22,993,000).

But in the Talbott case was singularly well exhibited the courage and devotion to public interest forever cherished by this newspaper. Charley Bartlett single handedly, in February 1955, went to work after receiving information that there was a conflict of interest in Harold Talbott's efforts, while he was Secretary of the Air Force, on behalf of a firm in which he had an interest and which had business with the Government.

In early March the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations took up the case as a result of this information. But not until July 13 could Correspondent Bartlett, in a 3-day national beat, disclose for publication that the inquiry was underway.

Between that time and almost exactly 1 month later, when Harold Talbott resigned, Mr. Bartlett's 17 dispatches to the Times told the Talbott story in graphic and unexcelled detail. He recorded the core of the issue involved, that of Mr. Talbott's inability to see the impropriety of writing prospective clients on Air Force stationery. The New York Times' publication of several of those letters forced Mr. Talbott to testify at the committee hearings.

Charley Bartlett came to the Times in 1946, a Yale graduate and member of a family some of whom he described facetiously as feeling Herbert Hoover was a dangerous radical. But he classes himself as an independent in politics and he has served his profession without fear or favor.

Congratulations, Charley. We expect more great things of you in the future. In the qualities of persistence, as well as those of courage, independence and enduring concern for the public welfare, you have written your name along side those of the great newspapermen. For they are qualities long held high both by the late great Joseph Pulitzer and in the legacy of ideals bequeathed to the Chattanooga Times.

[From the Chattanooga Times]

BARTLETT CALLS HIS AWARD RESULT OF UNITED EFFORT

(By Henry Trewhitt)

Charles L. Bartlett, a reporter with a deep conviction that Government business is public business, last night described his Pulitzer award as the result of a united effort.

He said the close cooperation of the editors and copyreaders of the Times made possible the publication of the last-minute details of the stories that brought him the award. Bartlett learned of the award while confined to his Washington home yesterday by a severe cold.

Bartlett, who joined the Times in June 1946, became the Washington correspondent in December 1947. His reporting of the national scene has frequently called public attention to officials in government who seemed to have forgotten their responsibilities as public employees.

The series of stories on which was based the citation and $1,000 Pulitzer prize, a top award in the profession, resulted from a casual, Sunday afternoon discussion of personalities in the Eisenhower administration between Bartlett and a friend who is an official of a large industrial concern.

Bartlett thus received his initial information that Harold E. Talbott, Secretary of the Air Force, had retained an active interest in a consulting firm which had several clients holding Government contracts.

This was in February 1955. He patiently investigated Talbott's outside interests for more than 5 months before his first story was published on July 13. The Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations then officially took up the investigation. Talbott resigned as an aftermath of the disclosures.

The log sent to member papers by the Associated Press shortly after the story broke shows the impact of the initial Bartlett story:

"We had missed the boat Tuesday night," the log said, "by failing to pick up a Chattanooga Times exclusive from its Washington correspondent, reporting a Senate committee vote to look into the business connections of Air Force Secretary Talbott. (Chattanooga sent a detailed advisory message but nobody acted on it.) Tonight (Thursday) the New York Times got into the story in a big way and we reported it then. Later * * * the lesson was applied; we acted quickly to pick up fresh developments reported by the Chattanooga member."

"Mr. Talbott's resignation would never have been accomplished without Bobby Kennedy (Robert F. Kennedy, chief counsel to the subcommittee)," Bartlett said last night. "He alone of all the officials saw the implications of the situation and worked against odds to bring out the facts."

NATIVE OF CHICAGO

Bartlett, 34, a native of Chicago, received his secondary education at St. Mark's School in Southboro, Mass., and was graduated from Yale University with a bachelor of arts degree in 1943. He served in the Navy from early 1943 to 1946 as an officer assigned to the communications intelligence branch of the office of the chief of naval operations.

After his release to inactive duty as a lieutenant in 1946, he joined the Chattanooga Times as a general assignment reporter.

His coverage of the Washington scene has been broad, extending far beyond comprehensive reporting on Tennessee Congressmen, the Tennessee Valley Authority and other matters of particular regional interest. In 1951 and 1952 his stories initiated an investigation of the contract held by ARO Inc., for operation of the Arnold Engineering Development Center at Tullahoma. The result was a limitation on ARO fees from the Government.

His stories were the first on the appointment of John Marshall Harlan as associate justice of the United States Supreme Court; the appointment of Joseph Campbell as United States comptroller; the appointment of Gen. Herbert D. Vogel as chairman of the board of the Tennessee Valley Authority; the fact that President Eisenhower had determined to seek re-election.

His coverage of Senator ESTES KEFAUVER's campaigns for the Democratic presidential nomination has consistently been ahead of

that of his Washington competitors. He was the first to predict KEFAUVER'S victory in the New Hampshire Democratic primary in 1952, and the first to sense the change of climate that resulted in the Senator's Minnesota victory this year.

Bartlett was married on December 23, 1950, to Miss Josephine Martha Buck of Far Hills, N. Y. They now have two sons, Peter Buck, 4, and Michael Valentine, 2.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks made by the Senator from Tennessee. I have known and have been a friend of Charlie Bartlett for almost 15 years, and I am sure there is not a more devoted or more disinterested reporter in Washington. He has been a good reporter for a long time, and I am glad to hear that he has been recognized in this way by the Pulitzer committee.

Mr. GORE. I thank my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts. I agree with everything he has said.

Mr. President, I wish to close by saying, "Charlie Bartlett, congratulations. At the age of 34 you have written your name alongside the newspaper great."

RECOGNITION OF SCIENCE IN THE CONDUCT OF FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, with the Berkner report in 1950, the State Department recognized science as an element in the conduct of our foreign policy. An ambitious program was set up involving the establishment of scientific staffs at various American diplomatic posts abroad, as well as the appointment of leading scientists as attachés in the Foreign Service Reserve.

This ambitious and farsighted program reached its peak in 1952, and then declined. Today, 4 years later, when the administration is belatedly admitting that we face a critical shortage of scientists and engineers, this State Department program is limping along without any scientists abroad or at home.

An illuminating article entitled "What's Happened to Science in State?" was published in the Chemical and Engineering News for January 9, 1956. I ask unanimous consent that the body of this article appear at this point in my remarks.

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

[Reprinted from Chemical and Engineering News of January 9, 1956]

WHAT'S HAPPENED TO SCIENCE IN STATE?

The State Department, 5½ years ago, disclosed its plan for meeting its responsibilities in the scientific and technical aspects of foreign relations. A key element of this plan was the establishment of science staffs at selected United States diplomatic missions abroad. The plan was implemented by the appointment of leading scientists for limited terms as attachés in the Foreign Service Reserve.

The peak was reached in the summer of 1952 when there were 10 science attachés in five European embassies. But then appointments waned. Last year there were 4 attachés, 1 each in London, Stockholm, Paris, and Tokyo. But their terms have expired. By the 15th of this month, all four will have reported into Washington on their way home. To date, no replacements have been named. The field aspect of State's science function has ground to a halt.

Will this be the end of science in the State Department? Probably not, because State's Science Office is still operating. The Department's experience with the science attaché program and with the Science Office has demonstrated how frequently science is intertwined with foreign relations. The Office is an active one and is constantly being called upon by various desks and divisions within the Department of State for advice and assistance.

The State Department's experience with science had roots in several studies during the late war and early postwar period. One of these was Vannevar Bush's Science, The Endless Frontier (1945), a study undertaken at the request of President Truman to determine how the knowledge acquired by the wartime Office of Scientific Research and Development could be applied to the problems of peace. Another was Science and Public Policy (1947) by the President's Scientific Research Board under John R. Steelman. This study explored the interrelationships of science in various branches of the Government and how they could be coordinated. The report led directly to the formation of the Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific Research and Development and laid the groundwork for the National Science Foundation.

Another root was inside the Department of State itself. It was the London Office on Science and Technology that had been taken over from the Department of Commerce in 1946. The Mission was attached to the American Embassy in London for the purpose of facilitating liaison between British and American scientists and exchanging scientific and technological information between the two countries. Behind this move was the backlog of unpublished wartime research and the inability of periodicals to handle it expeditiously because of the paper shortage.

Because the basis for this office was an economic one, responsibility in the Department of State was assigned to the Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs to carry out the project experimentally. Before the Office was set up, scientists inside and outside the Government were called on for advice. They suggested that scientists should compose the group, that their concern should be primarily with the promotion of interchanging unclassified scientific information, that the group should be a permanent staff of the Embassy, but that membership should be rotating, and that the products of the office should be as widely available as possible to American scientists.

First head of the London Office was Earl A. Evans, Jr., a biochemist from the University of Chicago. He served for 1 year. From his appointment to the end of 1949, 11 other scientists representing various disciplines served in the London office with tenures ranging from 4 months to 1 year. Occasionally, there were as many as 6 men assigned to the office at 1 time.

NOT FOR INFORMATION

The operation of the London Office indicated to the Department of State that scientists have a place in the conduct of foreign relations. As the work of the staff developed, it became clear to those concerned with the experiment, however, that if scientists were to function effectively they had to orient their functions more closely to the problems of foreign relations. The experience emphasized that the Department had no responsibilities itself for disseminating information to American scientists and had no facilities for doing so.

As a part of the State Department reorganization in 1949, and in cooperation with the National Academy of Sciences, several committees reviewed State's responsibilities in international science. On the basis of this review and on the experience of the London mission, the Department's International Science Steering Committee, under the chairmanship of Lloyd V. Berkner, issued the definitive report "Science and Foreign Relations." This document, which has come to be known as the Berkner Report, is the taproot of State's science operations. It demonstrates repeatedly that modern foreign relations consist of scientific and technical elements as well as political, economic, and military. It proposed that mechanisms be set up in the Department and in the embassies that would ensure adequate consideration of scientific and technical matters that have a bearing on foreign relations. It proposed that these functions be carried out mainly by men with background in international affairs and training in science.

To carry out these recommendations, the Berkner report suggested that a science office be established in the Department of State at the policy level, headed by a science adviser appointed as Special Assistant to the Under Secretary of State. It also recommended that the science adviser be supported by a small staff comprised of a deputy science officer, three scientists representing the physical, life, and engineering sciences, respectively, liaison officers from the political, economic, and public affairs areas, and from other Government agencies having international interests in science and technology, and such other personnel as are required to make the staff effective in the discharge of its responsibilities.

First to be appointed as science adviser was Joseph B. Koepfli, an organic chemist from California Institute of Technology who had served in the London Office with Evans. Appointed as science adviser early in 1951, he served 8 months past his original 2-year term before returning to Caltech.

Serving under Koepfli for 2 years as deputy science adviser was James W. Joyce, a Navy Department geophysicist. Now with the National Science Foundation, he had served as director of the Department's International Science Policy Survey Group, one of the committees that led to the Berkner Report. Joyce continued as acting science adviser for 6 months after Koepfli left to go to the Department of Defense in January 1954. Since that time, the office of science adviser has been vacant.

STATE USES SCIENCE OFFICE

The Science Office has become well known in the Department, and Rudolph reports that there are few desks or offices in the Department that do not call him from time to time for information or assistance. During a typical day recently he was called upon to write a statement for a Department committee, to advise one of the desks concerning a delegation of visiting scientists, and to advise another office concerning a proposed change in regulations involving a scientific body elsewhere in the Government. Several of these requests involved liaison with offices outside the Department. Between these duties, Rudolph took part in four committee meetings.

In the Department, Rudolph represents science. Toward science, he represents State. For instance, in the absence of a Science Adviser, Rudolph represented the Department of State at the meeting of the International Union of Scientific Unions in Oslo last August.

To implement its recommendations concerning operations abroad, the Berkner Report suggested that the State Department appoint scientists as attachés who would be integrated into the normal foreign-service structure of the embassies. Two attachés who had been appointed to the London Office continued under the new plan, and in 1951, 6 new attachés were appointed—2 to

London, 2 to Stockholm, and 2 to Bern. Six more were appointed in 1952, but in 1953 appointments began to slack off. The last appointee was Robert S. Mulliken, of the University of Chicago, who went to London a year ago. He is returning this week. During that interval, 19 scientists served in embassies abroad.

To find out how the science attaché program had functioned abroad, C. and E. N. asked the men who should best be able to answer—the science attachés themselves.

The question that is asked again and again is whether the Department of State wants a science operation such as it envisioned when it established the Science Office and the attaché program. For nearly 3 years the office operated without a Science Adviser and for 2 years without a scientist. The effects of this curtailment were harmful to the science attachés themselves. While they, like other officers of the United States missions abroad, are responsible immediately to the Ambassadors, they feel that "home base" is, after all, the Science Office in Washington. They have a common interest in science with that office. They believe it is only common sense that an office of the Science Adviser should be headed by a scientist. They feel that the Department either is not aware of the importance of science to foreign relations, or has been too slow in filling the vacancy.

At present, the Science Office is being operated by the Assistant to the Science Adviser, Walter M. Rudolph, and two secretaries. Rudolph, an economist, is the State Department career man on permanent assignment to the office as executive officer under the Science Adviser. He also served on the International Science Survey Group.

Rudolph has enormous responsibilities but little authority to implement the top echelon work that the Science adviser should be doing. Nevertheless, those who have worked with him agree that he has done an outstanding job of keeping the office going since its beginnings. Helping the office out of emergencies, Koepfli has frequently commuted from his California laboratory to Washington. But helping on emergencies and being active head of the Science Office are two different things.

The effects of having a Science Office without a scientist are harmful from the standpoint of public relations, the attachés indicate. Since their duties require them to confer with scientists abroad in universities, research institutions, Government offices, and elsewhere, science attachés frequently were obliged to discuss their individual place in the organization of Government. They felt embarrassed when they had to report the development in the Office of Science Adviser.

The curtailment of the science staffs in the European embassies from 2 or more several years ago to 1, was also bad for public relations. The attachés feel that many scientists and others abroad took this reduction as a slap at their science. The attachés believe that the curtailment had the effect of creating an attitude on the part of Europeans that Americans are vacillating and unreliable.

In direct contrast to this situation in Washington, the attachés report glowingly of their work and of the program's reception abroad. The Ambassadors and other mission officers have been cordial and helpful. Some Ambassadors relied directly on the science attachés for detailed advice and guidance on scientific matters affecting foreign relations. Good working relations were established between science attachés and other officers of the embassies with whom they frequently had to work on matters of common interest.

At Bonn, for example, Walter W. Greulich was able to contribute significantly toward formulating policy in Germany. In one instance, he reported the bitter opposition of German scientific and other organizations to the efforts by our industries and by some of our governmental agencies to recruit German scientists for work in the United States. These activities were misinterpreted by the Germans as an attempt on the part of our people to deprive them of their most valuable natural resource—their gifted young scientists. He was able to reassure the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (a research coordinating body) in this matter and to work out with them a mutually acceptable, modified policy of recruitment.

Greulich called to the attention of the head of the mission and to the Department in Washington the rapidity with which German science was recovering from the effects of the war and climbing again toward the position of world leadership which it considers properly its own. In his report, he stressed the grave consequences for our country, if, in the rapid and unpredictable course of history, the scientific resources of the Federal Republic of Germany should ever be lost to the West.

The science attachés at Bonn were in a somewhat different position from those in other missions because they were science advisers to the United States High Commissioner. On the other hand, the type of services they performed was not necessarily unique.

United States science attaché work found wide acceptance among scientists and others in foreign countries. The idea that science attachés were some sort of espionage agents was quickly dispelled, if the idea ever existed at all. Science attachés were accepted as officers representing at once the United States Government and American scientists. The attachés felt that this cordiality strengthened an important segment of foreign relations. They pointed out that no other officer in the embassies could effect this relationship because no other officer had access to influential foreign scientists.

The demands for the attachés' services were increasing all the time. Science in foreign countries is on the upswing and is active. Not only do the attachés have more work than they can do but they see many useful jobs they should be doing but cannot get around to doing.

One such job, for example, is that of coordinating the visits of American scientists. A science attaché may be asked to arrange that an American scientist visit a foreign laboratory. He does so. The next week a group of Americans visit the same laboratory unannounced and without his knowledge. They want to look at the same things the previous visitor looked at, ask the same questions, and go over the same material. Later the attaché is requested to set up another visit for an American scientist to the same laboratory to look at the same things, ask the same questions, and go over the same material. The process continues. The head of the foreign laboratory becomes irritable. The science attaché is embarrassed, frustrated. He feels Washington has let him down; it should have coordinated these visits and told him about them. The need for coordination was obvious.

Nearly all the attachés express the feeling that more than one scientist is needed in the science attaché office abroad. Some note the disparity between the number of military attachés and science attachés at various missions (19 to 1 in 1 case). Most of the attachés indicate that a tour of duty of 1 year is definitely not long enough. They feel that 2 years would be preferable.

A recent Hoover Commission report suggests that the backstopping of science attachés be placed with the Central Intelligence Agency. The science attachés view this recommendation with alarm.

Some believe that at best such a transfer would enervate the work of the science attachés, and at worst would create downright resentment abroad to the detriment of our foreign relations. Others believe that the recommendation must have been made without an understanding of the functions of the science attachés. Most of the science attachés are in agreement that the backstopping of their work should remain in the Department of State. Backstopping by the National Science Foundation has been mentioned as another possibility. Some feel, however, that this does not recognize State's day-to-day needs.

The science attachés are unanimous in expressing a strong belief that a lot of good has come from the functions they performed or are now carrying out. They have seen the benefits both in this country and in the country of their assignment. Some of the former science attachés have noted after their return to this country the snowballing of the private scientific exchanges they themselves had a part in promoting. They point out that scientists in this country feel that scientific cooperation can be one of the strongest instruments for furthering our foreign relations.

In the past, State has been successful in getting the funds it asked for the science program from Congress. It has been suggested that if money is the problem it stems from within the Department. The fact that the Office of Naval Research has operated a much larger office in London than any of the science attaché offices may be significant as far as Congressional approval is concerned.

SCIENTISTS FOR SCIENCE

A scientist who served early in the program mentioned a view that was then current in the United States foreign service that the position of science attaché provided special official representation of a field that is properly a function of the cultural attaché. It is rare, he adds, that a cultural attaché has the necessary scientific qualifications for the work. The scientific development in some countries, he points out, can greatly outweigh their economic affairs and should receive official Embassy attention by qualified officers.

Occasional references are made to the fact that State is "reevaluating" its science program, that the Department hasn't made up its mind about what kind of pattern it wants if any. Obviously, the Department has found its Science Office to be a useful arm of its day-to-day operation, even if it does not have a scientist. The scientists who have served abroad believe they have something unique to offer toward foreign relations.

Science today has an even greater impact on society than it did when State first recognized it. To let the science function die now, say the scientists, would be next to criminal and an enormous waste of their time and the taxpayers' money. The course of events mystifies them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I call the article to the attention of my colleagues, especially those on the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, because it reveals that a program which was well underway has now been permitted, for some undescribed and unknown reason, actually to die on the vine. It is a program which was designed to step up our scientific program, our program of education for scientists and of recruitment of top-grade scientists. That program now is a paper program only; it is not a reality in terms of activity.

THE SEASONAL RECURRENCE OF THE RAILWAY BOXCAR SHORTAGE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce concluded hearings yesterday on S. 2770. During these

hearings, an opportunity was given to examine again the serious national shortage of railway boxcars.

Mr. President, Senators have spoken on the subject of the boxcar shortage so many times that it has become almost a perennial topic. I think it is fair to say that for more than 20 years Congress has been faced every summer and fall with notice of a critical shortage of railway boxcars. The bill on which hearings have been held was introduced to see if something could not be done to stimulate the construction of boxcars so that there would not be the tragic losses in agricultural commodities during the harvesting season which have occurred in the past.

I feel certain that I speak for other Senators when I urge the committee to expedite action on this problem so that we may at last be saved from the seasonal recurrence of a boxcar shortage this year.

I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Action Urged on Shortage of Boxcars," published in the Minneapolis Star for Friday, May 4, 1956, be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

ACTION URGED ON SHORTAGE OF BOXCARS

(By Herb Paul)

The executive committee of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners (NARUC) meeting in Minneapolis urged immediate action by the Government and railroads to prevent "what may be the most drastic boxcar shortage this country has faced."

Charles H. Heltzel, public utilities commissioner of Oregon, chairman of the special committee to study railroad car shortages said the shortage of boxcars during the grain movement is expected to be the most severe this year.

In an effort to alleviate it, he said the committee took the following action:

Appealed to the Office of Defense Mobilization to extend the amortization program for rapid tax writeoff on new equipment which was terminated last year so more boxcars could be included in its provisions.

Asked the executive committee of the American Iron and Steel Institute to be more generous and allot more steel for freight car construction.

Urged the backing of a Senate bill which would permit the Interstate Commerce Commission to inflict heavier penalties on railroads for failure to supply cars to shippers as needed.

Urged that Congress appropriate more money for the ICC to increase its field force to enforce its regulations to avert car shortages.

BIPARTISAN MONEY-RAISING DRIVE FOR POLITICAL FUNDS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a unique bipartisan joint money-raising drive will begin on Thursday this week in Douglas County, Minn., as an experimental community chest drive for political funds. The project is the result of the initiative of Byron G. Allen, the Minnesota State commissioner of agriculture, and Philip Graham, publisher of the Washington Post and Times Herald. The experiment has already attracted national attention.

I ask unanimous consent that an article published in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Monday, May 7, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. I observe that the article relates directly to one of the problems before the Senate, and is embraced in what is called the Cain elections bill. I am very proud to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that one of the larger counties in Minnesota has been able to bring together both Republican and Democratic officials to engage in an overall, countywide campaign fund drive. The funds will be divided between the two political parties and will, of course, be used for very legitimate and good purposes in the coming campaign.

I suggest to my colleagues that they might wish to read the article carefully, because it may give them a reasonably good picture of what can be done in other sections of the country.

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

PARTIES JOIN FUNDS DRIVE IN MINNESOTA TEST

ALEXANDRIA, MINN., May 6.—Republicans and Democrats are joining hands here in a unique plan—a sort of community chest drive for political funds.

Beginning Thursday, two-man teams will start ringing doorbells in this bipartisan, joint money drive. Each team will have 1 Democrat and 1 Republican.

The experiment, a joint effort of Douglas County's GOP and Democratic organizations, is heralded by its sponsors as the first of its type. The proponents hope for sufficient success to spark nationwide fund collections on a similar basis.

They say their citizens march for good government offers political parties an opportunity to work together as fellow citizens in promoting a cause which rises above partisan politics.

The teams will start with 3 days of solicitations in Alexandria, the county seat. On June 1 and 2 they will cover the 10 villages in the county. Rural homes will be canvassed June 8 and 9.

The countywide goal is $10,000—$1 per each registered voter. It's figured more persons will contribute through the new system than otherwise. If $10,000 is collected, it would be about triple the total the two parties ever collected in years past.

Sponsors feel that voters who classify themselves as independents cannot be approached by party fund raisers but can be solicited by the citizens march.

The money collected will be divided into three equal parts—for the presidential campaign, for the Minnesota Seventh District congressional campaign, and for the gubernatorial campaign. Then each of the three divisions will be subdivided among the political parties, on the basis of the party vote cast for President in 1952 and for Congressman and governor 2 years ago.

The plan was suggested to the Douglas County party workers by Byron Allen, State commissioner of agriculture and past Democratic national committeeman, and Philip Graham, publisher of the Washington Post and Times Herald and a 1952 supporter of President Eisenhower. The two felt Douglas County would be a suitable place to make the experiment, because Republicans and Democrats voting in the county have been about equal.

THE AMERICAN PRESS AND UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Nation's top-ranking military leader recently accused the American press of weakening our ties with our allies by presenting a "picture of confusion" of American policy. I refer, of course, to Admiral Radford. His statements if accurately reported, thoroughly deserve the editorial reply in yesterday morning's Washington Post and Times Herald.

I ask unanimous consent that an International News Service report of Admiral Radford's original remarks, printed in the Washington Post and Times Herald on May 7, 1956, and the editorial reply entitled "Who Causes Confusion?" and published in the newspaper yesterday morning be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 7, 1956]

RADFORD SAYS UNITED STATES PRESS WEAKENS TIES WITH ALLIES

(By Raymond Wilcove)

The Nation's top-ranking military leader has accused the American press of weakening United States ties with her allies.

The charge was made by Adm. Arthur W. Radford, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in testimony given to the House Foreign Affairs Committee behind closed doors last month.

Testifying about American relations with the rest of the Free World nations, Radford stated: "* * * In some of the countries, their resolves to stick by us through thick and thin are not so great as they were some time past."

Radford told the committee there were two reasons for this. One, he said, "Is because the Russian propaganda, the Russian handling of the situation, has been very clever."

He continued: "The other thing that contributes to it a great deal, in my opinion, is the picture of confusion that is presented to the rest of the world by the free press of the United States.

"Certainly I would not advocate a controlled press, but I do say that the operation of our democratic system, as reported by our press and transmitted around the world, unfortunately presents to many leaders in foreign countries, and their people, a picture of confusion in the United States."

Radford added that "they get the feeling that the United States doesn't know exactly what they want to do."

On the other hand, he asserted, "from the Russian side they get a very firm and direct picture of leadership," largely because the Russians do not have to account to their people for everything they do.

Radford said some way must be found "of combating this picture of confusion that we present to the rest of the world," but he didn't know the answer.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 8, 1956]

WHO CAUSES CONFUSION?

Admiral Radford is talking through his braided cap. His complaint that the free press in the United States presents a picture of confusion to the world is ludicrous indeed, coming from a man whose own bombast has caused so many misgivings abroad about the course of American policy. The free press attempts to report events as they happen, including what officials say. If there is confusion, it very often is because the statements are confused and the officials have not synchronized their voices.

Obviously, if unity of expression is what Admiral Radford wants, the United States al-

ways is going to be at a disadvantage as compared with the Soviet Union, where the captive press can present a nice, monolithic picture of unified Soviet policy (though even total planning seemingly was unable to prevent a Khrushchev eruption in London). Admiral Radford was careful to qualify his testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee to make it clear that he did not advocate a controlled press. But there is no line, as Alexis de Tocqueville observed more than a century ago, between a controlled press and one that reports the facts freely as they are. Diversity is one of the badges of America.

We seem to recall a number of headlines made by the Admiral himself, concerning intervention with nuclear weapons in Indochina and a naval blockade of Communist China If Secretary Dulles has taken the country to the brink of war, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has at least egged the Secretary on. Indeed, the President had occasion some months ago to restrain the warlike talk. The only sure way to avoid a "picture of confusion" is to avoid the contradictory statements that cause it; and perhaps what Admiral Radford needs most is a mirror. At least he could get together with some of the Democratic politicians who keep lamenting the uniformity of the so-called one-party press. What is a poor bedeviled editor to believe?

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, then under the unanimous consent agreement entered into on Monday, May 7, the Senate will proceed to the call of the calendar.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senate will now proceed to the call of the calendar.

At the last call of the calendar, two bills were requested to be called at this time, namely, Calendar No. 1874, H. R. 3054, and Calendar No. 1883, S. 3113.

The clerk will call Calendar No. 1874, H. R. 3054.

BILL PASSED OVER

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3054) for the relief of Allen Pope, his heirs or personal representatives.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over until the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over until the next call of the calendar.

AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT SHIP SALES ACT OF 1946, AS AMENDED

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3113) to amend section 9 (c) of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments, in line 7, after the word "after", to strike out "October 1, 1955" and insert "the date of enactment of this amendatory proviso"; and in line 11, to strike out "amendment" and insert "amendatory proviso", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 9 (c) (2) of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 is hereby amended by inserting before ": and" at the end thereof the following proviso: *"Provided*, That the provisions of this subsection (c) (2) shall not apply to any such charter party executed on or after the date of enactment of this amendatory proviso; and the Secretary of Commerce is directed to modify any adjustment agreement to the extent necessary to conform to the provisions of this amendatory proviso."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An explanation is requested of Senate bill 3113.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I ask that Senate bill 3113, go to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go to the foot of the calendar.

The next bill in order on the calendar will be stated.

MODIFICATION OF FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECT FOR MISSOURI RIVER AGRICULTURAL LEVEE UNIT 513-512-R

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1358) to authorize modification of the flood-control project for Missouri River Agricultural Levee Unit 513-512-R, Richardson County, Nebr., which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with amendments, on page 2, line 1, after the word "include", to strike out the colon and "(1) Altering and modifying an existing bridge, 2½ miles southwest of Rulo, Nebr., and 3¼ miles above the mouth of the Nemaha; to raise the existing approach spans and piers; to add one 36-foot approach span and bulkheaded abutment to each end of the bridge, and to construct necessary approach embankments, at an estimated Federal cost of $40,000; (2)", and in line 13, after "$163,500", to strike out "In lieu of accomplishing the work prescribed in (1) above, an equivalent contribution may be made toward work when and as accomplished by local interests", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the authorization for Missouri River Agricultural Levee Unit 513-512-R, lying within the area of Drainage District No. 1 of Richardson County, Nebr., included in the general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Missouri River Basin, approved by the act of June 28, 1938, as modified by the act of December 22, 1944, and other acts, is hereby further modified to include Federal participation in certain highway bridge relocation and construction over the Nemaha River, to include constructing a new bridge near the mouth of the Nemaha River (exclusive of approaches to be provided by local interests) to replace a structure destroyed by the flood of 1951, approximately 300 feet long with 22-foot roadway, at an estimated Federal cost of $163,500.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BETTER FACILITIES FOR ENFORCEMENT OF THE CUSTOMS AND IMMIGRATION LAWS

The bill (H. R. 6769) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws" to increase the amounts authorized to be expended was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 9429) to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ERVIN. I ask that the bill go over. I do not think it is proper calendar business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

IMPERIAL AGRICULTURAL CORP.

The resolution (S. Res. 252) referring H. R. 5285 to the United State Court of Claims was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 5285) entitled "A bill for the relief of the Imperial Agricultural Corp.," now pending in the Senate, together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same, in accordance with the provisions of said sections, and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimants.

ROBERT GARTENBERG

The bill (S. 764) for the relief of Robert Gartenberg was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Robert Gartenberg shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

JONAS DERCAUTAN

The bill (S. 832) for the relief of Jonas Dercautan was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jonas Dercautan shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the

granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

SHUN WEN LUNG (ALSO KNOWN AS VAN LONG AND VAN S. LUNG)

The bill (S. 2507) for the relief of Shun Wen Lung (also known as Van Long and Van S. Lung) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Shun Wen Lung (also known as Van Long and Van S. Lung) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

FRANK SEVCIK, JR., ALSO KNOWN AS FRANTISEK OR FRANCESCO SEVCIK

The bill (S. 2750) for the relief of Frank Sevcik, Jr., also known as Frantisek or Francesco Sevcik, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Frank, also known as Frantisek or Francesco Sevcik, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

BRIGITTE LECHNER WAGNER

The bill (S. 2801) for the relief of Brigitte Lechner Wagner was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Brigitte Lechner Wagner may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

YUE YIN WONG (ALSO KNOWN AS WILLIAM YUEYIN WONG)

The bill (S. 2834) for the relief of Yue Yin Wong (also known as William Yueyin Wong) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Yue Yin Wong (also known as William Yueyin Wong) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ANTONIA SOULIS

The bill (S. 2838) for the relief of Antonia Soulis was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Antonia Soulis may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

DR. SHOU SOON KWONG

The bill (S. 2843) for the relief of Dr. Shou Soon Kwong was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. Shou Soon Kwong shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ETHEL KALLINS

The bill (S. 2874) for the relief of Ethel Kallins was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ethel Kallins shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ELISABETH DUMMER

The bill (S. 2888) for the relief of Elisabeth Dummer was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (9) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Elisabeth Dummer may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act. The provisions of this act shall apply only to a ground for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of enactment of this act.

OKSANNA OZTEMEL

The bill (S. 2931) for the relief of Oksanna Oztemel was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Oksanna Oztemel shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

LOTTE WINDSCHILD

The bill (S. 2941) for the relief of Lotte Windschild was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the alien, Lotte Windschild, may be granted a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

MARIA CEDRONE DE RUBEIS

The bill (S. 2953) for the relief of Maria Cedrone de Rubeis was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (9) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Cedrone de Rubeis may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act. The provisions of this act shall apply only to a ground for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of enactment of this act.

EGBERT CARLSSON

The bill (S. 3361) for the relief of Egbert Carlsson was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of the act entitled "An act providing for the barring of claims against the United States," approved October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1061), the Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to accept and consider any claim filed within 1 year from the date of enactment of this act by Egbert Carlsson, of McPherson, Kans., for compensation for the use by the Department of the Navy, from about November 1,

1943, through March 31, 1945, of certain lands in Lake County, Oreg., as part of an aerial gunnery range.

MRS. ESTHER REED MARCANTEL

The bill (H. R. 1488) for the relief of Mrs. Esther Reed Marcantel was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1913) for the relief of Mrs. Anna Elizabeth Doherty was announced as next in order.

Mr. PURTELL. I ask that the bill go over for further study.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over.

CITY OF SANDPOINT, IDAHO

The bill (H. R. 2423) for the relief of the city of Sandpoint, Idaho, was considered, ordered to a third reaidng, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF NEIL McLEOD SMITH

The bill (H. R. 3526) for the relief of estate of Neil McLeod Smith was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LT. COL. GEORGE H. CRONIN, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The bill (H. R. 4634) for the relief of Lt. Col. George H. Cronin, United States Air Force, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN L. BOYER, JR.

The bill (H. R. 5633) for the relief of John L. Boyer, Jr., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SAMUEL E. ARROYO

The bill (H. R. 5951) for the relief of Samuel E. Arroyo was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN RURAL CARRIERS

The bill (H. R. 6622) for the relief of certain rural carriers was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GAY STREET CORP., BALTIMORE, MD.

The bill (H. R. 6706) for the relief of Gay Street Corp., Baltimore, Md., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANK G. GERLOCK

The bill (H. R. 7114) for the relief of Frank G. Gerlock was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EUGENE GARDNER AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 8306) for the relief of Eugene Gardner, Byron M. Barbeau, John R. Reaves, and Jackson L. Hardy, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NATHAN A. KAHN

The bill (H. R. 8307) for the relief of Nathan A. Kahn was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ARTHUR E. WEEDEN, JR.

The bill (H. R. 8308) for the relief of Arthur E. Weeden, Jr., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

C. W. O. GEORGE C. CARTER

The bill (H. R. 8310) for the relief of C. W. O. George C. Carter was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DANIEL O. HULSE, JR.

The bill (H. R. 8311) for the relief of Daniel O. Hulse, Jr., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HILDEGARD L. McNABB

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1938) for the relief of Hildegard L. McNabb, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 7, after the word "act", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (9) and (19) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hildegard L. McNabb may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2048) for the relief of certain former employees of the Inland Waterways Corporation, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HRUSKA. By request, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ANNIEMAE M. SWANSON AND ARMYLEE V. SWANSON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2840) for the relief of Anniemae M. Swanson and Armylee V. Swanson, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 9, after the word "fees", to strike out "upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anniemae M. Swanson and Armylee V. Swanson, adopted minor children of Eugene Warner Swanson of Alexandria, Minn., an American citizen, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. YONG WHAN KIM

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2883) for the relief of Dr. Yong Whan Kim, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. Yong Whan Kim shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee, under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM JEFFREY JONAS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2944) for the relief of William Jeffrey Jonas, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, William Jeffrey Jonas shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. IDA BIFOLCHINI BOSCHETTI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1016) for the relief of Mrs. Ida Bifolchini Boschetti, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page

2, line 2, after the word "act", to strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MAJ. ROBERT D. LAUER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2284) for the relief of Maj. Robert D. Lauer, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, line 2, after the word "act", to strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

GRAPHIC ARTS CORPORATION OF OHIO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2893) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Graphic Arts Corporation of Ohio, of Toledo, Ohio, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Graphic Arts Corporation of Ohio, Toledo, Ohio, as to the liability of the United States, if any, either legal or equitable, for losses alleged to have been sustained by the said Graphic Arts Corporation of Ohio as the result of the performance of a contract, No. W33-038ac 2023, dated April 17, 1944, entered into with the United States Army Air Corps.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any statute of limitations or lapse of time, suit upon such claim may be instituted by the claimant within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act. Proceedings for the determination of such claim and review thereof, and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be had as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under section 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code.

SEC. 3. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States Government.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MAJ. ORIN A. FAYLE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2904) for the relief of Maj. Orin A. Fayle, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, line 3, after the word "act", to strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

COMDR. GEORGE B. GREER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3268) for the relief of Comdr. George B. Greer, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, line 12, after the word "act", to strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PAULINE H. CORBETT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3957) for the relief of Pauline H. Corbett, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "$18,716.97" and insert "$38,317.19."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

JAMES C. HAYES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4026) for the relief of James C. Hayes, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 2, line 6, after the word "act", to strike out "in excess of 10 percent."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the understanding of the Chair that the committee wishes to offer an amendment to the committee amendment, to add to the words proposed to be stricken out the word "thereof" on line 7, page 2.

Without objection, the amendment to the committee amendment is agreed to; and, without objection, the amendment, as amended, is agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

JAMES M. WILSON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4640) for the relief of James M. Wilson, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after the word "act", to strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MRS. ELLA MADDEN AND CLARENCE E. MADDEN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5237) for the relief of Mrs. Ella Madden and Clarence E. Madden, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, line 7, after the word "act", to strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

S. H. PRATHER AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5535) for the relief of S. H. Prather, Mrs. Florence Prather Penman, and S. H., Prather, Jr., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, line 22, after the word "skull", to insert a colon and *"Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

LT. P. B. SAMPSON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6184) for the relief of Lt. P. B. Sampson, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, line 3, after the word "Act", to strike out "in excess of 10 per centum thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

LT. MICHAEL CULLEN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7164) for the relief of Lt. Michael Cullen, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 11, after the word "veterans," to insert a colon and *"Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

WILLIAM C. IRVINE, CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 422) for the relief of William C. Irvine, chief warrant officer, United States Air Force, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "of", where it appears the second time, to strike out "$3,890.87" and insert "$2,622.05", and on page 2, line 4, after the word "act", to strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William C. Irvine, chief warrant officer, United States Air Force, Andrews Air Force Base, Washington, D. C., the sum of $2,622.05, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement, in addition to the amount he received under the provisions of the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, for household and personal effects destroyed or damaged when the vessel aboard which such effects were being shipped ran aground while en route from England to New York: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELSA EMELINA ROSADO Y RODRIGUEZ DE BROWER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2785) for the relief of Elsa Emelina Rosado y Rodriguez de Brower, which has been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the word "be", to insert "granted a visa and be", and in line 8, after the word "act", to insert a comma and "under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Elsa Emelina Rosado y Rodriguez de Brower may be granted a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act, under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 201) approving the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of certain aliens which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 2, after line 18, to strike out "A–6967495, Li, Pei Chao."

And, on page 34, after line 4, to insert:

A–6967612, Chang, Chao-Kang.
0300–447092, Li, Fei-Yu Lin.
A–7841866, Li, Tieh Tseng.

The amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

MR. AND MRS. HERMAN FLOYD WILLIAMS AND MR. AND MRS. W. C. SEGERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6137) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Herman Floyd Williams and Mr. and Mrs. W. C. Segers, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the word "to", to strike out "Mr. and Mrs. Herman Floyd Williams" and insert "Herman Floyd Williams and Bettie J. Williams, of Marianna, Fla."; in line 7, after the word "the", to strike out "sum of $16,097.26, to Mr. and Mrs. W. C. Segers" and insert "sums of $4,563.41 and $8,500, respectively, to Alma G. Segers, of Marianna, Fla"; and, in line 9, after the word "of", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$5,301.30."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act for the relief of Herman Floyd Williams, Bettie J. Williams, and Alma G. Segers."

CONSTITUTION WEEK

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 105) authorizing the President of the United States to designate the period beginning September 17 and ending September 23 of each year as Constitution Week was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to designate the period beginning September 17 and ending September 23 of each year as Constitution Week, and to issue annually a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to observe such week in schools, churches, and other suitable places with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

EDWIN K. STANTON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2057) for the relief of Edwin K. Stanton, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment on page 2, line 3, after the word "act", to strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MARY J. McDOUGALL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3366) for the relief of Mary J. McDougall, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the name "Dougall", to insert "of Napakiak, Alaska"; in line 8, after the word "quarters", to insert "at Napakiak, Alaska"; and in line 10, after the word "act", to strike out "in excess of 10 per centum thereof."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 253) certifying to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Robert Shelton to testify, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 1954, Senate Resolution 253; Calendar No. 1955, Senate Resolution 254; Calendar No. 1956, Senate Resolution 255; Calendar No. 1957, Senate Resolution 256; and Calendar No. 1958, Senate Resolution 257, be set for consideration on motion immediately following conclusion of the call of the calendar.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I concur in the request of the Senator from North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Let the Chair inquire whether the Senator from North Carolina wishes to have the several resolutions go to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. ERVIN. No; but to have them considered by motion following conclusion of the call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement which has been entered into, following conclusion of the call of the calendar the Senate will proceed to consideration of the unfinished business.

Mr. ERVIN. Then, Mr. President, I modify my request by asking that these resolutions go to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall object to consideration of these measures at this call of the calendar—let me

say that while we consider the resolutions to be most meritorious, expect to vote for their adoption, and hope they will be adopted by the Senate, yet we believe they are too important to be considered during the call of the calendar.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, at the request of the majority leader, I ask that the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered into be modified to the extent of permitting the consideration of these resolutions following conclusion of the call of the calendar.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall object—let me say that I think it very important that the Senate act promptly on the District of Columbia transit bill. I see no reason why these resolutions could not be taken up immediately following action by the Senate on the District of Columbia transit bill. I do not have the slightest idea how long consideration of the resolutions will take. The District of Columbia transit bill is set for disposal this afternoon, and it is important that the Senate dispose of it.

I should like to suggest to my friend, the Senator from North Carolina, that the understanding be that immediately following disposition of the District of Columbia transit bill, the Senate take up these resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection has been heard to the modified request of the Senator from North Carolina; and the resolutions will be passed over.

CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGE ACROSS THE ST. LAWRENCE RIVER NEAR OGDENSBURG, N. Y.

The bill (H. R. 8547) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the Ogdensburg Bridge Authority, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near the city of Ogdensburg, N. Y.," was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ST. MARYS RIVER PROJECTS, MICHIGAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 8807) to extend for an additional 3 years the time within which the State of Michigan may commence and complete the construction of certain projects heretofore authorized by the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to advise the Senate that a typographical error appears on page 1, in line 7, where the word "tool" should read "toll."

Without objection, that amendment will be agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 6143) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that for taxable years beginning after May 31, 1950, certain amounts received in consideration of the transfer of patent rights shall be considered capital gain regardless of the basis upon which such amounts are paid was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object to the bill as it is—let me say that I believe this measure is not proper Consent Calendar business. For that reason, and that reason alone, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

REFERENCE OF CLAIM OF WILLIAM E. STONE TO THE COURT OF CLAIMS

The bill (S. 2582) to consider jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of William E. Stone for disability retirement as a Reserve officer or Army of the United States officer under the provisions of the act of April 3, 1939, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the bill merely confers on the Court of Claims jurisdiction to hear and render judgment on this officer's claim for disability retirement as a Reserve officer. It seems there is a controversy between the officer and the Department of Defense as to whether the officer's injuries were sustained in parachuting from his crippled plane in Germany in 1944. All the bill does is allow the Court of Claims to pass on the question of whether the officer is entitled to disability retirement for the injury. In other words, the bill will simply send to the Court of Claims, for adjudication, the controversy between the officer and the Department of Defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2582) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims of the United States, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations, or any other limitation upon the jurisdiction of such court, to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of William E. Stone arising out of the failure of the War Department to retire him or to certify him for retirement as an Army of the United States or Reserve officer under the provisions of the act of April 3, 1939, as amended. In its consideration of such claim, the court shall determine whether or not said William E. Stone should have been retired for physical disability as an officer of the Army Air Corps. Should the court decide that the said William E. Stone should have been so retired, judgment shall be rendered in an amount equal to the amount the said William E. Stone would have received had he been so retired: *Provided*, That the passage and approval of this legislation shall not be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the Government of the United States.

Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 4 months after the date of the enactment of this act. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, and appeal from, and payment of, any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which the Court of Claims has jurisdiction as now provided by law.

PATRICIA A. PEMBROKE

The bill (S. 3472) for the relief of Patricia A. Pembroke was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act for the relief of Patricia A. Pembroke," approved August 28, 1954 (68 Stat. A231), is amended by inserting, in the proviso of such act, after the words "prior to the enactment of this act" the words "except hospital and medical expenses."

KINGAN, INC.

The bill (H. R. 3964) for the relief of Kingan, Inc., was announced as next in order.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I understand that the committee has requested that the amendment on page 1, in line 7, be withdrawn or eliminated from consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, Kingan, Inc., is engaged in the meatpacking business. In January 1953, swine belonging to the corporation were destroyed after the outbreak of an infectious disease of swine. Previously, there had been worked out between the State and Federal Governments a program by which owners of swine destroyed to prevent the spread of the disease were to be reimbursed on a 50–50 basis for losses incurred. Under the program, the animals involved were to be appraised to determine the loss. When the corporation's swine were destroyed, State authorities made an appraisal; but, due to a misunderstanding, no Federal appraisal was made. The State of Virginia has made its share of the payments to Kingan, Inc., but Federal officials have withheld payment of the share to be paid by the Federal Government, assigning as the reason that there had been no specific Federal appraisal. This bill would authorize payment of the Federal share out of moneys previously appropriated for the Department of Agriculture.

The Department of Agriculture recommends enactment of the bill. The amount of the payment allowable if the bill is passed is $13,095.82, and the Department states it is of the belief this is a fair evaluation.

Since the report was submitted, information which has been received requires that the committee amendments—except No. 4 which strikes the attorney's fees—be rejected, pending receipt of further information.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments of the committee will be stated.

The first amendment was, on page 1, line 7, after "$13,095.82", to strike out "an amount" and insert "and to Richmond Union Stock Yards Co., Richmond, Va., the sum of $1,255.50, amounts."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be rejected.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, in line 11, after the word "Incorporated", to insert "and Richmond Union Stock Yards Co."

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask that this amendment be rejected.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after the word "swine", to strike out "at its plant,".

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask that this amendment be rejected.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, in line 11, after the word "act", to strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask that this amendment be agreed to.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The amendment to the title was rejected.

ARMY AND AIR FORCE NURSES

The bill (H. R. 4051) for the relief of certain Army and Air Force nurses, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WRIGHT H. HUNTLEY

The bill (H. R. 8187) for the relief of Wright H. Huntley was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN J. COWIN

The bill (H. R. 4536) for the relief of John J. Cowin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CROSSE & BLACKWELL CO.

The bill (H. R. 4633) for the relief of Crosse & Blackwell Co. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ARTHUR H. HOMEYER

The bill (H. R. 5495) for the relief of Arthur H. Homeyer was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THOMAS W. BEVANS AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 6395) for the relief of Thomas W. Bevans and others was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

KAHZO L. HARRIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4162) for the relief of Kahzo L. Harris, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment on page 2, line 2, after the word "act", to strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO ST. JOHNS COUNTY, FLA.—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 7471) to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the Board of Commissioners of St. Johns County, Fla., was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, H. R. 7471 proposes to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to convey to the city of St. Augustine, Fla., without consideration, a tract of 5.82 acres of Coast Guard property surrounding the St. Augustine light station. The entire tract is within the municipal limits of St. Augustine and is valued at approximately $350. This bill would authorize a conveyance to the city for park purposes. It contains a reservation to the effect that the property shall be made available to the United States without compensation in the event of a national emergency. It also provides that no structure can be erected which would adversely affect the operation of the Coast Guard facilities located on the remaining 1.38 acres of the original tract.

The bill does not contain a reservation of minerals.

The Comptroller General's Office used the following significant language in its letter of August 12, 1955, in which he commented on this bill:

> Under section 13 (h) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 1622 (h)), disposition of surplus real property suitable for park purposes to States and political subdivisions thereof, at 50 percent of the fair value, is authorized. It is provided in that section of law (50 U. S. C. App. 1622 (h) (3) (A)) that the deed of conveyance provide that the land shall revert to the United States at its option if the land is not used and maintained for park purposes for a period of 20 years. The disposition of the land as proposed in the instant bill would therefore appear to give preferential treatment to St. Johns County, Fla., as against other counties which have acquired lands for park purposes under existing provisions of law. However, considering the relatively small value of the tract and the provisions of section 2 of the bill subordinating its uses as a park to Coast Guard operations, this Office would have no objection to favorable consideration of the bill by the Congress.

The entire argument of the Comptroller General in his letter is, of course, against the principle of the bill. Then, apparently applying what might be said to be a de minimis principle, he says that because the value of the property is so small, he will raise no objection.

We cannot start drawing such lines of discrimination. Either we should carry out the principles of the Surplus Property Act or repeal the act. The act provides for 50 percent of the fair market value. It ought to be applied to the 5.82 acres of Coast Guard property involved in this case, having a value of some $350. The city of St. Augustine should pay 50 percent of the fair market value.

When we eliminate mineral rights, and consider the reversion clause, the appraiser will give consideration to such elements in the original appraisal. In my judgment, we have gone too far down the road toward protecting this principle to make an exception on the floor of the Senate today.

On the other hand, the Treasury Department wrote, under date of January 20, 1956:

> The site of the St. Augustine Light Station has for many years consisted of a tract of approximately 7.2 acres. However, the maintenance of this amount of land has created a problem. The present authorized complement of the light station is one man. To reduce the maintenance problem, 5.82 acres of the land have been declared excess to the needs of the Coast Guard.

I say most respectfully that it is difficult to justify an exception to the general rule that 50 percent of the fair appraised market value should be paid for the land described in H. R. 7471. The fact that maintenance problems have arisen with respect to the land seems beside the point unless such maintenance problems make the land valueless. The best way to find out is to place the property on the market and see what someone would pay for it. I therefore offer the following amendment which would provide for payment of 50 percent of the fair appraised market value and for the reservation of the mineral rights:

On page 5, strike out lines 9 through 12, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

> SEC. 2. The conveyance authorized by the first section of this act shall be subject to the condition that the city of St. Augustine, Fla., pay to the Secretary of the Treasury, as consideration for the land conveyed, an amount equal to 50 percent of its fair market value as determined by independent appraisal, and the deed of conveyance shall reserve to the United States all mineral rights, including oil and gas, in the land so conveyed, and shall be subject to such other reservations, limitations, or conditions as may be determined to be necessary by the Secretary to protect the interests of the United States.
>
> SEC. 3. The deed shall contain a covenant that no structure shall be erected on the land which will in any way adversely affect the operation of the Coast Guard facilities, and a covenant that the—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask that consideration of the bill and the proposed amendment go over until the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] can be present.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his request long enough so that I may make a request that my amendment be printed and lie on the table?

Mr. ERVIN. Certainly.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask that my amendment be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed and will lie on the table.

The bill will be passed over.

ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC AIRPORTS IN ALASKA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 742) to improve the administration of the public airports in the Territory of Alaska, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with amendments, on page 2, line 10, after the word "airports", to insert a colon and "*Provided, however,* That as to all powers granted by this section, primary jurisdiction for the investigation of all Federal offenses under the investigative jurisdiction of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall remain with the Federal Bureau of Investigation."; on page 3, line 4, after the word "of", where it appears the second time, to insert "the unexpended balances of funds appropriated prior to the date of enactment of this section to carry out the purposes of this act and"; in line 7, after the word "appropriations", to insert "thereafter"; in line 9, after "July 1,", to strike out "1955" and insert "1956"; on page 5, line 21, after the word "under", to strike out "(1) and"; in line 22, after the word "subsection", to strike out "for contributions with respect to the service of any officer or employee for any period prior" and insert "on account of cases arising from injury, or death from injury, occurring prior"; and, on page 6, line 21, after "July 1,", to strike out "1955" and insert "1956", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of May 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 277), as amended, is amended as follows:

By striking out section 10 thereof and adding the following new sections 10 and 11:

"SEC. 10. (a) The Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter referred to as 'the Secretary') and any employee of the Department of Commerce appointed to protect life and property on the airports, when designated by the Secretary, are hereby authorized and empowered (1) to arrest under a warrant within the limits of the airports any person accused of having committed within the boundaries of the airports any offense against the laws of the United States, or against any rule or regulation prescribed pursuant to this act; (2) to arrest without warrant any person committing any such offense within the limits of the airports, in his presence; or (3) to arrest without warrant within the limits of the airports any person who, he has reasonable grounds to believe, has committed a felony within the limits of the airports: *Provided, however,* That as to all powers granted by this section, primary jurisdiction for the investigation of all Federal offenses under the investigative jurisdiction of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall remain with the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

"(b) Any individual having the power to arrest as provided in subsection (a) of this section may carry firearms or other weapons as the Secretary may direct or by regulation may prescribe.

"(c) The officer on duty in command of those employees designated by the Secretary as provided in subsection (a) of this section may accept deposit of collateral from any person charged with the violation of any rule or regulation prescribed under this act, for appearance in court or before the appropriate United States Commissioner; and such collateral shall be deposited with such United States Commissioner.

"SEC. 11. (a) To carry out the purposes of this act, there is authorized to be established an Alaskan airports fund (referred to hereinafter as the "fund"). The capital of the fund shall consist of the unexpended balances of funds appropriated prior to the date of enactment of this section to carry out the purposes of this act and such amounts as may be advanced to it from appropriations thereafter made for that purpose, together with the value of the assets of the airports, less liabilities as of July 1, 1956. The value of the assets shall be determined by the Secretary of Commerce, subject to the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, taking into consideration original cost, less depreciation, the usable value to the airports if clearly less than cost, obsolete and unusable facilities and equipment, and other reasonably determinable factors which would reduce the value of the assets of the airports.

"(b) Unless the Congress otherwise directs, the Secretary shall pay into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury at the close of each fiscal year, interest on the capital of the fund at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average yield to maturity (on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations during the month of June of the preceding fiscal year) on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having a maturity date of 15 or more years from the first day of such month of June; except that no interest shall be payable on that portion of the capital which the Secretary determines to be properly allocable to national defense, nor on that portion which the Secretary determines to be equivalent to the Federal grants-in-aid that would have been received if the airports had been built and developed in their entirety subsequent to enactment of the Federal Airport Act and under its provisions by a local public agency with maximum Federal grants-in-aid. The determinations of the Secretary under this subsection shall be subject to the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

"(c) Whenever any capital in the fund is determined by the Secretary to be in excess of the current needs of the airports, such capital shall be credited to the appropriation from which it was advanced, where it shall be held for future advances. The capital of the fund shall be considered reduced by the net amount of such credits.

"(d) Receipts from operations under this act shall be credited to the fund. The Secretary is authorized to charge any Government agency for facilities and services at the rates charged to the public, or to charge a lump sum which in the aggregate would approximate the total of the individual charges incurred by the using Government agency; except that no charge shall be made for services equivalent to those required to be rendered without charge by comparable public airports which have received grants-in-aid under the Federal Airport Act. The fund shall be available for payment of all expenditures of the Secretary under this act.

"(e) (1) Contributions shall be made from the fund to the civil-service retirement and disability fund, on the basis of annual billings as determined by the Civil Service Commission, for the Government's share of the cost of the civil-service retirement system applicable to the officers and employees of the airports and their beneficiaries.

"(2) Contribution shall be made from the fund to the employees' compensation fund, on the basis of annual billings as determined by the Secretary of Labor, for the benefit payments made from such fund on account of the officers and employees of the airports and their beneficiaries.

"(3) Each such annual billing for contributions under (1) and (2) of this subsection shall include a statement of the fair portion of the cost of the administration of the fund with respect to which such billing is made, and a sum equal to such fair portion of the cost shall be paid by the fund into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"(4) The fund shall not be liable under (2) of this subsection on account of cases arising from injury, or death from injury, occurring prior to the effective date of this section, nor for payments for administrative costs with respect to any period prior to such effective date.

"(5) In carrying on the activities authorized by this act, the Secretary shall utilize, to the extent practicable, the available services and facilities of other agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government on a reimbursable basis.

"(f) Appropriations are hereby authorized for payment of such amounts as may be shown in the annual budget program of the airports as necessary to cover actual losses of prior years sustained in the conduct of its activities under this fund. Amounts appropriated to the fund under authority of this subsection shall not be added to the amount of advances and shall not require payment of interest under subsection (b) of this section.

"(g) Such sums as may be required to carry out the purposes of this act are authorized to be appropriated without fiscal year limitations, to remain available until expended. Advances shall be made to the fund from the appropriations made therefor when requested by the Secretary. This act shall take effect July 1, 1956."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936, AS AMENDED

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1833) to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments, on page 2, line 3, after "(2)", to strike out "In respect of hull insurance, the valuation in the policy for actual or constructive total loss of the vessel insured shall not exceed the amount that would be payable if the vessel had been requisitioned for title under section 902 at the time of the attachment of the insurance under said policy: *Provided, however*" and insert "In respect of hull insurance, the valuation in the policy for actual or constructive total loss of the vessel insured shall be a stated valuation determined by the Secretary which shall not exceed the amount that would be payable if the vessel had been requisitioned for title under section 902 (a) at the time of the attachment of the

insurance under said policy: *Provided, however,* That in the case of a construction-subsidized vessel, the valuation so determined shall be reduced by such proportion as the amount of construction subsidy paid with respect to the vessel bears to the entire construction cost and capital improvements thereof (excluding the cost of national defense features): *Provided further*"; on page 3, line 2, after the word "has", to strike out "so" and insert "not"; in the same line, after the word "valuation", to insert "the amount of any claim therefor which is adjusted, compromised, settled, adjudged, or paid shall not exceed such stated amount, but if the insured has so rejected such valuation"; in line 12, after "902", to insert "(a)"; in line 13, after the word "policy", to insert a colon and "*Provided, however,* That in the case of a construction-subsidized vessel, the valuation determined by the court as such just compensation shall be reduced by such proportion as the amount of construction subsidy paid with respect to the vessel bears to the entire construction cost and capital improvements thereof (excluding the cost of national defense features): *And provided further*"; in line 21, after the word "the", where it appears the first time, to insert "stated"; in line 23, after the word "contained", to insert "in the 12th paragraph under the heading Maritime Activities in title I of the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1956, in the 10th paragraph under the heading Maritime Activities in title III of the Department of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the United States Information Agency Appropriation Act, 1955"; and on page 7, after line 5, to insert:

SEC. 5. The first sentence of section 1206 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U. S. C. 1286), is amended by striking out the words "during any time the United States is at war or during any period of emergency declared to exist by the President of the United States."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1209 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 1289 (a)), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) (1) The Secretary, in the administration of this title, may issue such policies, rules, and regulations as he deems proper and may adjust and pay losses, compromise and settle claims, whether in favor of or against the United States and pay the amount of any judgment rendered against the United States in any suit, or the amount of any settlement agreed upon, in respect of any claim under insurance authorized by this title.

"(2) In respect of hull insurance, the valuation in the policy for actual or constructive total loss of the vessel insured shall be a stated valuation determined by the Secretary which shall not exceed the amount that would be payable if the vessel had been requisitioned for title under section 902 (a) at the time of the attachment of the insurance under said policy: *Provided, however,* That in the case of a construction-subsidized vessel, the valuation so determined shall be reduced by such proportion as the amount of construction subsidy paid with respect to the vessel bears to the entire construction cost and capital improvements thereof (excluding the cost of national defense features): *Provided further,* That the insured shall have the right within 60 days after the attachment of the insurance under said policy, or within 60 days after determination of such valuation by the Secretary, whichever is later, to reject such valuation, but shall continue to pay premiums upon such valuation at the rate provided for in said policy. In the event of the actual or constructive total loss of the vessel, if the insured has not rejected such valuation the amount of any claim therefor which is adjusted, compromized, settled, adjudged, or paid shall not exceed such stated amount, but if the insured has so rejected such valuation, the insured shall be paid, as a tentative advance only, 75 percent of such valuation so determined by the Secretary and shall be entitled to sue the United States in a court having jurisdiction of such claims to recover such valuation as would be equal to the just compensation which such court determines would have been payable if the vessel had been requisitioned for title under section 902 (a) at the time of the attachment of the insurance under said policy: *Provided, however,* That in the case of a construction-subsidized vessel, the valuation determined by the court as such just compensation shall be reduced by such proportion as the amount of construction subsidy paid with respect to the vessel bears to the entire construction cost and capital improvements thereof (excluding the cost of national defense features): *And provided further,* That in the event of an election by the insured to reject the stated valuation fixed by the Secretary and to sue in the courts, the amount of the judgment will be payable without regard to the limitations contained in the 12th paragraph under the heading Maritime Activities in title I of the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1956, in the 10th paragraph under the heading Maritime Activities in title III of the Department of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the United States Information Agency Appropriation Act, 1955, in the 11th paragraph under the heading 'Maritime Activities' in title III of the Department of Justice, State, and Commerce Appropriation Act, 1954, the 10th paragraph under the heading 'Operating Differential Subsidies' in title II of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, the corresponding paragraphs of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952, and the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, although the excess of any amounts advanced on account of just compensation over the amount of the court judgment will be required to be refunded. In the event of such court determination, premiums under the policy shall be adjusted on the basis of the valuation as finally determined and of the rate provided for in said policy."

SEC. 2. Section 902 (c) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 1242 (c)), is amended to read as follows:

"(c) If any property is taken and used under authority of this section, but the ownership thereof is not required by the United States, the Commission, at the time of the taking or as soon thereafter as the exigencies of the situation may permit, shall transmit to the person entitled to the possession of such property a charter setting forth the terms which, in the Commission's judgment, should govern the relationships between the United States and such person and a statement of the rate of hire which, in the Commission's judgment, will be just compensation for the use of such property and for the services required under the terms of such charter. If such person does not execute and deliver such charter and accept such rate of hire, the Commission shall pay to such person as a tentative advance only, on account of such just compensation a sum equal to 75 percent of such rate of hire as the same may from time to time be due under the terms of the charter so tendered, and such person shall be entitled to sue the United States in a court having jurisdiction of such claims to recover such amounts as would be equal to just compensation for the use of the property and for the services required in connection with such use: *Provided, however,* That in the event of an election by such person to reject the rate of hire fixed by the Commission and to sue in the courts, the excess of any amounts advanced on account of just compensation over the amount of the court judgment will be required to be refunded. In the event of loss or damage to such property, due to operation of a risk assumed by the United States under the terms of a charter prescribed in this subsection, but no valuation of such vessel or other property or mode of compensation has been agreed to, the United States shall pay just compensation for such loss or damage, to the extent that person entitled thereto is not reimbursed therefor through policies of insurance against such loss or damage."

SEC. 3. The first sentence of section 902 (d) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 1242 (d)) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) In all cases, the just compensation authorized by this section shall be determined and paid by the Commission as soon as practicable, but if the amount of just compensation determined by the Commission is unsatisfactory to the person entitled thereto, such person shall be paid, as a tentative advance only, 75 percent of the amount so determined and shall be entitled to sue the United States to recover such amount as would equal just compensation therefor, in the manner provided for by section 24, paragraph 20, and section 145 of the Judicial Code (U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 28, secs. 41 (20) and 250): *Provided, however,* That in the event of an election to reject the amount determined by the Commission and to sue in the courts, the excess of any amounts advanced on account of just compensation over the amount of the court judgment will be required to be refunded."

SEC. 4. All war-risk insurance issued under title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, which is in force on the date of the enactment of this act shall, as of the beginning of such date, be deemed to have been amended to conform to the requirements of section 1209 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended by this act unless the insured, within 10 days after such date, objects to such amendment.

SEC. 5. The first sentence of section 1206 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U. S. C. 1286), is amended by striking out the words "during any time the United States is at war or during any period of emergency declared to exist by the President of the United States."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MINERAL INTERESTS ACQUIRED IN CONNECTION WITH THE GARRISON DAM PROJECT—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 746) to provide for the return to the former owners of certain lands including Indian tribal lands, acquired in connection with the Garrison Dam project of mineral interests in such lands was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the bill, as amended, would provide that the former owners of mineral rights with respect to lands flooded by the waters of Garrison Dam might purchase back the mineral rights taken by the Government. The bill, as proposed to be amended by the committee, would require that the fair market value of the mineral rights be paid.

I ask unanimous consent that the report of the committee be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report (No. 1955) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 746) to provide for the return to the former owners of certain lands, including Indian tribal lands, acquired in connection with the Garrison Dam project of mineral interests in such lands, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

On page 1, line 5; on page 2, line 3; on page 2, line 6, insert the words "or devisees" immediately after the word "heirs."

On page 1, line 6, strike out the words "lands or interests therein were" and insert in lieu thereof the words "any mineral interest in lands or any estate in lands that included a mineral interest was."

On page 2, line 4, strike out the words "in such lands as were" and insert in lieu thereof the words "that were so."

On page 2, line 7, insert the words "upon the date of approval of this act" immediately after the word "interests"; and on page 2, lines 8–10, delete the phrase ", but not in excess of 5 percent of the purchase price paid for the land by the Government."

On page 2, add the following language at the end of section 1 of the bill:

"*Provided*, That where mineral interests in the same lands were acquired from more than one person or tribe, no conveyance shall be made unless it is established to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the proposed conveyance will operate in a manner which will be fair and just to each person (and the heirs or devisees of any such deceased person) or tribe from whom any mineral interest in such lands was acquired by the United States, and which will not prejudice the proper conservation and development of the mineral deposits affected by the conveyance. For the purposes of this act former mineral interests, whether or not in the same lands, may be combined or divided in such maner as may be requested by the applicant or applicants and approved by the Secretary."

Add to the bill a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 3. In the event all of the mineral interests of the United States in and to all of the mineral deposits that are subject to any one lease, permit, license, or contract issued under the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands, approved August 7, 1947 (61 Stat. 913; 30 U. S. C., 1952 ed., secs. 351–359), as amended, are otherwise eligible for conveyance under section 1 of this act to a single grantee, or to several grantees as tenants in common, then such conveyance shall contain an assignment of all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to such lease, permit, license, or contract, including the right to all rentals, royalties, and other payments accruing under such lease, permit, license, or contract after the effective date of such conveyance. Except as provided in the preceding sentence, mineral deposits that are subject to any such lease, permit, license, or contract shall not be eligible during its continuance for conveyance under this act. Nothing contained in this act, shall affect the continued validity of any such lease, permit, license, or contract or any rights arising thereunder."

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of this measure is to provide for the reconveyance of mineral rights in certain lands acquired for the Garrison Dam project to the former owners thereof.

An area in excess of 400,000 acres of land in North Dakota was acquired by the Department of the Army for the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River as authorized by the act of Congress approved December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 891). By late 1951, fee title to 173,577 acres of this area, including 13,483 acres comprising the dam site and other construction areas, had been acquired.

CHANGE IN LAND ACQUISITION

With the speculation in oil and gas leases which accompanied the significant oil and gas activity in the Williston Basin in 1951, the Department of the Army reviewed its remaining land requirements for the project and concluded that a reservation of oil and gas rights by owners of land within the project area, but not within specified distances of the main dam, spillway, outlets, powerhouse, embankment section, and so forth, would be compatible with the project requirements provided the rights reserved are subordinated to the right of the United States to flood and submerge the land as required and that the exercise of such rights is appropriately restricted.

In order to restrict the landownership requirements of reservoir projects to the minimum area essential to their development, operation, and maintenance, the Department of the Army in October 1953, revised its general land-acquisition policy so as to place greater emphasis on the acquisition of flowage easements instead of fee title, wherever feasible. The statement of the revised policy, which was developed in collaboration with the Department of the Interior, was published in the Federal Register on December 23, 1954 (19 Federal Register 8845). The revised policy is being applied in the acquisition of land for all new reservoir projects.

In furtherance of the revised policy, the Department of the Army has taken action in appropriate cases to amend pending condemnation cases and proceedings, as authorized by the act of Congress approved October 21, 1942 (56 Stat. 797), to provide for the taking of such lesser interest in lands as will conform these acquisitions to the revised policy. The Secretary of the Army, however, does not have authority to adjust in a similar manner acreage or title interest in lands acquired either through purchase, transactions, or condemnation proceedings in which final judgment has been entered.

BASIC OBJECTIVE

The lack of authority on the part of the Secretary of the Army to adjust title interest in certain lands gives rise to this legislative proposal to provide for adjustment in the title interest in that acreage outside the dam site and construction area acquired in fee prior to October 1951, so as to conform the title interest to be retained by the United States in these lands with the title interest acquired in conformity with the decision reached in 1951.

Some landowners in the Garrison Dam area took advantage of the opportunity to reserve oil and gas rights for whatever speculative value they had; others elected to convey the full fee-simple title to the United States. There is also included within the project boundaries an area consisting of approximately 152,360 acres which was acquired in fee from the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation in North Dakota in accordance with the joint resolution of Congress approved October 29, 1949 (63 Stat. 1026).

AMENDMENTS

The fact that these lands are subject to the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (30 U. S. C., 1952 ed., secs. 351–359) makes desirable the addition of language of a technical and clarifying nature governing reconveyances of interests in land subject to oil and gas leases issued by the Department of the Interior under the above-mentioned act. All amendatory language of this character, suggested in the report received by the committee from the Department of the Interior, has been adopted. A full explanation of the need for such amendments is contained in the Department's report, which is set forth below with the report of the Bureau of the Budget.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., January 31, 1956.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: This is in reply to your request for the views of this Department on S. 746, a bill to provide for the return to the former owners of certain lands, including Indian tribal lands, acquired in connection with the Garrison Dam project of mineral interests in such lands which, we understand, supersedes S. 536, a bill to provide for the return to the former owners of certain lands acquired in connection with the Garrison Dam project of mineral interests in such lands.

We would have no objection to the enactment of S. 746, if it were amended in accordance with our suggestions below.

Section 1 of S. 746, if enacted, would require the Secretary of the Army to convey the mineral interests in lands acquired by the United States for the Garrison Dam project, upon application, to any Indian tribe or any person (or his heirs) from whom the lands were acquired, upon the payment of a purchase price equal to the fair market value of the mineral interests, but not more than 5 percent of the purchase price paid for the land by the United States. Section 2 of the bill would authorize the Secretary of the Army to include in each conveyance such reservations and restrictions as he may deem advisable for purposes relating to the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir or for other purposes that are in the public interest.

Since all of the lands to which this bill is applicable were acquired by the Department of the Army and are at this time subject to its jurisdiction, that Department is in a much better position than we to comment on the merits of the bill from a substantive standpoint. However, these lands are subject to the Mineral Leasing Act for acquired lands (30 U. S. C., 1952 ed., secs. 351–359), under which this Department is authorized to issue, with the concurrence of the Department of the Army, oil and gas leases on the lands. Twenty-six such leases were issued during the period from January 1953 to December 1954, and applications for additional leases are pending. Moreover, the beneficiaries of the bill would include the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, and individual members of that Indian tribal group.

In the event favorable consideration is given to the enactment of S. 746, we recommend that it be amended in five respects.

1. The bill as now worded extends the privilege of obtaining a reconveyance of the mineral interests in the lands affected by its provisions to the former owners, if living, and, if deceased, to their "heirs." It may be questioned, however, whether the term "heirs" is entirely adequate to cover situa-

tions where the former owner has disposed of his estate by a will. We suggest, therefore, that at each of the 3 places where this term appears in the bill (p. 1, line 5; p. 2, line 3; and p. 2, line 6) the words "or devisees" be inserted immediately after the word "heirs". If this were done, we consider that the privilege of reacquiring the mineral interests of a deceased owner would be exercisable by those persons who, under the laws of the State of North Dakota governing the descent and testamentary disposition of real property, would have succeeded to such mineral interests had they remained as part of the estate of such former owner at the time of his death.

2. The bill as now worded does not identify with as much clarity as would be desirable the situations to which it is intended to apply. The person from whom surface rights were acquired by the United States for the Garrison Dam project frequently did not convey full mineral rights to the United States. In some cases this was because the mineral rights in the lands already belonged to the United States, having been reserved to it in the original patents or other instruments under which the lands were held by the surface owners. Thus, it is estimated that about 3,500 acres of the acquired lands were subject to a reservation of fall mineral deposits, and that about one-fourth of the acquired area was subject to a reservation of the coal deposits. In other cases the surface owners were unable to convey full mineral rights to the United States because they had made conveyances or leases of such rights to third parties. As a consequence of this situation, it was necessary for the Government to obtain relinquishments of mineral rights in hundreds of instances from persons other than the surface owners. In still other cases, some mineral rights were excepted from acquisition by the United States. Thus, we understand that oil and gas rights have been retained by the former surface owners in a number of instances.

In these circumstances we believe it most important that the bill should clearly express the principle that former surface owners, as well as former owners of mineral leases or grants, in the area affected by the bill are to be entitled to a reconveyance of only the particular mineral interests which the United States acquired from these owners. To this end we suggest the following amendments: (1) at page 1, line 6, strike out the words "lands or interests therein were" and insert in lieu thereof the words "any mineral interest in lands or any estate in lands that included a mineral interest was"; and (2) at page 2, line 4, strike out the words "in such lands as were" and insert in lieu thereof the words "that were so."

3. It is believed that the United States should benefit, in any reconveyance of mineral interests to former owners, from any increase in the value ascribed to those mineral interests while title to them is in the United States. For this reason, we believe that the provision in S. 746 which limits the price to be charged for the reconveyance of mineral interests to 5 percent of the purchase price paid for the land by the United States should be removed, and that the price charged the former owners should in every case be the fair market value of the mineral interests. Since the date of the enactment of S. 746 will be the time at which the policy of returning title to the mineral interests to the former owners will be effectively established, it would be appropriate to provide that the price to be charged the former owners be the fair market value of the mineral interests upon that date. To achieve these ends, we suggest the insertion of the words "upon the date of approval of this act" immediately after the word "interests" at page 2, line 7, and the deletion of the phrase ", but not in excess of 5 percent of the purchase price paid for the land by the Government" at page 2, lines 8–10.

4. In many of the situations where separate mineral interests in the same lands were acquired from two or more persons, restoration of the mineral interests acquired from one would be both impractical and inequitable unless accomplished as part of a restoration of the status quo with respect to all. Particularly is this true where a mineral lease was involved. In such a situation a satisfactory restoration could hardly be effected without the consummation of an agreement between the former lessor and former lessee reinstating the obligations created by the former lease, or substituting new obligations. Hence, the bill should condition the reconveyance of the interests of lessors or lessees or of other fractional, partial, conditional or future interests upon a showing that the parties in interest have worked out whatever arrangements may be necessary in order to avoid unfairness and to permit proper utilization of the mineral deposits. For this purpose, we suggest that the following provisions be added at the end of section 1 of the bill:

"*Provided*, That where mineral interests in the same lands were acquired from more than one person or tribe, no conveyance shall be made unless it is established to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the purposed conveyance will operate in a manner which will be fair and just to each person (and the heirs or devisees of any such deceased person) or tribe from whom any mineral interest in such lands was acquired by the United States, and which will not prejudice the proper conservation and development of the mineral deposits affected by the conveyance. For the purposes of this act former mineral interests, whether or not in the same lands, may be combined or divided in such manner as may be requested by the applicant or applicants and approved by the Secretary."

5. As pointed out in the forepart of this report, some of the lands affected by the bill are subject to outstanding oil and gas leases issued under the Mineral Leasing Act for acquired lands. We believe that the interunderlying the bill probably is to transfer the interests of the United States in these leases to the former owners of the mineral deposits covered by such leases, in the event the former owners apply for the reconveyance of their former interests in these deposits. If this is the true intent, we believe it needs to be spelled out in the terms of the bill. Furthermore, serious objections would exist to the conveyance of mineral interests in lands that are subject to an outstanding Federal mineral lease unless such interests cover all of the mineral deposits that are subject to the particular lease involved. Partial assignments of leases or of reverters or reversions in leased mineral deposits could result in burdening the lessees as well as the United States with additional and costly problems of accounting, operations and administration. Hence, we recommend that it leased mineral deposits are to be included within the application of the bill, such application be limited to situations where all of the interests of the United States in all of the mineral deposits subject to the particular lease involved are eligible for reconveyance under the bill, and where the effect of the reconveyance will be to transfer the entire interests of the United States in the lease to a single grantee or to several grantees holding as tenants in common. Both of the matters discussed in this paragraph could appropriately be handled by adding to the bill a new section, reading substantially as follows:

"SEC. 3. In the event all of the mineral interests of the United State in and to all of the mineral deposits that are subject to any one lease, permit, license, or contract issued under the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands, approved August 7, 1947 (61 Stat. 913; 30 U. S. C., 1952 ed., secs. 351–359), as amended, are otherwise eligible for conveyance under section 1 of this act to a single grantee, or to several grantees as tenants in common, then such conveyance shall contain an assignment of all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to such lease, permit, license, or contract, including the right to all rentals, royalties, and other payments accruing under such lease, permit, license, or contract after the effective date of such conveyance. Except as provided in the preceding sentence, minerals deposits that are subject to any such lease, permit, license, or contract shall not be eligible during its continuance for conveyance under this act. Nothing contained in this act shall affect the continued validity of any such lease, permit, license, or contract or any rights arising thereunder."

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

WESLEY A. D'EWART,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This will refer to our letter to you of February 10, 1955, concerning S. 536 and S. 746, bills which would authorize the return to former owners of mineral rights acquired in connection with Garrison Dam.

In that letter it was stated that the Bureau of the Budget would have no objection to enactment of these measures if amended to provide that the United States shall receive the full fair market value of mineral interests in these lands. Since that time we have reviewed our position on this legislation in the light of discussions with representatives of the Indian interests involved, and we have concluded that we would have no objection to enactment of these bills, if amended to provide that the United States shall receive for the mineral interests in these lands their full fair market value appraised as of the date of enactment of the legislation. It is understood that such a provision would be satisfactory to the Indian interests.

Sincerely yours,

PERCY RAPPAPORT,
Assistant Director.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I commend the Senator from Louisiana for the protection which he has sought to give the taxpayers of the country by including in the bill provision for payment for the mineral rights.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do I correctly understand that, in addition to the mineral rights, the land itself is to be returned to the original owners?

Mr. LONG. No. In 1951 the Department of the Army changed its policy with regard to land acquisition, recognizing that, in acquiring floodways and lands to be flooded by dams, it is not necessary to acquire mineral rights, particularly mineral rights to oil and gas.

Therefore, since 1951, the policy seems to have been that unless it is necessary, the Department of the Army does not acquire mineral rights in order to have a dam in a certain area.

In this instance the landowners would like to be placed in a situation in which they could buy back the mineral rights. They would have to pay more for such mineral rights than the Government paid them, because there has been oil exploration in the area. Under the terms of the bill, they would pay the fair market value of such mineral rights.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ROY M. HOFHEINZ AND HIS WIFE IRENE

The bill (H. R. 3738) for the relief of Roy M. Hofheinz and his wife Irene was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT SHIP SALES ACT OF 1946, AS AMENDED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1883, S. 3113, which was placed at the foot of the calendar. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3113) to amend section 9 (c) of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. When the bill was considered previously on the call of the calendar, an explanation was asked for. Does the Senator from Connecticut renew his request in that regard?

Mr. PURTELL. The Senator from Connecticut does not renew his request, and he offers no objection to the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce were previously agreed to.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM TO SERVE THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That concludes the call of the calendar. Under the order previously entered, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is S. 3073.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3073) to provide for an adequate and economically sound transportation system or systems to serve the District of Columbia and its environs; to create and establish a public body corporate with powers to carry out the provisions of this act; and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the unanimous-consent agreement which was entered into on Monday last and which governs the further consideration of the unfinished business.

The legislative clerk read the unanimous-consent agreement, as follows:

Ordered, That, effective on Wednesday, May 9, 1956, at the conclusion of the calendar call, during the further consideration of the bill S. 3073, the Washington Metropolitan Transit Authority Act, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, yield additional time to any Senator on any amendment, motion, or appeal. (May 7, 1956.)

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have two amendments which perhaps will not take long to consider. I call up, first, the amendment I now send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 71, after line 22, it is proposed to insert:

(e) In the event that Authority acquires specific items of real property or tangible personal property by eminent-domain proceedings under the provisions of this section, it shall take not less than the entire interest in such items of property which is vested in the owner thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Florida desire?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 mintues.

This amendment is offered not only by myself but by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. This is a matter which was discussed at some length on the floor of the Senate during the debate day before yesterday, and was agreed upon at that time. I know of no one participating in the debate or who was present at that time who was not in accord with the provisions of the amendment. Under the amendment, if the owner has a fee simple title, the Authority must in condemnation proceedings, condemn the fee simple title. If the owner has a less important title, for instance, a possessory interest, such possessory interest must be taken as a whole.

The amendment, if adopted, will bring an end to any thought that the Authority might condemn less than the full interest in any property, and, particularly, might condemn for only a period of time such capital assets as rolling stock, street cars, buses, and the like.

Mr. President, I believe there is no objection to the amendment. I know of none. I yield back the remainder of my time, unless the Senator from Oregon or the Senator from Colorado wishes to supplement anything I have said.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, unless some Senator wishes to speak in opposition to the amendment, I shall be glad to yield back our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] for himself and other Senators.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I send forward another amendment, also offered for myself, the Senator from Oregon, and the Senator from Colorado, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Florida will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 67, after line 3, it is proposed to strike out lines 4 to 12, inclusive.

At the beginning of line 13, it is proposed to change "(c)" to "(b)."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, this amendment also relates to a matter which was discussed in some detail on the floor day before yesterday. The question discussed was whether under the bill it was wise to give to the Authority the right to condemn the capital stock of a corporation which was the owner of assets desired by the Authority.

I believe it was agreed during the debate that such a provision was inserted as an alternative provision to be used only if further condemnation proved to be inadequate.

I have understood from the Senator from Oregon that on checking the matter it has been discovered that this particular provision did not have reference, under the plan of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, to capital stock of the transit company, but, instead, to another situation entirely.

I find that we are all in accord with the feeling that it would be unwise to give to the Authority the right of condemnation of both capital stock and the assets represented by the capital stock, so that, in effect, by condemning both, the Authority would be sitting on both sides of the table representing the then operator of the line and also representing holders of the remaining assets of the transit company. It seems to me, Mr. President, that that would be particularly unwise when it is realized that by condemning only that part of the stock held by the present operating group of the company, the officers of the District of Columbia could be substituted for the corporate officers of the corporation and would then be in control of the assets of the corporation in which the minority stockhold-

ers have an interest. I am advised that there are 2,500 of those stockholders, all told.

It appears that the Senators who have discussed this matter are in substantial accord, and unless some Senator wishes to supplement my brief remarks, I shall be glad to yield back the remainder of my time. I shall be glad to yield time to either the Senator from Oregon, the Senator from Colorado, or the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I am on the floor at this time for the purpose of yielding back the time, because there seems to be no opposition to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] for himself and other Senators.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I call up at this time my amendment "5–7–56–C" and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 81, line 19, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a comma and the following:

And shall make and promulgate rules and regulations governing the conditions of employment of such personnel as may be employed by the Authority, including, but not limited to, the selection, appointment, reemployment, promotion, demotion, suspension, and dismissal of such personnel according to merit and fitness and without regard to political, religious, or racial considerations; the fixing of pay and hours of employment; the establishment of an employee grievance procedure; and the establishment of leave, welfare, and pension privileges, subject to the provisions of any collective bargaining agreement then in effect or thereafter adopted.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I believe there is no objection to this amendment as it is now written. The purpose of it is to make more definite and certain the language of the bill itself. The bill provides a rather elaborate and complete personnel and arbitration system, but fails to give the Authority the fundamental right of writing rules and regulations under which the work shall be carried on. That has now been done by this amendment.

I have no further remarks to make concerning the amendment, unless some other Senator wishes to comment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the Senator's interpretation that the use of the word "subject" on line 5, page 2, makes the amendment refer to the entire section?

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes; it is. That is my purpose.

If no other Senator wishes to speak on the amendment, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of the time on the other side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment "5–7–56–F," and I ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 82, lines 20 to 23, it is proposed to strike out the following:

Subject to the provision that such employees as may not be absorbed at time of transfer shall retain their employment status and employment rights.

On page 83, following the sentence ending in line 1, it is proposed to insert the following new sentence:

Any person employed by such transit utility who is not, at the time the Authority acquires such utility, offered transfer and appointment as an employee of the Authority shall, for a period ending August 14, 1958, have a right of seniority for purposes of employment and employment benefits under the Authority in a position comparable to the position he last occupied while employed by such transit utility or in any other position the duties of which he is qualified to perform, in accordance with any collective bargaining agreement then in effect.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The purpose of the amendment is to spell out, in behalf of the employees, all the rights they shall have under the proposed Authority.

In the bill as printed, on page 82, beginning in line 20, the language reads:

Subject to the provision that such employees as may not be absorbed at time of transfer shall retain their employment status and employment rights.

That language was considered to be too vague. Therefore, I have prepared the amendment for the purpose of spelling out specifically the employment rights and benefits which the employees shall have when they transfer or are transferred to the Authority. The amendment makes the language very definite, as contrasted with the rather vague language which is now in the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. As the Senator from Colorado knows, I support his amendment.

Does the Senator agree with me that what the amendment proceeds to make crystal clear is that the Authority shall not be required to employ any number of employees in excess of the number required to operate the system; but that any employees who are necessarily laid off will be, nevertheless, protected in their security rights if, as, and when additional employees must be hired, and that the Authority will at least offer top priority to those who were laid off because they were not needed at a particular time in the operation of the system?

What is sought to be done by the section of which the Senator's amendment will become a part is simply to make clear two things: First, that the Authority does not have to hire employees who are not needed to operate the system; second, if, as, and when the Authority needs to hire additional employees, it shall respect the seniority rights of the employees who were laid off.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator from Oregon has made abundantly clear the purpose of the amendment. It is not the intention of the amendment that the transit Authority will have to accept more employees than it needs, but the amendment protects the seniority of the employees when they are transferred. It was thought best to spell out that provision specifically in order that the rights of the employees would be made crystal clear.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time on the amendment.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, on our side, we are prepared to yield back the remainder of our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment "5–7–56–D" and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 85 it is proposed to strike out the period in line 11, and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon, and between lines 11 and 12 to insert the following:

(10) For the purposes of the act approved August 9, 1955 (Public Law 330, 84th Cong.; 69 Stat. 624), the government of the District of Columbia and the Authority shall be deemed to be agencies of the United States, and such act shall in every respect be applicable to the officers and employees of the government of the District of Columbia and of the Authority.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Since this is an amendment which, as I understand, will not be readily accepted, and because of the importance of the amendment, I wonder if it would be agreeable to the acting majority leader to have a quorum call, without the time for the quorum call being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May the Chair inquire through the minority leader whether the Senator from Colorado has any other amendment to call up which may be noncontroversial?

Mr. ALLOTT. I have no more amendments. This will be the last one, so far as I know.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thought that if there were any other amendments which were of a noncontroversial nature, they might be disposed of first.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I had understood there were no additional amendments to be offered by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I agreed to the suggestion of the distinguished minority leader that there be

a quorum call, the time for the call to be charged to neither side.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will I retain the privilege of the floor?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I include, as a part of my unanimous-consent request, that the Senator from Colorado shall retain the privilege of the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That will be understood.

The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allott	Frear	Long
Beall	Fulbright	McCarthy
Bricker	Holland	McNamara
Butler	Hruska	Morse
Byrd	Jackson	Neuberger
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Payne
Case, N. J.	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Knowland	Watkins
Daniel	Langer	Williams
Dworshak	Lehman	Wofford

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD and Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] is absent on official business attending the atomic energy tests in the South Pacific.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senators from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). A quorum is not present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BENDER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GORE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. POTTER, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THYE, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

SENATOR WALTER F. GEORGE, OF GEORGIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we have all heard this morning with deep regret the news that the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is retiring from the Senate at the end of this term. All of us must respect the considerations of health which have impelled him to his decision. But, Mr. President, all of us feel a deep sense of sorrow that a friend and a leader is leaving this body.

WALTER F. GEORGE is one American whose place in history is already assured. For many years Senator GEORGE has enriched our public life with his statesmanlike advice and his always sound counsel.

WALTER GEORGE has been the man of calm reflection, of deep thought, of wide knowledge.

WALTER GEORGE has been the man upon whom all of us have leaned for support and for strength in the turbulent seas of the period following World War II.

WALTER GEORGE is a man whose roots, like those of a mighty oak, are planted deep in the soil of his native Georgia; but in a very real sense WALTER GEORGE is a national figure, and a world figure.

WALTER GEORGE'S name has become a household word in every dwelling in our land and across the seas and the oceans. In far away countries, and in places which are alien and strange, WALTER GEORGE is a magic figure, who symbolizes all that is best and noble in the United States.

I like to think that he embodies the finest traditions of this great Nation—courage, determination, moderation, and a desire to solve rather than to aggravate or exaggerate the problems of our time. I believe that every good American will join me in that thought.

I trust that I may be forgiven a personal note. WALTER GEORGE is to me more than a great leader, more than a towering figure of statesmanship. He is also one of my closest and most dearly beloved personal friends. For the past few years we have sat side by side in the Senate. He has always given me the advice and counsel of a wise father. Without him, I do not believe I would have done as well as I have.

The news tickers have carried the announcement of the President that he has offered Senator GEORGE a place in keeping with his great talents. This is a wise act, an act of patriotism. We can ill afford to lose such talents, and whatever the future may have in store, the people of America will always hold WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia, deeply enshrined in their hearts as a champion without fear, and a statesman for the ages.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I would not wish this opportunity to pass without, on behalf of the minority, rising and joining the majority leader in his admirable and timely statement regarding the services which WALTER GEORGE has rendered his country. He has not only been a tower of strength in the United States Senate, ably representing his State of Georgia, but in a very real sense he has been and is a Senator of the United States.

He has carried heavy burdens in the Senate. As chairman for many years of the Committee on Finance, and subsequently as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, he has participated and been leader in many of the great decisions affecting the fiscal and foreign policies of our country.

He has carried forward the high traditions of the Senate and of the Government of the United States in developing and maintaining a bipartisan foreign policy, so that in meeting great international problems we could present to the world a united front.

Senator WALTER GEORGE is loved and respected in the Senate equally on both sides of the aisle.

Of course, all of us regret the news that he will leave the Senate at the end of his present term in January 1957. However, I think that we can temper our regret by the knowledge that he is not leaving the service of the Government and of the people of the United States. Inasmuch as we will not have him with us in the Senate after the present Congress has concluded its business, it is stimulating and satisfying to know that he will be using his talents and great abilities in helping to represent the Government of the United States in meeting some of the great problems confronting us in the North Atlantic alliance.

I know of no man who could be selected by the President of the United States who has a better background than Senator WALTER GEORGE. When the chips are down, Senator GEORGE acts as an American in meeting the great challenges that confront us.

He has never been a narrow or a bitter partisan. He has served, of course, the great party with which he is affiliated. But, more than that, he has served the United States, which he loves.

All of us regret that he is leaving the Senate, but all of us rejoice that he will have more years of service to give to the Government and to the people of the United States.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, one of the privileges that I treasure most highly is that I have been a close and intimate associate of Senator WALTER GEORGE for more than 23 years. We are now desk mates in the Senate, and I have sat next to him in the Senate Finance Committee for a long time. It has been an association that I shall value as long as I live, because I feel I have had the opportunity to know intimately one of the greatest statesmen of this age.

No one can be associated with Senator GEORGE without forming for him a rare kind of love and admiration which seldom occurs in human relationships. He has one of the greatest intellects among men in public life. His kind consideration to all endears him to his colleagues.

There has never been a time, I believe, in the history of our country when we

have needed so much men of the character and the capacity possessed by WALTER GEORGE. He will leave a void in the Senate deliberations and in the work of important committees of which he is a member that it will be impossible, in my opinion, to fill.

Of him it can be said that his actions always are determined by what in his conscience he believes to be for the best interests of his country.

I was more than shocked when I heard of his determination not to be a candidate for reelection. We in the Senate will miss him sorely. Throughout his career he has always borne serious responsibilities, and I can only hope that his future work will provide him with the opportunity to contribute the judgments of his superb intellect in his patriotic effort to accomplish those things which will add to the progress and security of America.

My friendship for him and my close association with him during our service in the Senate will ever remain one of the finest memories in my life. I sincerely hope our paths will cross frequently in the future so that, in the future as in the past, I can derive inspiration from his courage, his patriotism, and the fine judgment with which he is so richly endowed.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I share the feelings expressed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], about the great Senator GEORGE.

The avenues available to human beings for progress and eminence are limited and cherished. A man may become a great father, a great husband, a great friend, a great businessman, or a great statesman. WALTER GEORGE has achieved eminence in all these fields.

I have a new concept of statesmanship and patriotism because I have had the opportunity and privilege of being closely associated for nearly 8 years with WALTER GEORGE, of Georgia. I have become aware of a broader view of devotion to a man's native State. I have learned anew of the power of intellect and wisdom, as manifested by articulate eloquence.

As a boy, it was my privilege to hear William Jennings Bryan when he was rightly regarded as the most eloquent voice in his party. Mr. President, the voice of WALTER GEORGE is just as eloquent. He has an even greater authority and understanding and realization of the subjects to which he addresses himself and the relative position they occupy in respect to the welfare of his country and its people.

I realize the contribution he has made to bipartisan support of the foreign policy of the United States, whether under a Democratic or a Republican President. I am deeply aware that WALTER GEORGE is a great Democrat. No stronger voice was ever lifted in the Senate in defense of the rights and privileges and the opportunity to make the progress which belong to the average citizen, including the farmer.

Mr. President, as the years come and go, WALTER GEORGE'S stature and eminence in the fields of public service which he has adorned will become larger and larger and be more and more deeply appreciated.

WALTER GEORGE is a great friend. I appreciate the words of the distinguished majority leader on that point. I have no fonder feeling as regards my membership in the Senate than my association with the great Senator from Georgia.

To say that I personally will miss him is an understatement. In my judgment, he is the tallest timber in the great group of mighty trees we know as the United States Senate. When he leaves his place here, there will be a void in the forest as the eye looks toward the sky. Certainly, when he came to the Senate he filled a vacancy. When he leaves there will be a void which I do not expect to see filled in my lifetime.

I am happy that he has been offered a position of responsibility by the President of the United States, because, great as he is as a husband and father, as a friend, and as a champion of the common people, he has achieved his greatest eminence as a patriot.

So, Mr. President, in whatever position he may find himself, as a private citizen, as a representative of his President in an important position in the field of the development of peace, or as an adviser to friends of his in this body, I know that so long as he lives he will continue to be one of the greatest patriots America has ever known. We who have been privileged to serve with him count ourselves fortunate by reason of the blessing of his friendship, association, and the opportunity we have had to walk side by side with him.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I am sure that all Members of the Senate have heard with sorrow that the dean of the Senate, the able WALTER GEORGE, has decided to retire from membership in this body.

I am deeply pleased to know that the President of the United States hopes to be able to continue to make use of the services of this great man in a position with the NATO organization. I think it was particularly fortunate that a great Republican, Warren Austin, was called upon by a Democratic President to take a responsible position with the United Nations. In the same spirit I think it is extremely pleasing that a great Democrat, such as WALTER GEORGE, can be called upon by a Republican President to assume responsibilities in a world organization. I know that in whatever work he shall undertake he will take with him the confidence, the faith, and the loyal friendship of every Member of this body.

In the case of another great American it was once said that the people were proud of him because of the enemies he had made. I should like to feel that the Members of this body are proud of WALTER GEORGE because of the friends he has made. I think it is a good thing once in a while for a man in an eminent position to have made enemies because of his stand, but I think it is a notable thing that WALTER GEORGE has made friends because of the way he has handled great questions, and because of the way he has treated all his fellow Members on the floor and off the floor of the Senate.

It is with a profound sense of personal loss that we who are to remain in the Senate realize that we shall not have him with us as a wise friend and counsellor after the conclusion of his term. I think the Nation can ill afford to lose him from the Senate of the United States. I hope it will be the privilege of the American people long to make use of his fine judgment and long to hear the ringing tones of his voice as he speaks out in behalf of the things to which he has pledged allegiance and to which he has given his very life.

We regard him as a truly great man, not because he has remained in the Senate a long time where he has rendered great service to the people of his State and Nation, although he has done that, but because it has been truly an inspiration to the Members of the Senate to have known him, and he will long be remembered as one of the kindliest men who ever served in this body.

We shall miss him very much. I hope this great American will relieve that situation by coming frequently to Washington and giving us many opportunities to renew the friendship we have enjoyed with him.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I rise to pay my tribute to our friend, Senator GEORGE.

I have known WALTER GEORGE ever since I became a Member of the Senate, and I have received from him the uniformly courteous treatment he accords to everyone. But beyond that, Mr. President, I have had the privilege of being intimately acquainted with him during the 10 years I have been a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. Of course, he has been a bulwark of strength in our approach to foreign problems. I do not know how a man of his vision, his thoughtful approach, his ability to see all sides of problems, can be replaced. I know I speak for all the Members of this body when I say that he really is irreplaceable.

But beyond his ability, his statesmanship, beyond the affection in which he is held by all the Members of the Senate and, in fact, by all the people of the Nation, I wish to pay tribute to him as a warm personal friend, because I have found that WALTER GEORGE and his wife, "Miss Lucy," are two of the finest people whose friendship my wife and I have ever enjoyed. I wish to express our sorrow at his leaving the Senate and to wish him great success in his new assignment to the NATO organization.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, it was with profound regret that I heard of the decision of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] to retire from the Senate.

It is difficult to imagine the Senate without the steadying hand of Senator GEORGE. He has been at the helm, so to speak, ever since I have been in this body, so it will be certainly a very drastic change for me as well as for the Senate as a whole to lose his leadership.

It would be presumptuous on my part to attempt to tell this body about the great qualities of leadership possessed by

the Senator from Georgia. Many Senators have known him longer than I, and all of us have observed the wisdom with which he has handled so many of the most important problems to come before this body.

During the past 10 years I have served on the Committee on Foreign Relations with the distinguished chairman of that committee. He has always been a steadying influence in the deliberations of that committee. His great experience and his profound knowledge of the Constitution and of the Nation's history have been of invaluable aid to the deliberations of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. President, I could continue at length to discuss the great contributions which Senator GEORGE has made to the work of this body and to the welfare of his country. All that I might say, however, can be summed up in the simple phrase that he has been and is "a fine public servant." He has served his country and his State well. It is men like WALTER GEORGE who have made our Nation a strong and free community of civilized human beings which is the hope of the world. He deserves the acclaim of all free people, everywhere.

I know that I shall sorely miss his advice and leadership on the committee and on this floor.

I wish him and "Miss Lucy" Godspeed and many years of happiness which they so richly deserve.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think it is utterly impossible adequately to portray in words the confidence, the respect, and the affection in which WALTER GEORGE has been held by all his colleagues throughout his service in this body. He is a man of wisdom, a man of eloquence, a man of great influence, a man of vision, and, above all, a man of human understanding. He understands people. He understands their motives, and he understands the great principles upon which our Government was founded. There is no one who has ever associated with him who has not been enriched by such association. He left his mark upon everyone with whom he associated, a mark which meant the improvement and growth of those who worked on his committees or on the floor of the Senate with him.

There are many, many things to be said about the contributions which he has made to the welfare of the people of our country in all grades and all classes.

I was happy to have had the opportunity to serve with him before the end of the last war, when he brought to the floor a resolution providing for the creation of a special committee on economic policy and planning for the postwar period. Out of this committee, of which he was the chairman, and of which he was the guiding influence, came substantial legislation which prevented the development of the disastrous influences which so frequently follow great wars. Senator GEORGE was the author of legislation which made it possible for the United States to pass easily from the turmoil of active war to the rebuilding of civil life.

Senator GEORGE is a great man in the truest sense of the word. I have no hesitation in saying that, in my opinion, a greater man never stood on the floor of this Chamber.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have listened to the majority leader, the minority leader, and my other colleagues. With what they have said concerning the qualities and character of WALTER GEORGE as a Senator and as a man, I agree. He is an American statesman in the best sense of that word. He has had much to do with keeping our Nation financially sound because of his decisions when he was chairman of the Committee on Finance; and as the present chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations he has shown that he always rises above partisanship in his decisions on international problems.

I should like to express the personal sense of pride Mrs. Saltonstall and I feel that we can call WALTER GEORGE and his wife, "Miss Lucy," our friends. Many, many times I have enjoyed our friendly conversations in the Capitol. Frequently I have listened to his convincing arguments on difficult problems. Often I have consulted with him.

We shall miss WALTER GEORGE in the Senate. I shall miss his friendly smile and fine sense of humor. But we shall follow him eagerly as he continues his service for his country in the halls and committee rooms of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

I join with his many friends in congratulating him upon undertaking this new and all-important assignment in a period of great uncertainty in the world.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I heard this morning the sad news that Senator GEORGE intends to retire from the Senate at the end of his term. I sent him a note in which I said, "I always respect your judgment, but in this instance I am heartbroken over your decision."

In my opinion, the American people will suffer a great loss when Senator GEORGE walks out of this Chamber into retirement, because he has become the architect of foreign-policy decisions in the Senate under the advice-and-consent clause of the Constitution. Frankly, I know of no greater service Senator GEORGE possibly could render the people of the United States than to continue as chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, but, I yield to his judgment. At the same time I think he should know of the high regard all of us have for him and of our appreciation of the great leadership he has given to the Senate in respect to foreign-policy matters. I say that as one who has not always agreed with him, and still does not, on some foreign-policy issues. But I know of no possible assignment which could be given to him outside the Senate in which he could make so great a contribution to the peace and security of this Nation as he could make if he continued to serve as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I thought this should be said by one who at the same time respects the decision he has made, to retire from the Senate. I wish him Godspeed in any new assignment he undertakes; and I know that whatever that assignment may be, the people of the United States will be the rich beneficiaries of his future service.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I have just come from a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations, over which Senator GEORGE was presiding. Word came to me that some of my colleagues had been paying tribute to him in view of the announcement that he would not stand for reelection, so I felt I must come to the Chamber and add a few words to what I know my colleagues would say about the remarkable ability and wonderful qualifications of Senator GEORGE for the positions he has occupied, about the notable work he has done as a Member of the Senate, and the loss we will sustain when his term comes to an end.

If I am not mistaken, Senator GEORGE has served in the Senate for a generation. That is 34 years—a remarkably long time. During that time he has acquired information and knowledge which has made him a great authority in two special fields, the field of fiscal affairs and taxation, and the field of foreign relations. We have all benefited by his experience, because he has shared it with us, especially in times of crisis. We have benefited not only by his knowledge, but also by his wisdom and by the application of his knowledge and wisdom to the changing conditions in the world.

I hope sincerely that both our country and the world will continue to benefit by the counsel and advice of Senator GEORGE at critical junctures. I earnestly trust that when he ceases to sit in the Senate, he will serve in some other position befitting his unequaled qualifications, and that we will still be able to avail ourselves of his experience, wisdom and judgment.

Having worked with Senator GEORGE for so many years in the Senate, I felt I could not let the opportunity pass without saying these few words.

There is one other qualification which adds to his value to us, but which will not, of course, be available if he is in some other position, and that is his unrivaled power of presentation. When he has mastered all the facts in a case, he can not only present them clearly to his colleagues in the Senate, but can also draw the inferences from them convincingly, and do it with a zeal and an enthusiasm which in themselves are moving.

When the time comes—and it will not be until next year that we will lose his voice in the Senate—I am certain we will have lost something which is irreplaceable.

Mr. President, I felt that I must say these few words. Now I feel that I must return to sit beside Senator GEORGE in a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, from time to time each Member of the United States Senate is referred to as a leader. Perhaps in a very real sense each Member of this body is a leader, particularly in the thought and action of the people whom he is honored to represent.

Some of us perchance, by fortune of position, seniority, talent, of courage, may upon occasion be a leader among

Senators. Senator WALTER GEORGE surpassed even that occasional, fortunate position. Senator GEORGE was a Senator's Senator, a man whose voice carried great weight, not only with the country, which had come to hold him in such high esteem, but with the more difficult body to lead, though fewer in number, the men composing this great legislative body.

As a new Member of the Senate in January 1953, I sought out the senior Senator from Georgia. He was gentle. He was kind. He was considerate. When I was a Member of the other body of Congress, of course I had known him, but I had not known him in any personal way. I had not known him in a manner to bring me into contact with the warmth of his personality, the gentleness of his spirit, his fine sense of humor, and his understanding of the problems of his colleagues. That element of his leadership in this body explains why he has had such great influence among his colleagues, and with officials of the executive branch of the Government.

That was by no means the only attribute which went into the makeup of the great leader that WALTER GEORGE has been, is, and is yet to be. Few men are blessed with the incisive intellect, the power of logic, the courage of conviction, and the inimitable ability to speak his thoughts in a way that grips the attention of his colleagues.

The news that he will no longer after this year serve in this body renders me disconsolate, and gives me a feeling of depression. This news represents not the passing of an era, but the passing from this Chamber of one of the greatest Senators who has ever graced it. That is not to say that upon all matters I have found him to be my leader. It is unnecessary to say that, Mr. President. It is unnecessary to say it for several reasons, not the least of which is the willingness of the senior Senator from Georgia to concede to all of his colleagues not only the right to disagree, but to concede to them the sincerity of their disagreement.

I could speak at great length upon the attributes of this man, the particular attributes which have made of him a leader among men, a Senator's Senator. Other Senators have already spoken, and therefore I shall conclude by saying that in giving recognition to the merits, the qualities, the influence, and the power of this fine citizen, President Eisenhower has done a grand thing. In his new field of work the senior Senator from Georgia can bring his great talents to bear, not only in a manner to render service to the United States of America in its relationships with the countries of Europe, but I venture to say that he can render a very great service to all members of the North Atlantic Alliance; and, through his talents of persuasion, vision, and understanding, he may make a most valuable contribution to the economic and political unification of Western Europe.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, many years ago it was my privilege to meet the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia in the home of Gov. Max Gardner, of North Carolina. At that time Governor Gardner told me that in his opinion, without question, Senator GEORGE was our greatest living American.

After knowing Senator GEORGE over the years, I fully agree with that opinion; and it was my very great pleasure to say so in a recent talk in the great Georgia city of Savannah.

Mr. President, it is hard to picture the Senate without WALTER GEORGE. He is loved and completely respected by every Member on both sides of the aisle.

By his decision the Senate will lose its greatest Member.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I know that there is nothing I can add to the very fine statements and tributes which have been made upon the announcement of the forthcoming retirement from the Senate of our distinguished colleague, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the friend of all of us, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. President, I can remember when Senator GEORGE came to the Senate from our neighboring State of Georgia. At that time I was a student in the university. Fourteen years later I came to Congress as a Member of the House, on the other side of the Capitol. I had ample oppjortunity to observe the work of the Senator from Georgia and to admire his growing stature. I never dreamed in those days, however, that I should some day be a colleague of his in this body of Congress, and, even more than that, to have the privilege of serving under his chairmanship on that great committee of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I have talked with Senator GEORGE frequently regarding his plans. I felt, as everyone must have felt this morning when the announcement finally was made that he was not going to become a candidate for reelection, that it signaled a real loss to this body, certainly to the members of the Foreign Relations Committee who serve under him, and who have served under him during the past several years; and, even more than that, a great loss to our country, and, indeed, to all the free world.

Some of the sting was taken out of the decision of the Senator from Georgia by the announcement and the very fine recognition on the part of President Eisenhower as to the great contribution the Senator from Georgia has yet to make, and the President's request to Senator GEORGE that he remain available for such work as might be given him, specifically, as has been referred to, as the President's special ambassador to NATO.

I am sure we were all delighted with the statement Senator GEORGE made that he would stand ready to be available at all times for such responsibilities and such tasks as the President might think he was capable of assuming.

Mr. President, even though I join with others in expressing my regret at seeing Senator GEORGE leave this body, I want to say that if any man ever earned the right to retire from the trying duties of public service day by day, Senator GEORGE has earned it, because during the 34 years he has been in the Senate, he has been one of its most active Members.

I know all of us join in wishing for him and "Miss Lucy" many years of great happiness and good health.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, the characteristics of a real statesman are not easily or quickly attained. Perhaps they are inherent qualities born in an individual, and not developed.

In any event, the honor of being designated as a statesman, with all that it implies, has come to but a comparatively few of the many who have served their country in high public office.

Surely we who presently serve in this distinguished body are fortunate in that we have in our midst a personality whose high patriotism, devoted service, deep understanding and appreciation of the Nation's welfare exemplify the qualities of statesmanship to the fullest and finest degree.

The distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, with the wisdom of his many years in Congress, has contributed able leadership in legislative matters affecting the Nation's fiscal affairs, as well as its foreign relations.

His position as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee is perhaps the most sensitive and far-reaching assignment which any Member of the Senate can hold.

In his prior leadership of the Finance Committee, Senator GEORGE has presided over and carefully guided tax legislation of the greatest importance.

His success in these matters and in countless others has won for him the appreciation of the entire Nation.

Yet, though, he has always been acutely conscious of the need for the participation of the Federal Government in national affairs, he has also recognized the rights of the individual States, wherein the real strength of our Federal Union is found.

Mr. President, although Senator GEORGE has decided to relinquish the heavy burdens of his present position, we are happy in the thought that he will be available to us for counsel and guidance in the days ahead.

May I wish for him and his gracious "Miss Lucy" many additional years of health and happiness.

I know that as he leaves the Senate, he carries with him the warm and grateful thanks not only of his native State, but of the people of all the other States of the Union, which he has helped to strengthen and prosper through his dedicated service in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it was with a sense of deep personal sadness that I learned today that our distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has announced that he will decline to run for reelection.

Georgia owes this man a great deal. The United States of America owes him still more. The free world will be indebted to him for many years to come because of the positive action he has taken in the field of foreign policy, in seeing what he could do to keep the

democracies free, and to stop the onrush of atheistic aggression.

I know that the people of Georgia will miss him from his seat in the United States Senate; and I know, also, that they will remember him fondly and well because of the many contributions he has made to their welfare and betterment.

The people of the United States will miss him, because not only has he been a great Senator from the State of Georgia, but he has also been a great Senator of the United States. Mr. President, as a Senator of the United States, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has been a recognized leader of national standing as far as all parts of our country were concerned.

I am delighted that Senator GEORGE has accepted an appointment from the President of the United States to be the United States representative to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization with the rank of Ambassador. I wish to commend the President for the courtesy, consideration, and understanding he has shown toward this great statesman.

All Members of the Senate are going to miss Senator GEORGE; but I know that Mrs. Mansfield and I will be able, as will the rest of the Members of the Senate, to see Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, one of the Nation's great statesmen, and "Miss Lucy" from time to time, because I am quite certain that in his new position he will return occasionally and will give us the benefit of his advice, his counsel, and his understanding.

So, Mr. President, although we shall miss him very greatly, indeed, after next January, from his seat in this Chamber, we are thankful that in the years to come we shall have the continued benefit of his service, his counsel, and his advice. We shall need them; and no person in the United States is better qualified than is Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, to act in that capacity, so that in the end the United States and the free world as a whole will benefit.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing my regret that the service in the Senate of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is drawing to a close.

His contributions to the welfare of his own State of Georgia and to the Nation as a whole are well known. But I shall remember him especially for his unfailing courtesy and kindness of manner to all of those of us who served with him. We shall miss him greatly.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, it will be a great loss to this body when, commencing with the next Congress, the great senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the dean of the Senate, and our President pro tempore, will no longer be with us.

Senator GEORGE has served in the Senate for 34 years. All Senators know that seniority means a great deal in this body. Yet, Mr. President, the intellect and ability of the senior Senator from Georgia are such that if Senator GEORGE were to commence his service here today, he would be one of the great leaders of this body.

Only those who have served as Members of the Senate can fully understand the tremendous power and influence of Senator WALTER GEORGE, of Georgia, as a Member of the Senate of the United States.

The brilliance and eloquence of Senator GEORGE have moved this body to take the proper and the wise course when momentous decisions regarding foreign policy, taxes, social security, public welfare, and a great number of other matters were to be made by us. Time and again we have seen him save the day for that which we found to be in the best interests of the Nation.

It has been my privilege to serve under Senator GEORGE as a member of the Senate Committee on Finance, both when he was chairman of the committee and during the time after he stepped aside from its chairmanship, to serve as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. He has been a most courteous and fair chairman. He has been sympathetic and helpful to all members of the committee, and has accorded to them every right which could possibly be expected by the committee members.

I believe that all Members of the Senate will agree that the understanding of Senator GEORGE of both our foreign policy problems and our tax problems is superior to that of perhaps any other Member who has ever served in this body.

We shall miss him, and we shall miss his help and advice.

Personally, I have never questioned the judgment of Senator GEORGE, because we have found that time generally proves him right.

If WALTER GEORGE should agree to accept an important position in connection with the foreign affairs of this Nation, I am sure that the bipartisan nature of our foreign policy would be greatly improved. Our position in world councils would be greatly strengthened. I trust that his service in that capacity, if he chooses to accept such an appointment, will be as great as his service in this body.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I was extremely sorry to learn, today, that Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, has decided not to seek reelection this year, and that, accordingly, he will not be a Member of the Senate in the next Congress.

I have not known Senator GEORGE as long or as well as have some of my colleagues, for of course I am very much junior in service to him. I believe that he has served in the Senate longer than has any other present Member and he has won their high respect.

Mr. President, even Members of the Senate who have not always seen eye to eye with Senator GEORGE have recognized that he is a man of great stature, a man of high integrity and intelligence, and of the strictest devotion to duty.

I am sure that Senator GEORGE did not reach his decision to leave the Senate without the most soul-searching and prayerful thought, and for reasons which appeared to him to be completely sound.

Yet the Congress will be poorer when Senator GEORGE leaves this body. The entire Nation, which has profited so long and so greatly by his wise and devoted service, will suffer a serious loss. His long experience in the Senate has made him a most valuable member of both the Finance Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee and his views have always been respected by his colleagues and in most instances widely supported.

I am very happy, indeed, to know that President Eisenhower has offered him so important a position in the Foreign Service, where Senator GEORGE will, I hope, further strengthen the relationships between the United States and our allies in NATO.

I wish for Senator GEORGE everything good that he may desire for himself in the years which lie ahead. I hope he will be spared with Mrs. George for many, many more years of good health, happiness, and useful service.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, when I learned of Senator GEORGE's decision to retire at the end of this session of Congress I was confronted with mixed emotions.

First, I thought of the loss of his great ability and his unselfish and patriotic service to the Nation and to the world. I thought we could ill-afford to lose the services of such an outstanding Member of the United States Senate at this time when our Nation confronts many delicate international problems.

I thought of how much I would miss him personally. I have had the privilege of serving with him as a member of the Finance Committee for the past few years. He has always been friendly. He has always been willing to advise those of us who are junior members of the committee. It has always been a pleasure to be associated with him when we came to deal with problems of taxation, social security, tariffs, and international trade programs.

I thought also of his many years of devoted service to the country, which entitle him to a few years of rest and retirement after his many fruitful years of service.

I know, too, how much Mrs. George will appreciate the greater opportunities for home life when Senator GEORGE is relieved of some of the burdens which must always be borne by a man who, for so many years, has been prominent in public life.

I make this last statement because this afternoon I rode to the Capitol from the Senate Office Building in the car with Mrs. George. She told me that she felt she had been relieved of a great load today.

Mrs. Carlson and I wish for Senator GEORGE and Mrs. George—"Miss Lucy," as she is affectionately known—a well deserved retirement and rest.

Senator GEORGE is always a perfect gentleman. Not only does he possess great ability, but he is willing to visit and work with those who need his advice and counsel, particularly the younger Members of this body.

I am pleased that again the President has shown sound judgment and has demonstrated his ability to select well-qualified men for important places by offering to Senator GEORGE the most important position as our representative in NATO. In that position he can render outstanding service not only to this Nation but to the world. We would, indeed, be fortunate to have such a representa-

tive. I sincerely hope that he will accept the position.

Personally I shall miss Senator GEORGE's services. I first met him when I became a member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives in 1938. At that time we began to deal with tax problems. It has been my pleasure to be associated with him for 6 years on the Senate Finance Committee. It was a distinct privilege to have the opportunity to know him and to work with him.

I wish for Senator and Mrs. George a well earned rest and retirement.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I listened with most sincere approval to the fine commendations which have been spoken in regard to our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. Although it has not been my privilege to serve on any committees with him, I wish to add a word of personal appreciation for the counsel and help he has given me in many matters since I first came to the Senate. His door was always open. He had no party inhibitions which might have prevented him from talking over frankly, earnestly, and sincerely with me the problems with which I was concerned at the time.

We regret Senator GEORGE's departure from this body, but we all sincerely hope that he will cross our paths often, and will be frequently among us. We hope that his great talents will continue to be at the service of his Government, as they have been for so many years past.

I know of no one who has been more nobly endowed in so many ways. He has been endowed with ability and experience for the strenuous work in which he has been engaged for more than a quarter of a century in this body.

It has been a great privilege to be associated with him. I wish for him and his family many years of companionship, and, for those who serve their Government, the benefit of many more years of his service, guidance, and counsel.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, like the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], I experience a conflict of emotions, in view of Senator GEORGE's decision about which we have just heard.

Over the years he has been a great tower of strength to the Senate. At first I watched his work from a distance, as closely as I could, especially during the 1930's, when he stood firm on matters of principle which were vital and important to our Nation's economy and to the credit of the Government of the United States.

During my service in the Senate it has been a great privilege to watch him more closely, and to appreciate the great force of his wisdom and personality, and the impact which his intellect has made upon the United States Senate. I doubt if it was ever more clearly shown than last year, at the time when we had under consideration the far eastern treaties pertaining to the islands off the coast of China. I believe Senator GEORGE did more at that time to unify the Senate on a difficult issue than anyone I have ever observed or read about. He supported the President's policy vigorously and firmly, and in such a way that those of us who were in doubt were able to resolve our doubts by reason of the wisdom of Senator GEORGE, and the forceful way in which he expressed his conclusions on that issue.

I can hardly refrain from saying a personal word to indicate what a great privilege has been his friendship and that of "Miss Lucy," his wonderful wife, for whom Mrs. Bush and I have formed a very real affection.

I have often wished that I might have attained a degree of dignity in the eyes of my wife which would cause her to call me "Mr. BUSH." "Miss Lucy" has always called her husband "Mr. GEORGE" over the many years of their close association. I think we admire them particularly because of the great courtesy which they show not only toward each other, but to all their friends.

We regret the departure of Senator GEORGE from the Senate. We know that both he and Mrs. George will remain close to us, because they are the kind of people who always remain close to their friends.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, when Senator GEORGE announced his retirement from the Senate at the end of this calendar year I felt that I was losing a senatorial father. He has meant just that to me, and I am sure that many other Senators can say the same thing.

Senator GEORGE led us, not by patting us on the back. I do not remember ever having heard him ask me or any other Senator expressly to vote for any measure in which he was especially interested. I doubt whether he asked any other Senator to do so, unless that Senator first approached him. He led and guided us by his logic. He compelled us by the soundness of his own ideas and conclusions. This attribute and the fine qualities of his character and his wisdom and unselfishness all go to make up the real elements of constructive statesmanship. His influence has been so great, and its foundation so secure, that I believe we will still have him with us in many ways even beyond the time of his term of office in the Senate. His influence will live with us, and his example in his approach to matters of state and to the problems of the Nation will continue to be a shining light and a guide for us.

I recall that not too long after I became a Member of the Senate, I came into the Chamber during the latter part of a yea-and-nay vote, and I voted without hearing any of the arguments. Later someone asked me how I had voted. I replied that I had voted against the bill then pending. The person said to me, "Well, there is no use asking you why you voted as you did; you did not hear Senator GEORGE's argument." That was true, Mr. President. Many times we have been indebted to him for his counsel. We have also been indebted to him for his speeches on the floor of the Senate, whereby, because of his compelling logic and sound reasoning, he was able to change votes on the floor, to change the outcome of a vote on an amendment, or on a bill.

Along the line of what was said by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] that Senator GEORGE's wife refers to him as "Mr. GEORGE," I have never been able to say "Walter," when referring to him, as we ordinarily refer to another Member of the Senate by his first name. It is because there is something compelling about Senator GEORGE's innate dignity, which commands, from my viewpoint, at least, that I give him the great title of gentleman. In the area from which I come, to call a man "Mister" is to give him the title of gentleman.

Mr. President, I should like to say about Senator GEORGE's retirement from the Senate that if he had felt he was physically capable of making a campaign, he would have made it. In view of his thought and his conclusion on that point, I am willing to take his judgment and abide by his verdict, that from a physical standpoint he has probably extended his years of service as far as he feels justified.

I know his influence will continue to be felt in the Senate. I believe he will continue to serve his Nation in some capacity in a truly great way; and from that service I hope he will reap great rewards and satisfactions.

Certainly he can leave the Senate with the knowledge that he is honored and respected, and that he has carved out a career which has brought him enduring fame. As he goes from the Senate, his fine life companion will go with him. She, too, can know that she has played a major part in, and has made a great contribution to, her distinguished husband's career and has been a source of inspiration to him. Among those who have had the pleasure and privilege of being associated with her there are included, of course, our wives, who appreciate and greatly love her.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, when I heard this morning that Senator GEORGE had determined to retire from the Senate, I regretted it exceedingly. I had the privilege of becoming a member of the Committee on Finance when I first came to the Senate. As a result I have been very closely associated with Senator GEORGE during the past 10 years.

During that service, year after year, and day after day, I always considered Senator GEORGE to be an outstanding American. I know he has always made his decisions based on what he thought was in the best interest of America. He was a strong partisan, but he never hesitated to lay aside party considerations if that would result in greater benefit to his country.

My colleagues have made reference to the beautiful association that exists between WALTER GEORGE and "Miss Lucy." They have been an exemplary couple. I have enjoyed their friendship very much. I trust that they will come back frequently and visit with us. I am glad that Senator GEORGE will have an opportunity of continuing to serve America. I consider WALTER GEORGE a granite American. He is a patriot first. He has profound knowledge of his country and of its needs, and he exercises that knowledge for the benefit of the Nation.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the words of tribute which have been spoken by our colleagues today in behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, the Honorable WALTER F. GEORGE.

Despite his greatness, ability, and busy schedule, Senator GEORGE has been available always for counsel and advice to those of us who are younger in point of service in the Senate.

From the first day of my service in the Senate in 1953 until the present time I have depended upon Senator GEORGE for help in arriving at many of my official and personal decisions, and I know that the same has been true of many of the other younger Members of the Senate.

In the future the wise counsel and patriotic statesmanship of Senator GEORGE will be missed by the Senate and the Nation.

I can add nothing to what has been said except my personal word of appreciation for the honor of having served with Senator GEORGE in the United States Senate, and the inspiration and assistance which he has furnished all of us who have had the privilege of being numbered among his colleagues.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I have not had the privilege of serving on a committee with Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia. But I did have the privilege of sitting as a member of the Committee on Armed Services in the joint sessions of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services at which the two distinguished Senators from Georgia presided. The senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] presided as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] presided as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services at the joint session of the two committees when they were considering the so-called Formosa resolution last year.

The deliberations lasted for about 3 days, and at their close one of the very highly respected senior Senators of the Senate made the remark that in his 20 years of service in the Senate he had never been called upon to vote on a more important question. I mention that merely to reflect the atmosphere of the committee sessions at which the Senator from Georgia presided as the primary chairman. The fact that out of the joint sessions of the committees came a resolution of a character which commanded the respect and support it did in the Senate was in no small degree due to the wise guidance of the sessions of the joint committees by Senator GEORGE.

In another capacity I suppose I have had an experience which, so far as I know, no other Member of the Senate has had. When the select committee was created a few months ago to investigate a certain incident, the Senator from Georgia was named chairman of that committee. To a degree which I did not realize at the time, my own veracity, and my own standing in the Senate, perhaps, were at stake at the time. In going before that select committee, I, as a person whose statement was being investigated or considered, had no doubt in my own mind of the fairness and sound approach which would be taken by the committee under the chairmanship of Senator GEORGE.

I may be pardoned for saying that under those circumstances no higher expression of confidence could be given by anyone than the attitude I had in my own mind and heart when I knew that Senator GEORGE was selected as chairman and was to preside during that particular study and investigation.

Mr. President, throughout my entire experience in the Senate and in the House of Representatives Senator GEORGE has been regarded as one of the great statesmen of the United States. That was true at the time when it was reported that an effort was to be made to "purge" him. He commanded the confidence of the people of the Nation. He has never lost their confidence. He has stood as an example of unselfish patriotism, as a person utterly devoted to the welfare of his country, regardless of how his attitude might affect his personal standing at any particular time.

I wish to join with other Senators who have paid their tribute to Senator GEORGE.

I should like to say also that Mrs. Case has told me many times of the very high respect she has for the great lady known as "Miss Lucy." Mrs. Case and I join others in the high regard held for this couple. We are proud of the fact that the President of the United States has indicated that he has more work for this honorable elder statesman to perform.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I should like to follow the good old North Carolina custom and say that I am in hearty accord with everything which has been said about Senator GEORGE. Furthermore, Mr. President, all of us will always retain at "100 percent of parity" our admiration for Senator GEORGE and our love for "Miss Lucy."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleagues of the Senate by adding my tribute to a good friend and a great American, WALTER GEORGE, and to wish him and Mrs. George years of happiness and pleasant associations in the work which he is about to undertake. The years of service which he has given to his country have redounded to its benefit, and his association and his leadership have been an inspiration to me during the 20 years I have served in the Senate. I wish him well in everything he may undertake.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be seated while I address the Senate for a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, since I have been a Member of the Senate I have been, almost from the very beginning of my service, a member of the Senate Finance Committee. For a short time I was chairman of that committee, but always I worked in close cooperation and companionship with Senator GEORGE. A man may deem himself to be highly honored to have had that privilege.

During my experience on the Senate Finance Committee Senator GEORGE took the leadership in placing the work of that committee above narrow partisan considerations.

Mr. President, I wish to invite attention to two things. I do not know of any change which has ever been made in the staff of the Senate Finance Committee or in the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, which serves the Senate Finance Committee, that has ever been made for partisan reasons. So far as I am concerned, and I am sure it is true of Senator GEORGE, there were no changes made in the staff. I took over the staff which Senator GEORGE had when I became chairman of the committee, and it was continued after I left the chairmanship.

Mr. President, I can add nothing to what has been said here today, and I shall not attempt to do so. I wish to express my gratitude for being able to say that Senator GEORGE is a thoroughly good man, and we shall miss him very much.

Mr. President, I wish to say a few words about the great lady who graces his home. Miss Lucy is certainly a lovely lady, and their devotion to each other has made their marriage an ideal one. Mrs. Millikin and I shall miss these true friends. I wish for them many more years of happy life together and success in their future.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like to compliment the Senator from Colorado for his outstanding attendance on the Senate floor, even though he has some temporary difficulty. I think he is due a vote of gratitude from all Senators and from all the people of the country for coming here as he does day after day and attending every session of the Senate.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I should like to join with my distinguished friend from Wisconsin in acclaiming the Senator from Colorado for his attendance on the sessions of the Senate, and also for what the Senator from Colorado has just said about the distinguished Senator from Georgia. I doubt that there is any Senator on this side of the aisle who has had a better opportunity to judge the Senator from Georgia than has the Senator from Colorado. We are all very grateful to him for the thought which he has expressed and for his feeling of regard for the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the Senate of the United States is very fortunate to have men like the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. I have observed the Committee on Finance during the past 10 years. It is the committee which is in the best position to study the tax laws of our country as they affect the various segments of industry and the various segments of our society. The Senate of the United States is very fortunate in having on the Finance Committee two Senators of the great ability and character of Senator GEORGE of Georgia and Senator MILLIKIN of Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KERR in the chair). With the indulgence of the Senate, the Presiding Officer at the

moment wishes to commend the statements made by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] about the great Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the remarks of the Senator from Colorado about our distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, it was with profound regret that I heard the announcement of the senior Senator from Georgia that he would not seek reelection to the seat he so ably filled for many years.

When I came here 22 years ago, WALTER GEORGE was already an experienced and highly respected Member of the Senate. His legal training and logical mind made his counsel and advice in debate invaluable.

It was my privilege to serve with Senator GEORGE on the Foreign Relations Committee before the Congressional Reorganization Act of 1946. There I quickly learned to recognize his grasp of intricate problems involved in foreign affairs. His skill in dealing with delicate diplomatic matters always impressed the Senate. Since then his ability in this field has been recognized, not only in the United States, but throughout the world. He is known as one of the greatest authorities on, and one of the most skilled practitioners of the delicate art of diplomacy.

He has conducted the affairs of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee without a tinge of partisanship. Whatever successes this administration has had in the field of foreign policy must be shared in good measure by this illustrious Democratic chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

I know of no former or present Member of Congress who has had as strong and beneficial an influence on United States foreign policy and world affairs as has Senator GEORGE. He has achieved this rank by virtue of his vision, ability, and plain hard work. Yet he somehow manages to find the time to influence the Congress in enactment of domestic legislation. And I need not dwell on his particular value to the region and the State he has so ably represented. He was a genuine statesmen of the Nation.

We here in the Senate have been privileged to learn of other qualities in Senator GEORGE in addition to those which gained him worldwide renown. He is a gentleman of the old school. He is the kind of man whose every acquaintance and associate is the finer for having known and worked with him.

I am proud to count WALTER GEORGE as my good friend, and to have had the pleasure of serving with him these many years in the United States Senate. Our country will lose a great national leader, the Senate will be the poorer for his going, and I extend to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia and his charming wife every good wish for many years of peaceful retirement with good health and happiness.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I would be derelict in my affection for the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] if I did not add to the deserved remarks made about him today in the Senate. There is not much more I could say than that I deeply regret the retirement from the Senate of a great American.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I was very much disappointed to learn that the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia had announced his retirement from this body. I have come to know Senator GEORGE as one of the great American statesmen. His loss will be felt by all of us. It is a loss not only to the people of Georgia, but to the country as a whole.

This is true because he has consistently acted for the good of all the people of this Nation.

Because of this, he has gained a reputation which has cut across State lines and party affiliations.

As a friend, as a colleague, and as a representative of the people of Maryland, I certainly regret his retirement.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, one could not long be a Member of this distinguished body without first learning to respect the great Senator from Georgia and then to love him. It has not been my privilege to serve on a committee with that great man, but I have had the privilege of sitting here in the Senate for the past 6 years and of having heard the Senator from Georgia debate momentous national and international issues. I have never seen the time in the Senate, when we were all perplexed by some of the problems which confronted us, that the Senator from Georgia did not rise and, in his very calm and dispassionate way, advise and counsel the Senate and ultimately put us on the right course of thinking.

In the short time I have been in the Senate, the Senator from Georgia has debated with great skill and apparent ease such issues as troops-to-Europe the Bricker amendment and other equally important questions.

I am very sorry to hear that he is about to leave the Senate. I can think of no greater demonstration of the loss which the Senate and people of the country will suffer than to see the great and distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] "fill up" at the thought of Senator GEORGE's leaving us.

I wish to join with my colleagues in telling the Senator from Georgia and his lovely wife, whom I just met casually, how much I shall miss them. I wish the Senator Godspeed, and great success, which I know he will have, in any task he may undertake.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, it is with considerable regret that I have learned of the plans of my beloved friend, WALTER GEORGE, the foremost statesman of the Senate, to retire. Throughout the time of my service in the Senate he has been an inspiration, certainly to me, and I believe to all of those who served with him. At all times he has placed above politics what he believed to be for the welfare, protection, and best interests of the United States.

He has been a genuine, humble servant of the people, without rashness, without intemperance and without bigotry regardless of what troubled or honors arose in his path of service. I shall miss the snowhaired gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I want to express my deep regret over the departure from the Senate of my friend, my neighbor, and my wise counselor, Senator GEORGE. When I first entered the Senate some 18 years ago, there were in this body such giants as Senator William E. Borah, of Idaho; Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska; Senator Hiram W. Johnson, of California; Senator Alben Barkley, of Kentucky; Senator Carter Glass, of Virginia; and Senator Pat Harrison, of Mississippi; and Senator George stood as a giant among the giants. It was my privilege to present him at a great gathering of Georgians and Alabamians at the breaking of ground for the Fort Gaines Dam last fall. In my words of presentation, I declared that if one were to walk into the gallery of the Senate, see every Senator in his seat, and the Chamber so quiet that the drop of a pin could be heard, one could well know that Senator GEORGE was the Senator addressing the Senate, because he was the most commanding figure in the Senate. By virtue of his ability, his industry, his character, and his magnificent leadership, Senator GEORGE has been a commanding figure from the day he first entered the Senate. The story of his speeches, his deeds, his accomplishments, and his leadership, is a brilliant chapter in the history of our country. So long as men love justice and cherish free institutions, WALTER GEORGE will be remembered. We shall sorely miss him. Our consolation in his going is in the knowledge that our country will have at NATO a spokesman, a representative and a statesman worthy of America's noble heritage and her finest traditions.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I should like to join the majority and minority leaders and other Members of the Senate in expressing my deep regret in the decision of Senator GEORGE to retire from the Senate at the expiration of his present term.

During the many years of my interest in Congress—during my years of service here—Senator GEORGE has always represented the finest traditions of this great body.

To the average American, to our Government, to our colleagues, and to the freedom-loving nations of the world, the name of Senator GEORGE has been like the word "sterling" on true silver.

Senator GEORGE, during his many years of constructive service in the Senate, has not only distinguished himself by his leadership, his character, and his ability, but has reflected by this great service distinction also on our democratic processes and upon the legislative system.

As an individual, I regret to lose the friendly association I have enjoyed with this great leader. As a legislator I regret that loss of his advice, his counsel and his ability to give leadership to varying viewpoints within the Senate all because of the great respect in which he was held by all Members.

The record he has made by great service on both the domestic front and in the field of world peace will stand forever as

a tribute to one of Georgia's greatest sons.

I wish him all the success in the world in his new undertaking in behalf of strengthening the forces of the free world under NATO. It is characteristic of his great fighting spirit to be willing to extend his service continuously in the cause of a just and a lasting world peace.

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF A DELEGATION FROM THE GERMAN BUNDESTAG

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, there is seated in the back of the Senate Chamber a delegation from the German Bundestag. The members of it are visiting in this country under the cultural exchange program of the State Department. We are honored in having them visit the Senate Chamber on this day. They have been present during the time eulogies have been paid to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. I know they have enjoyed those eulogies.

Mr. President, I should like at this time to have the privilege and honor of presenting the members of the delegation individually to the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point a brief biographical sketch of each member of the delegation.

There being no objection, the biographic sketches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(a) Full name: Dr. Fritz Hellwig.

(b) Place and date of birth: Saarbruecken (Saar), August 3, 1912.

(c) Citizenship: German.

(d) Home address: Duesseldorf-Oberkassel, Rheinallee 130.

(e) Academic training: Vienna and Berlin Universities, Ph. D.; Dr. habil., Heidelberg.

(f) Present position: Director of the Institue of German Industries in Cologne: Bundestag deputy (member of the CDU/CSU Bundestag faction).

(g) Previous positions: 1933–39, Chamber of Commerce Saarbruecken; 1937–38; Lecturer at Teachers' College, Saarbruecken; 1939–43, Regional Association of Iron and Steel Manufacturers, Duesseldorf and Saarbruecken (managing director).

(h) Knowledge of English: Fluent.

(i) United States program interests: Foreign policy discussions, State Department, visit to the Pentagon and discussion of procedures for letting contracts to industry in the defense field, talks with congressional leaders and committee staffs. Also interested in the following subjects: cartel and trade union problems, church-state relations, documentation and scientific research in the parliamentary field, labor-management and public relations in industry, the social impact of industrial development and automation.

(a) Full name: Ernst Mueller-Hermann.

(b) Place and date of birth: Koenigsberg (Prussia), September 30, 1915.

(c) Citizenship: German.

(d) Home address: Bremen, Kirchbachstr. 88.

(e) Present position: Editor; Bundestag deputy (member of the CDU/CSU Bundestag faction).

(f) Past positions: 1945–46, translator with the American Military Government (transportation section), Bremen; 1946–48, state business manager of the CDU in Bremen; 1948–51, editor of the Weser-Kurier, Bremen; 1946–52, member of the Bremen parliament; member of the first Bundestag.

(g) Knowledge of English: Adequate for individual travel.

(h) United States program interests: Discussions with journalists, the National Press Club, foreign-policy discussions, State Department, visit to Pentagon, discussion of problem of civilian and congressional control over the Armed Forces, House and Senate Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Public Works Committee, Armed Forces Committee. Also interested in the following subjects: Traffic and transportation problems, road and highway construction and financing, city planning.

(a) Full name: Dr. Karl Atzenroth.

(b) Place and date of birth: Cologne, September 23, 1895.

(c) Citizenship: German.

(d) Home address: Koblenz-Metternich, Ruebenacherstr. 11.

(e) Academic training: Study of political economy at Bonn University, Cologne University, doctor's degree (political science).

(f) Present position: Bundestag deputy (faction of the Free Democratic Party); owner of furniture factory.

(g) Past positions: Member of first Bundestag (1949–53); president of the European Association of Furniture Manufacturers.

(h) Knowledge of English: Adequate for simple private conversations.

(i) United States program interests: Foreign policy discussions, State Department, visit to the Pentagon and discussion of procedures for letting contracts to industry in the defense field, talks with congressional leaders and committee staffs. Also interested in the following subjects: cartel and trade union problems, church-state relations, documentation and scientific research in the parliamentary field, labor-management and public relations in industry, the social impact of industrial development and automation.

(a) Full name: Prof. Dr. Ernst-Christoph Bruehler.

(b) Place and date of birth: Mannheim, February 12, 1891.

(c) Citizenship: German.

(d) Home address: Freiburg im Priesgau, Valentinstr. 11.

(e) Academic training: Freiburg University, Ph. D.

(f) Present position: Director of the Evangelic Teachers' Academy in Freiburg. Bundestag faction leader of the Deutsche Partei.

(g) Past positions: 1919–43, high-school teacher in Land Baden; 1934, appointed school director; 1929, member of the Landtag in Baden.

(j) Knowledge of English: Adequate for conversation.

(k) United States program interests: Foreign-policy discussions, State Department, visit to the Pentagon and discussion of procedures for letting contracts to industry in the defense field, talks with congressional leaders and committee staffs. Also interested in the following subjects: cartel and trade-union problems, church-state relations, documentation and scientific research in the parliamentary field, labor-management and public relations in industry, the social impact of industrial development and automation.

(a) Full name: Dr. Alfred Gille.

(b) Place and date of birth: Insterburg (East Prussia), September 15, 1901.

(c) Citizenship: German.

(d) Home address: Luebeck, Rudolph-Groth-Str. 26.

(e) Academic training: Doctor's degree at Koenigsberg University.

(f) Present position: Lawyer; Bundestag deputy (Refugee Party).

(g) Previous positions: 1927–28, Judge at the Lower Court in Koenigsberg; 1928–45, mayor of the city of Loetzen (East Prussia).

(h) Knowledge of English: Insufficient.

(i) Proposed activities in the United States: Foreign-policy discussions, State Department, visit to the Pentagon and discussion of procedures for letting contracts to industry in the defense field, talks with congressional leaders and committee staffs. Also interested in the following subjects: cartel and trade-union problems, church-state relations, documentation and scientific research in the parliamentary field, labor-management and public relations in industry, the social impact of industrial development and automation. In addition, Dr. Gille would like to meet with persons dealing with Eastern European problems, including, if possible, visits to institutes conducting research on Eastern Europe. Dr. Gille would also be interested in visiting legal institutions, including a court session.

(a) Full name: Hermann Runge.

(b) Place and date of birth: Conradsthal/Silesia, October 28, 1902.

(c) Citizenship: German.

(d) Home address: Duesseldorf-Lohausen, im Grund 64.

(e) Present position: Manager of SPD party office for the Regierungsbezirk Duesseldorf. Member of the Bundestag.

(f) Past positions: 1917–31, locksmith; 1931–33, secretary of SPD party office for the county of Moers/Rhineland; 1933–35, locksmith, and illegal SPD activities in Rhineland-Westphalia; 1935–45, imprisoned for political reasons and sentenced by the Volksgerichtshof for the preparation of high treason; 1945–46, secretary of SPD party office for the county of Moers; 1946–47, member of Land Parliament; 1948–49, member of Parlamentarischer Rat (constitution-making body of the Federal Republic).

(g) Knowledge of English: None.

(h) United States program interests: Foreign policy discussions, State Department, visit to the Pentagon and discussion of procedures for letting contracts to industry in the defense field, talks with congressional leaders and committee staffs. Also interested in the following subjects: cartel and trade-union problems, church-state relations, documentation and scientific research in the parliamentary field, labor-management and public relations in industry, the social impact of industrial development and automation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I now present to the Members of the Senate Dr. Fritz Hellwig; Mr. Ernst Mueller-Hermann; Dr. Karl Atzenroth; Dr. Ernst-Christoph Bruchler; Dr. Alfred Gille, and Mr. Hermann Runge.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

PROBLEMS CONCERNING THE PEACETIME ATOMIC ENERGY PROGRAM

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is about to begin hearings on some fundamental problems which may well affect the future of the entire peacetime atomic energy program. These hearings were announced in my floor statement on April 26, and are scheduled to commence next Tuesday, May 15. Today I would like to say a few words more about their importance and about the objectives we hope to accomplish.

Two bills before the committee, H. R. 9701 and H. R. 9802, concern the question of public liability, or insurance, of companies engaged in the atomic energy program. As Senators know, the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 was intended to encourage private industry to construct and operate nuclear plants for

the generation of electrical power. The progress in this field to date has been slower than anticipated. During the past year the committee has been informed by private utilities and equipment companies that certain problems must be solved before they can proceed in the atomic power field.

Chief among these problems is the question of liability to the public of manufacturers and operators of nuclear reactors in the very remote event of a reactor accident. The two bills before us are intended to provide the needed protection for the companies against unlimited liability. We have invited interested parties to testify, and we have requested industrial witnesses to disclose any other roadblocks which they believe stand in the way of progress of private industry in this very important field.

After considering the insurance problem, we will commence public hearings on Wednesday, May 23, on S. 2725, known as the Gore bill, and on other proposals for accelerating the civilian reactor program. The Gore bill authorizes and directs the Atomic Energy Commission to build six nuclear power reactors to assure advancement of the nuclear art, either in addition to, or in the absence of, private industrial participation.

As you know, Mr. President, there has been mounting concern both within the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and elsewhere as to whether or not the United States can maintain its position of world leadership in the industral and other peaceful applications of atomic energy, especially in view of significant progress reports made by the Soviet Union, and by our friends in Great Britain and France.

The joint committee has been continuously studying the world picture and our domestic status in the atomic energy field during the 84th Congress.

Thus, the committee members attended and observed the many interesting developments demonstrated at the International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy at Geneva last summer. Also, following this, a panel of leading citizens, organized by the committee and known as the McKinney panel, studied and reported on our status and our future.

In addition, the committee conducted public hearings during the first 60 days of this session, in accordance with section 202 of the Atomic Energy Act, in order to study and hear testimony on the growth, development and future of the atomic energy industry. Following this, we conducted public hearings on the report of the McKinney panel.

In addition to these efforts, the committee conducted an informal advisory seminar to explore, with the help of many interested parties, the question of public liability as its affects civilian reactor progress. This seminar was most constructive in that it permitted the committee to receive a frank presentation of industry's views on this serious matter.

The time is now at hand, Mr. President, for our committee to place the whole situation in perspective, to examine the issues before us, and to provide congressional leadership in setting further objectives and policies to guide our civilian atomic energy program. Although consideration of the insurance problem has delayed congressional analysis of the whole civilian reactor problem, it is my hope that some action on both fronts can be taken in the present session of Congress. We cannot afford further delay. It is time that we attain a position where we may offer to the people of this country and to the free people of the world a product which is both advanced in concept and in being—not just paper plans and promises.

Our committee proposes to proceed in the following manner:

First, we feel that we must know more about the specifics of reactor hazards, safety practices, and insurance coverage. This is the purpose of the first set of public hearings on the question of public liabilty. We also want to identify other road blocks, if any, to private development.

Next, in executive session, we will examine the international aspects in order to compare the progress of the United States with that of other countries in this field. Here and in the public hearings which follow we will attempt to assess what would be the effect in the position of the United States in the world if we ceased to be the leading nation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Finally, we will consider the Gore bill and other proposals for accelerating the program through Government construction of additional power reactors. Here we will want to determine the status of private atomic energy projects, and consider what additional efforts, if any, are required.

The McKinney panel, in its report, stated that if private industry does not or cannot assume the full risks and burdens of the nuclear power development, then the Government must do the job. Thus if Congress is expected to grant concessions to private industry, in addition to insurance or indemnity coverage in order to back up a lagging program, it may well conclude that more direct Government sponsorship and initiative is required to get the show on the road. This would not necessarily mean complete Government financing or construction of atomic powerplants. It could mean, for example, a cooperative arrangement such as the Shippingport project, where the AEC through its contractor is constructing the reactor and the Duquesne Power Co. is responsible for constructing the generating facilities and operating the entire plant.

After these hearings, I hope that our committee will be able to report to the Congress whether or not we believe that greater Government participation, in addition to that of private industry, is now required.

At the end of these hearings we should be able to report to Congress and to tell you, Mr. President, what, if anything, needs to be done to assure necessary atomic progress in the United States in order to maintain world leadership and to develop and conserve our own natural resources. Congress will then be in a position to take such steps as it considers necessary in order to achieve these objectives.

CONSTRUCTION OF NUCLEAR-POWERED PROTOTYPE MERCHANT SHIP

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to discuss a matter which I hope the distinguished minority leader has had an opportunity to consider.

Calendar No. 1285, S. 2523, is a bill to authorize the construction of a nuclear-powered prototype merchant ship for operation in the foreign commerce of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair must advise the Senator from Washington that the Senate is operating under a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely wished to ask unanimous consent that the bill be taken from the calendar and recommitted to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Washington?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, temporarily reserving the right to object, I believe the request will be agreed to, but there is one member on our side of the aisle with whom I should like to discuss the question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have made the request now because the distinguished chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy [Mr. ANDERSON] is on the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to tell the distinguished minority leader that I have had 2 or 3 suggestions recently from the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission that plans are not available for a nuclear type merchant ship.

The resolution which is before the Senate, as the Senator from California will remember, embraces two ships, a merchant ship and an exhibit ship. It seems difficult to provide for a combined proposal. I therefore thought the bill might be recommitted to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as the House has done with a similar bill, and have the committee report a bill on the merchant ship, and then discuss with the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission what further action, if any, he desires to take.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am certain the matter can be cleared up this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington temporarily withhold his request?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Has the Senate returned to the consideration of the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has not taken positive action to return to that status. The Chair was about to recognize the junior Senator from Maryland, under the impression that he desired to make some remarks about the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. BEALL. That is correct, Mr. President.

[Mr. BEALL addressed the Senate in tribute to Senator GEORGE. His remarks appear elsewhere at the appropriate place in today's RECORD.]

TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KERR in the chair). By unanimous acquiescense, the Senate, for the past 2 hours, has been engaged in paying tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia. The Senate will now return to the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3073) to provide for an adequate and economically sound transportation system or systems to serve the District of Columbia and its environs; to create and establish a public body corporate with powers to carry out the provisions of this act; and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], on page 85, line 11.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the time for debate on the amendment is limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided between the Senator from Colorado and the majority leader.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield so that I may propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I believe the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado is subject to a point of order on the ground of nongermaneness, under the unanimous consent agreement. I do not care to interrupt the Senator from Colorado, but I should like to reserve time to make the point of order at the earliest appropriate moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will have the right to do that at an appropriate time.

Mr. ALLOTT. May I inquire if the Senator is making the point at this time?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Perhaps in the interest of saving time, it would be appropriate for me to make the point now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has the floor.

Mr. ALLOTT. I do not choose to yield any time for that purpose at this time. I do not want to argue the germaneness of the amendment at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is entitled to the floor for 15 minutes. How much time does he yield himself?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous consent request? I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum. I understand the majority leader wishes to have a quorum call before the Senate starts this debate. I should like to have unanimous consent that there be a quorum call, without the time being taken from either side.

Mr. ALLOTT. I would not object to such a request.

Mr. MORSE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator yield a moment, because it seems to me the suggestion has been made that a point of order might be raised. If the point of order should be sustained, the time used to discuss the amendment would largely be wasted effort. I do not believe the point of order which has been suggested is valid, because, as will be found, the original bill as introduced and then reported from the committee with the committee amendment, dealt with the very subject matter with which the Senator from Colorado is dealing in his amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should like to ask that the discussion on the point of order not be charged to my 15 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The discussion on the point of order will not be charged to the time of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I was going to say that since the Senator from New Jersey has suggested a point of order would be made, I thought, to save the time of the Senate, the point of order might be made first, because, if the point of order should be sustained, the debate on the amendment would be pretty much wasted effort, and it might be better to have the point of order settled now.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield such time as the Senator from New Jersey needs to make the point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado would amend the act approved August 9, 1955, Public Law 330, of the 84th Congress, and would provide that for the purposes of this act the government of the District of Columbia and the authority—that is to say, the Transit Authority proposed by the pending bill—"shall be deemed to be agencies of the United States, and such act shall in every respect be applicable to the officers and employees of the government of the District of Columbia and of the Authority."

The unanimous-consent agreement provides, in part, that "no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received."

Mr. President, it seems to me quite clear that nothing in the bill now being considered by the Senate contains any reference to the provisions of the act referred to in the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, namely, the act of August 9, 1955. It is quite true that in the bill as originally introduced, reference was made to that act; but the bill was reported by the committee to the Senate with amendments; and the amendment of the Senator from Colorado is offered, not to the original bill, but, rather, to one of the amendments. The subject matter of the amendment of the Senator from Colorado is not contained in the amendment in the nature of a substitute, reported by the committee.

Therefore it seems to me to be clear that the amendment of the Senator from Colorado is not germane, and should at this time be ruled out of order, on the point of order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to be heard on the point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I submit that the point of order against the amendment of the Senator from Colorado is not valid, for the reason that Senate bill 3073, which was introduced in the Senate, and deals with this whole subject matter, contained the very language dealt with by the amendment.

I call attention to page 43 of the bill, which reads, in part, in the language stricken out by the committee amendment:

> For the purposes of the act approved August 9, 1955 (Public Law 330, 84th Cong.; 69 Stat. 624), the government of the District of Columbia and the Authority shall be deemed to be agencies of the United States, and such act shall in every respect be applicable to the officers and employees of the government of the District of Columbia and of the Authority.

Then, Mr. President, I submit that in the committee amendment there are to be found a whole series of provisions dealing with the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, and other matters which were dealt with in the original bill—one of the few eliminated being this particular section.

Under those circumstances, I submit that the bill deals with the matter of the public authority for the Transit Authority for the District of Columbia; that this is a pertinent part of any public ownership or public authority, and is within the jurisdiction of the Congress; that it was originally intended to be within the jurisdiction of the very bill we are considering; and that therefore the point of order does not lie.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there further remarks to be made on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

In the opinion of the Chair, the point of order is not well taken; and therefore the point of order is overruled.

The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] to the committee amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I desire to modify my amendment, because as it

is written, I believe it poses some extraneous matters which I do not wish to have introduced into the determination of the question I shall discuss this afternoon. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified, so that in line 4 and following, it will read:

"(10) For the purposes of the act approved August 9, 1955 (Public Law 330, 84th Cong.; 69 Stat. 624), the Authority shall be deemed to be an agency of the United States, and such act shall in every respect be applicable to the officers and employees of the Authority."

As previously written, my amendment also included the words "the government of the District of Columbia." Because that involves other questions, I do not wish to have the issue on the determination of this amendment clouded by additional questions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Colorado to the committee amendment will be modified accordingly.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, in discussing my amendment to the committee amendment, I realize it is very difficult to suggest an amendment of this sort without being accused of being either prolabor or antilabor—in this instance, antilabor. But I desire to assure the Members of the Senate that in submitting the amendment, there is not in my mind, and there never has been, any thought of being antilabor.

As a matter of fact, I believe that the hearings on the bill show that repeatedly during the course of the hearings I submitted to the bill amendments which were for the purpose of spelling out and strengthening the position of the employees. As a matter of fact, the Senate has adopted two of those amendments this afternoon, and they materially strengthen and clarify the position of the employees in this matter.

Less than a year ago there was a strike in the Capital Transit system in the District of Columbia. It is not necessary for us to determine who was responsible for the strike. But I think I may well repeat some of the words used at that time by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who, when speaking last year, said:

This has not been an easy task, but I am satisfied that as a result of the cooperation we have received from our colleagues, we have brought to the Senate today, in behalf of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, a bill for which the Commissioners have asked to enable them to perform their governmental duties in the District of Columbia, and to provide the many thousands of suffering people of the District with the transportation service they need.

In saying that, the Senator from Oregon said what many of the rest of us also said, namely, that the District of Columbia was, in fact, in dire straits because of the suspension of service.

Again I say I do not charge the union or the employees or anyone else with the responsibility for that situation. Suffice it to say that there was a strike, that many people were walking to work, that some of them were riding bicycles to work, and that the police force was spending from 12 to 14 hours a day on the streets, directing traffic, while the strike continued.

For our purposes, it is sufficient to state that the actual governmental functions of the Nation were impeded, and in some cases were stopped, because of the existence of the strike.

What is the situation today? During the course of the hearings on the bill, several questions were asked of the representatives of the employees, as to their wishes with respect to arbitration and other matters governing employee-employer relationships. I may say that, in my opinion, and to the best of my recollection, there is written into the bill every request they made for their protection. Voluntary arbitration is called for by the bill. In fact, so far as I can recall, everything else they requested is included in the bill to protect them.

From page 279, in volume 4, of the hearings, I quote what was said at the time:

Mr. BIERWAGEN. I can pledge you my word that if they will give to us a binding arbitration clause, we will give to them a no-strike agreement. But they must give to us a binding arbitration clause—not compulsory. We want them to volunteer to submit all issues not resolved by negotiation to final and binding arbitration. That is a self-imposed restriction. We have that on our side.

On the same matter, I quote from volume 3, page 229, of the hearings, a statement made by the same gentleman:

Voluntary contractual arbitration is the soundest and fairest terminal procedure for settling transit labor disputes when direct negotiation fails. Such arbitration has been actively sponsored by our international union for many years, and today it is generally accepted by both management and local labor representatives throughout the industry. Most public-transit authorities have followed the established practice of private industry in this respect, and their labor contracts include arbitration procedures. State and local governments and the Federal Government enacted laws to enforce or to encourage the use of arbitration, particularly in vital transportation industries. In the amendment which we have proposed, we have included arbitration machinery following the traditions and techniques that in the past have worked most successfully in the industry.

That is the end of the statement by Mr. Bierwagen.

What have we provided in the bill? I read from page 82, line 5:

In case of dispute over wages, salaries, hours, working conditions, health and welfare, insurance or pension or retirement provisions where collective bargaining and mediation do not result in agreement, the Authority may agree—

That makes it voluntary—

to submit such dispute to a tripartite board of arbitration and shall agree with such accredited representatives or labor organization that the decision of a majority of any such arbitration board shall be final and binding. Each party shall agree in advance to pay half of the expense of such arbitration.

The effect of that language is that, although the arbitration is voluntary in the first instance, the parties, having submitted themselves to arbitration, have both thereupon become bound by the final decision of the board of arbitration.

I am informed by representatives of the union—and I think it is generally conceded to be a fact—that if there is to be a no-strike provision in the bill, arbitration should be compulsory. I therefore tell the Senate very frankly that in the event my amendment is agreed to, it is my intention to offer another amendment, amending line 9 on page 82 so that the word "may" will read "shall," thereby making arbitration compulsory, and providing a method for accomplishing that purpose.

I know that as a general rule compulsory arbitration is not acceptable to those who deal with labor matters. However, it has been agreed that if my amendment should be adopted the bill would be better with the compulsory arbitration feature. The public law to which the employees would become subject is Public Law 330, which provides that no person shall accept or hold office or employment in the Government of the United States, or any agency thereof, if he participates in any strike or asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States or such agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Colorado has expired.

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield myself another 3 minutes.

I know that the argument will be made that this activity is a proprietary function of the Government. An unusual problem is posed by the contention that this is a proprietary function rather than a governmental function, and that therefore the right to strike should not be taken from the employees.

However, I remind Members of the Senate that less than 9 months ago the governmental functions of this country were tied up and brought almost to a literal standstill because of the strike.

If representatives of the union are willing, as they say, to give us a no-strike agreement, let us write it into the law. We owe it to the people of the District of Columbia and to the Federal Government. After all, the new Authority will cost the Government of the United States $2 million a year in lost taxes. The Federal Government will also be picking up the tab for any losses in operation. The Government has a vital interest in this problem. The fact that the activity is proprietary does not preclude the fact that the Government itself and the people of the District of Columbia suffered, and our governmental processes were slowed down because of the strike. The people of the District of Columbia are looking to us to take care of this problem. For that reason I believe that my amendment should be adopted.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] such time as he may require.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I believe that this amendment, if it were adopted, would create a very unfortunate precedent in the Senate, for these reasons:

Consider the last point made by the Senator from Colorado. This activity

involves the exercise of a proprietary interest on the part of a governmental agency. It is not the exercise of a police power.

It has been made clear in many writings, upon many occasions, that when it comes to the exercise of the police power of a State the employees charged with such responsibility should not have the right to strike, because that would be a strike against the Government. It would be a strike against the exercise of the very functions of government itself in carrying out its police power.

But there is a borderline area of governmental activities which we call the activities of the proprietary interest of Government. They are, in a very real sense, the exercise of commercial activities on the part of the Government—for example, when there is public ownership of a municipal transit system.

We are dealing here with the question of public ownership and operation of our transit system in the District of Columbia for an interim period—and, in all probability, permanently, as the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and other Senators yesterday predicted would very likely be the ultimate course of action.

In connection with this type of activity the police power of the State is not involved. It is proposed to say to fellow Americans, "You cannot exercise the economic power of the strike." I think that would be a very bad precedent to establish by Federal law.

I always try to be exceedingly fair and to give all facts in my possession in such situations. It is true that in some State jurisdictions there are laws similar to the principle of this amendment. There are municipal ordinances of that kind. It is true that in many cities in which there is municipal ownership of the transit system, there is a no-strike provision. There are certain exceptions. As I understand, Boston and Chicago are good examples of the exception.

The point I wish to stress is that it is proposed to say to streetcar operators, bus operators, garage mechanics, and other employees in this proprietary enterprise, "We take away from you a basic American freedom, namely, the right, in contests with management, to seek to enforce your demands for a better standard of living, better hours, wages, and conditions of employment, by the exercise of economic power."

I think it would be unfortunate to establish any such precedent, and I could not think of voting to deny to fellow Americans the right to strike in a proprietary activity of a municipality merely because a municipality, rather than a private industry, is operating the transit system.

The next step would inevitably be to try to enact legislation denying to fellow Americans the right to strike when they are working for a private company.

It is easy to draw the inference that, because the Government is operating this particular proprietary activity, the employees are therefore Government employees, in the sense that they are employees engaged in the operation of an essential activity of Government. I respectfully submit that such is not the case. The problem is as the Senator from Colorado has pointed out. In its present form, the bill does not include compulsory arbitration. I am against compulsory arbitration, because of its bad precedental implications, and because it is not necessary. It is not needed, Mr. President, when the parties to a collective bargaining agreement conduct themselves in good faith.

Reference has been made to the 52- or 53-day-long strike on the Capital Transit system last summer. Mr. President, there need not have been a day of strike if the company had been willing voluntarily to arbitrate the dispute. If the company had been willing to do that, the men would never have thrown a picket line.

The company was dealing with an international union which has a 63-year record of voluntary arbitration. It is an international union which will not let a local union go out on strike unless the company refuses to arbitrate the dispute. Any local of the international union which seeks to inaugurate a strike without offering to arbitrate the dispute loses its charter. That is the kind of union we are dealing with here, Mr. President.

Therefore, I do not believe we should impose a no-strike requirement in this situation. There is no need for it if what we are concerned about is the danger of a strike. If the public authority will arbitrate, the union will arbitrate. That is the record of the union. If a different situation should arise, we would still have time to act. The fact is that last year, in the debate on this subject, I kept pressing on the floor of the Senate the suggestion that the company accept voluntary arbitration.

I am glad to hear the Senator from Colorado say that if his amendment is adopted he will then move to change the word "may" to the word "shall" in the arbitration section of the bill.

I shall not vote for such a provision, because I am unalterably opposed to compulsory arbitration, as a principle and by reason of experience. Mr. President, we can pass all the laws we want in this field, but we cannot drive men to work. We can put them on buses and on street cars at the point of bayonets, but red-blooded, free American workers still will not work under compulsion in a free economy. I am making a fight for the maintenance of a free economy. I have faith in voluntaryism. I do not believe that in the operation of our economy in a democracy there is any need for compulsion, when government, in the form of a municipal institution, is the operator of a transit system.

In conclusion, I say most respectfully that we should try to operate under the provision as it is presently written in the pending bill. If the problem which the Senator from Colorado fears should develop, we can take care of it. I believe we have a bill which is based upon the principle of voluntaryism. I believe it will work. I believe the people of the District of Columbia will be given transportation without interruption by the exercise of the voluntary arbitration provision now contained in the bill.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the other member of the subcommittee, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado. As one of the members of the subcommittee, I wish to say that we considered this particular problem with very great care and with no preconceived notions or doctrinaire ideas about it.

It seems to me that the two points of view have been quite well presented. I believe the Senate would be well advised to follow the arguments of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] on this subject.

Merely because an employer happens to be a sovereign State or a municipality should not destroy the right to strike. We ought to look at the kind of function the employee is supposed to perform and is engaged in performing.

Certainly in the case of functions which are strictly governmental—that is to say, those which cannot be performed by anyone else except by the State or by a political subdivision, such as the protection of the people, and functions of that kind—the doctrine that a strike should not be countenanced against the State is a good doctrine and is sound in its application.

However, if the function is not one of that kind, but rather one which could equally well be performed by a private agency or by private enterprise under contract, then surely we ought not to extend the no-strike doctrine to that sort of enterprise, or to the relationship between the State in such a case and the employee, merely because the State or other governmental agency, or the creature of a State, happens to be the employing agency. The question is, What will work best?

I am sure the Senator from Oregon is right when he suggests that a freely operated system of relationships between employer and employee in this connection will work best. Certainly the presumption that it will work best is so strong that we ought to try it first without at the outset, in the very creation of the agency which will operate the Capital transportation system, undertaking to preclude a fair trial of voluntary operation.

The particular union involved has a long and honorable record. In its international constitution there is contained a provision to the effect that no local union may strike unless it has first offered arbitration and that the arbitration has been refused. Voluntary arbitration will work better, in the sense that we will have not only the pressure of the Government and of public opinion upon the employees who stay at work, but we will also have the pressure of the union itself and of its prestige with its members.

Therefore, the result will be better in the particular circumstances.

Just one more word, Mr. President. I am certain that if one of the great Republican leaders of this Nation were here, he would be against the pending amendment. I refer to the late great Senator Taft. One of the principles he always

emphasized was voluntaryism in the relations between employer and employee. Senators will recall that in the Taft-Hartley Act there is no ultimate provision for a dominated or directed settlement of strikes or the terms on which they must be settled.

The great Senator Taft was insistent that there should be provision merely for a cooling off period, with the right ultimately to strike left unimpaired. He insisted that any dispute which could not be resolved by negotiation should be dealt with on an ad hoc basis, with the parties coming back to Congress, which has the power to deal with them and to find the solutions the circumstances require.

Therefore, I believe we should restrain ourselves and not be led astray by unsound proposals; rather, we should deal with the essentials of the problem in ways which are calculated to bring about sound results and establish no unfortunate precedents.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am very strongly opposed to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. I do not believe it is necessary. I do not believe it is fair. The proposed agency is not, in the generally accepted understanding of the word, a direct Government agency. It is like many other authorities. There are a great number of such agencies in my State, and I have no doubt there are many also in other States. In New York State, so far as I know, we do not have a "no-strike" provision in such agencies. There is no such no-strike provision in effect in the municipally operated transit system of New York City. That situation has worked out very well. There has been no need for such a provision. The relationships have been amicable, and they have been constructive. There has been relatively little difficulty or conflict between the men working on the transit system and the government of the city of New York.

If we were to adopt the amendment, we would take away from labor one of its great weapons in its fight for fair treatment and just labor conditions.

I am also strongly opposed to compulsory arbitration. I have spent a substantial part of my life in mediating or arbitrating disputes. It is frequently very useful to have arbitration, but it must be voluntary arbitration and not compulsory arbitration, which in the final analysis leaves both sides dissatisfied and with very little accomplishment. Therefore, I shall certainly vote against the pending amendment which would impose a "no-strike" clause.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes out of the time on the bill, or so much thereof as may be necessary to speak in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

Mr. President, is this an unsual piece of legislation? As has been suggested by the Senator from Colorado, the answer to that question is "No."

In the last session of Congress on July 29, 1955, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service submitted a report on H. R. 6590.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of that report may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the report (No. 1256) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6590) to prohibit the employment by the Government of the United States of persons who are disloyal or who participate in or assert the right to strike against the Government of the United States, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

STATEMENT

Report No. 1152 accompanying H. R. 6590, as approved by the House of Representatives, is incorporated as a part of this report:

"This legislation will clarify and consolidate in a single, permanent, penal statute the rider reenacted each year in appropriation acts, as well as certain similar permanent provisions in existing law, which in effect prohibit the employment by the Government of (1) any person who advocates overthrow of our constitutional form of government or belongs to an organization that so advocates, and (2) any person who strikes against the Government or belongs to an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government.

"The appropriation rider first appeared in the Fourth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, without the language relating to striking against the Government. With seven exceptions, it was repeated in each regular deficiency, and supplemental appropriation act through May 18, 1946. The Third Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946, broadened the rider to include any person who strikes against the Government or who is a member of an organization which asserts the right to strike against the Government. With three exceptions, the rider as thus broadened has been repeated all in subsequent regular, deficiency, and supplemental appropriation acts to date.

"Existing law also contains three permanent provisions which are somewhat similar, in effect, to the appropriation rider. They are (1) section 612 of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U. S. C., sec. 1445); (2) section 9A of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939 (5 U. S. C., sec. 118j), known as the Hatch Act; and (3) section 305 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended (29 U. S. C., sec. 188), known as the Taft-Hartley Act.

"Section 612 of the Housing Act of 1949 is repeated, in substance, in paragraphs 1 through 4, inclusive, of the first section of H. R. 6590.

"Section 9A of the Hatch Act prohibits employment of persons who are members of 'any political party or organization which advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government in the United States.'

"This provision is reenacted in paragraph 2 of the first section of H. R. 6590.

"Section 305 of the Taft-Hartley Act requires the discharge of persons who strike against the Government. This is repeated in paragraph (3) of the first section of the bill.

"Accordingly, since H. R. 6590 includes all of these provisions of existing law such provisions will be repealed.

"Hearings were held at which representatives of the Civil Service Commission, the Department of Justice, and a number of Government employees' organizations appeared and testified favorably on H. R. 6590. There were no objections.

"General analysis

"The first section of the bill, as amended, will prohibit the employment in the Federal Government, or in any agency thereof, of any person who (1) advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government in the United States; (2) is a member of an organization that advocates overthrow of the Government, knowing of such advocacy; (3) participates in any strike against the Government or any such agency; (4) asserts the right to strike against the Government; or (5) belongs to an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government, or against such agencies, knowing that such organization asserts such right to strike.

"Section 2 (a) of the bill requires that, except as provided in subsection (b), every person accepting Federal office or employment, within 60 days after entering on duty, shall execute an affidavit that in doing so he does not violate the first section of the bill. The affidavit will be prima facie evidence that there is no such violation.

"Section 2 (b) provides that an affidavit will not be required from a person employed for less than 60 days for sudden emergency work involving the loss of life or destruction of property, but that this exception will excuse no one from liability for violation of the first section of the bill.

"Section 3 makes any violation of the first section of the bill a felony, for which the penalty shall be a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year and a day, or both.

"The favorable report of the Civil Service Commission and the report of the Department of Justice interposing no objections to a similar bill (H. R. 617) follow:

"UNITED STATES
"CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
"Washington, D. C., June 21, 1955.

"Hon. TOM MURRAY,
"Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives.

"DEAR MR. MURRAY: This is in reply to your request of June 21 for the Commission's views on H. R. 6590, a bill to prohibit the employment by the Government of the United States of persons who are disloyal or who believe in the right to strike against the Government of the United States, and for other purposes.

"The bill would provide that no person shall accept or hold office or employment in the Government of the United States who (1) advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government in the United States; (2) is a member of an organization that advocates such overthrow, knowing that the organization so advocates; (3) participates in a strike against the Government; or (4) is a member of an organization that asserts the right to strike against the Government, knowing that the organization asserts such right. The bill further provides that every person who accepts office or employment in the Government shall, not more than 60 days later, execute an affidavit that his employment will not constitute a violation of the statute. Affidavits would not be required from persons employed for less than 60 days for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or the destruction of property. Violation of the statute would constitute a felony punishable by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year and a day, or both.

"The bill would repeal section 612 of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U. S. C. 1445); section 9A of the Hatch Act (5 U. S. C. 118j); and section 304 of the Labor Management Relations Act (29 U. S. C. 188). Section 612 of the Housing Act is substantially identical

in its provisions to H. R. 6590, but is limited in its application to employment in the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Department of Agriculture. Section 9A of the Hatch Act makes it unlawful for any person employed in the Government 'to have membership in any political party or organization which advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government in the United States.' The only penalty provided is removal from the service, with the provision that appropriated funds shall not thereafter be used to pay the compensation of such person. Section 304 of the Labor Management Relations Act forbids striking by Government employees, requires the discharging of an employee who strikes and the forfeiture of his civil-service status, if any, and makes him ineligible for employment for 3 years.

"For some years provisions similar to the proposed legislation have appeared in appropriation acts each year. The Commission believes that H. R. 6590 represents desirable legislation, since it would put such legislation into permanent form, and would also consolidate and supersede the several statutes which now partially cover the subject.

"Time has not permitted clearance of this report with the Bureau of the Budget. However, the Bureau advised it had no objection to our report on H. R. 617, a bill similar to H. R. 6590.

"By direction of the Commission.

"Sincerely,

"PHILIP YOUNG,
"Chairman."

"DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
"OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY
"ATTORNEY GENERAL,
"Washington, April 25, 1955.

"Hon. TOM MURRAY,
"Chairman, Post Office and Civil Service
"Committee, House of Representatives,
"Washington, D. C.

"DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for the views of the Department of Justice relative to the bill (H. R. 617) to prohibit the employment by the Government of the United States of persons who are disloyal or who believe in the right to strike against the Government of the United States, and for other purposes.

"The bill would make it a felony for any person to accept or hold office or employment in the Government of the United States who (1) advocates the overthrow of that Government by force or violence, (2) is a member of an organization that advocates such overthrow, knowing that such organization advocates the same, (3) engages in a strike against the Government, or (4) is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government.

"Section 2 (a) of the measure would provide for the execution, by persons accepting office or employment in the Government of the United States, of affidavits to the effect that their acceptance and holding of such office or employment does not or will not constitute a violation of the bill's prohibitions. Subsection (b) would exempt from the application of subsection (a) persons employed by the Government of the United States for less than 60 days for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or the destruction of property. Such persons, however, would not be relieved of liability for a violation of the prohibitions contained in the bill. Section 4 would repeal section 612 of the Housing Act of 1949, a section which, with respect to officers or employees of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Department of Agriculture, contains provisions similar to those which would be provided for generally by this measure.

"Whether or not this bill should be enacted constitutes a question of policy concerning which the Department of Justice prefers to make no comment. However, there are certain matters to which the attention of the committee is invited.

"The prohibitions contained in section 1 of the bill are not new. Under existing law persons entering the employ of the United States are required to execute appointment affidavits which include certifications such as are contemplated by this bill. Likewise, various appropriation acts forbid the use of Government funds to pay officers or employees who fall within any of the categories enumerated in section 1 and provide penalties for the use of Government funds in violation of such prohibitions. Illustrative of other legislation which is concerned with the problem to which the bill is addressed is section 118 (j) of title 5 of the United States Code which provides that it shall be unlawful for any person employed in any capacity by any agency of the Federal Government whose compensation or any part thereof is paid from funds authorized or appropriated by any act of Congress to have membership in any political party or organization which advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government in the United States. Any person violating the provisions of the section shall be immediately removed from the position or office held by him and thereafter no part of the funds appropriated by any act of Congress for such position or office shall be used to pay the compensation of such person. Also, section 188 of title 29, United States Code, provides that it shall be unlawful for any individual employed by the United States or any agency thereof, including wholly owned Government corporations, to participate in any strike. If any individual employed by the United States or by any such agency strikes, he shall be discharged immediately from his employment and shall forfeit his civil-service status, if any, and for 3 years shall not be eligible for reemployment by the United States or any such agency.

"The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

"Sincerely,

"WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
"Deputy Attorney General."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the report deals with what has become Public Law 330, which the Senator from Colorado proposes shall by amendment be applied to this bill.

I ask unanimous consent that Public Law 330 be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

[Public Law 330, ch. 690, 84th Cong., 1st sess.]

H. R. 6590

An act to prohibit the employment by the Government of the United States of persons who are disloyal or who participate in or assert the right to strike against the Government of the United States, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That no person shall accept or hold office or employment in the Government of the United States or any agency thereof, including wholly owned Government corporations, who—

(1) advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government in the United States;

(2) is a member of an organization that advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government in the United States, knowing that such organization so advocates;

(3) participates in any strike or asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States or such agency; or

(4) is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States or such agencies, knowing that such organization asserts such right.

SEC. 2. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), every person who accepts office or employment in the Government of the United States after the date of enactment of this act, shall, not later than 60 days after he accepts such office or employment, execute an affidavit that his acceptance and holding of such office or employment does not or (if the affidavit is executed prior to acceptance of such office or employment) will not constitute a violation of the first section of this act. Such affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the acceptance and holding of office or employment by the person executing the affidavit does not or will not constitute a violation of such section.

(b) An affidavit shall not be required from a person employed by the Government of the United States for less than 60 days for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or the destruction of property. This subsection shall not relieve any person from liability for violation of the first section of this act.

SEC. 3. Any person who violates section 1 of this act shall be guilty of a felony, and shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year and a day, or both.

SEC. 4. The following parts of acts are hereby repealed.

(1) Section 612 of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U. S. C., sec. 1445);

(2) Section 9A of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939 (5 U. S. C., sec. 118j); and

(3) Section 305 of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended (29 U. S. C., sec. 188).

Approved August 9, 1955.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to read a pertinent portion of Public Law 330:

Be it enacted, etc., That no person shall accept or hold office or employment in the Government of the United States or any agency thereof, including wholly owned Government corporations, who—

These paragraphs may not be pertinent to this particular case—

(1) advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government in the United States;

(2) is a member of an organization that advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government in the United States, knowing that such organization so advocates;

(3) participates in any strike or asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States or such agency; or

(4) is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States or such agencies, knowing that such organization asserts such right.

Mr. President, I think all of us will agree that in dealings between a private company and its employees there is an entirely different situation. I hope that to the largest extent possible in this country of ours we shall keep private industry and that employers and employees will negotiate around the table in determining wages, hours, and working conditions. But here we have a transit system which exists in the Nation's Capital upon which the functioning of the Government of the United States to no little extent depends.

As a matter of fact, when the transit strike a year ago closed down trans-

portation, one of the arguments used on the floor of the Senate in connection with the legislation which was passed to take away the company's franchise was that it was very important to the functioning of the Government of the United States, since the Congress was about to adjourn and go home and leave the District of Columbia without a governing council that this rather drastic step should be taken.

I supported that legislation at the time, although with some misgivings, because it seemed to me that in the Nation's Capital, in a Federal District, established because of its importance to the Government of the Nation, the argument was pertinent that the closing down of the transportation system would vitally and adversely affect the very functioning of the Government of the people of the United States.

Mr. President, if because of a strike being called or as a result thereof we have not only canceled the franchise rights of a private company, but, in effect, have precipitated the issue of public ownership to the extent that the Government of the United States is going to underwrite, in effect, the operating costs without limit, we are all practical enough to know that once the transportation system of the District comes under public ownership it is very likely to remain under public ownership as long as any of us shall live, or, at least, such is a very strong possibility.

That means that the Government of the United States will, in effect, be underwriting whatever deficit there may be. We shall have to provide some of the funds for this Government ownership. We have applied the no-strike rule to other Government corporations. If we exempt the Transit Authority in the District of Columbia, which is a Federal District, then are we going to exempt other Government corporations?

I think it is a very vital issue as to whether there is a right to strike against the Government of the United States or the Federal City of the Government of the United States.

Under those circumstances, Mr. President, I think the amendment is well in order. Certainly, we are faced with the problem that if the transportation system shall be closed down again it will have an adverse effect upon the functioning of the Government.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, first of all, I should like to say that I find myself well in accord with the general opinion expressed by the distinguished Senator from California. The very premise of the bill will be invalidated, it seems to me, if we accept the argument which has been made against the amendment. The whole premise of the bill is that the public welfare requires an Authority to operate public transportation in the Nation's Capital, come what may.

Mr. President, some years ago it was my privilege to be associated with the late mayor of the city of New York, Mr. La Guardia, in a panel discussion on the issues which are involved in this particular question. Everyone will recall the leadership which Mr. La Guardia gave in labor legislation. I recall that when the question was put to him on the panel that morning, "What happens if a municipality operates a hospital? Can the employees of that hospital strike?" Mr. La Guardia said, "I think we have to recognize that when certain functions pertaining to the public welfare, health, or safety, are involved, the normal right to strike does not exist," or words to that effect.

In my opinion, something of the same question is involved here. To me there is no justification for proposing or authorizing public ownership of a mass-transportation system in the District of Columbia, unless we put it upon the ground of the Nation's welfare in this instance because this is the Capital City. If that be true, then, it seems to me we should preserve for the Authority whatever is necessary to see that public transportation is carried on without interruption under any circumstances whatsoever.

With the record which Congress has in dealing with employees of the Government, I do not fear that a fair and square deal will not be given to the employees of the Authority which would operate the transportation system. I think in this forum and in the forum of the House of Representatives they will have adequate protection of their rights of seniority, working conditions, wages, and matters of that sort. If we are going to take the step of authorizing a public authority to operate the transportation system, then we must give it the power to carry it on without interruption. Otherwise, the whole premise of the bill would be defeated.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, may I inquire how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield an additional 5 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, there are 2 or 3 things which, it seems to me, ought to be settled here. Let us first discuss the proprietary matter. True, this is a proprietary function of the Government. But what did Congress say about this less than 9 months ago?

> That it is hereby declared that the business of mass transportation of persons for hire in the District of Columbia is clothed with a public interest and is essential to the proper functioning of the Government of the United States and the government of the District of Columbia. The continuous, uninterrupted, and proper functioning of such business in the District of Columbia is hereby declared to be essential to the welfare, health, and safety of the public, including the civilian and military personnel of the Government of the United States located in the District of Columbia and the metropolitan area of Washington.

That is a quotation from the act passed by Congress last August.

What is now proposed? First of all, it is proposed that we give up $2 million a year in taxes, in order to establish a Transportation Authority. Second, it is proposed that the Government lend $20 million in order to establish a transportation system. Third, the way the bill is drafted, the Government will pick up the tab for any deficit which may occur—and, in my opinion, the deficit will be frequent and probably large.

The next step is to bar the employees of the Authority from the right to strike. No one in the world deplores more than I do the denial of the right to strike in ordinary circumstances. I have always fought for the right to strike, and I shall continue to do so. But I believe there are some circumstances in which the right to strike should not exist. This is one of them.

It has been said, "Let us wait until we are confronted with that situation; then we will face it; then we will take care of it." But if Congress were not in Washington at the time a strike occurred, what would happen? Would we again subject the District of Columbia to what took place last July and August? Suppose it became necessary for Congress to act at a time when it was not in session. Would we let the people of the District of Columbia walk the streets for months at a time, while they awaited the passage of a law by Congress? I do not think we should allow that to happen.

It has been said also that the amendment would establish a new and a bad precedent. As a matter of fact, if the proposed authority were excluded from the provisions of Public Law 330, although it would be controlled and owned by the Government of the United States, and with the money for its establishment being put up by the Government, because Congress has said such an authority is vital to the welfare of the Government, we would indeed be establishing a new precedent, which would affect the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Alaska Railroad Company, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Panama Canal Company. If we exempt the proposed Transit Authority, we will, in fact, be establishing a new precedent in government and then there would be no reason for not removing all the other agencies from the prohibition against the right to strike, under Public Law 330.

I do not suggest that the union is not acting in good faith in the matter, but there have been other strikes, including wildcat strikes. What would be done if there should be a wildcat strike? No one will march the employees at the point of a bayonet but neither can anyone contend that a union can paralyze the Government and paralyze the people who work for the Government. It cannot be contended that the union should have a right to repeat what it did last year.

Contrary to what my estimable and great friend from Oregon says, it is not a question of who was responsible for the strike. The fact is that the strike occurred. It is a fact that hundreds of thousands of persons, day after day, trudged many miles to work because they could not obtain public transportation. It is a fact that the functions of the Government were stymied, were foreclosed, were slowed down, for some

5 or 6 weeks, while a debate was in progress as to whether the employees should get what they were seeking in the strike.

I favor the right to strike in ordinary circumstances. But if we permit the employees of the Authority to strike, we will be establishing a new precedent. As a matter of fact, we will be establishing a new principle if we exempt the new Authority, which is about to be created, from the provisions of Public Law 330.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I am advised that 2 minutes remain on our side. I should like to take a part of that time, at least, to say that it is a fact that a strike existed, or took place. The strike did not take place through action by the employees so far as arbitration was concerned. Before they went on strike, the employees offered to arbitrate. It was the management which refused to arbitrate.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado would take punitive action against the persons who were the least guilty in the whole affair.

I think the two other members of the subcommittee, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], have stated the view of the subcommittee, as we understand the problem. I associate myself with their remarks, and I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Flanders	McNamara
Allott	Fulbright	Millikin
Anderson	Gore	Morse
Beall	Green	Mundt
Bender	Hayden	Murray
Bennett	Hennings	Neuberger
Bricker	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hill	Payne
Bush	Holland	Potter
Butler	Hruska	Purtell
Byrd	Humphrey	Robertson
Carlson	Jackson	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Scott
Chavez	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Knowland	Sparkman
Daniel	Langer	Stennis
Dirksen	Lehman	Symington
Douglas	Long	Thye
Duff	Magnuson	Watkins
Dworshak	Mansfield	Wiley
Eastland	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Ellender	Martin, Pa.	Wofford
Ervin	McCarthy	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WOFFORD in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] to the committee amendment.

All time on this question has expired; and the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. If the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD and Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] is absent on official business attending the atomic-energy tests in the South Pacific.

On this vote, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay," and the Senator from Delaware would vote "yea."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senators from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—32

Allott	Dirksen	Mundt
Bennett	Dworshak	Robertson
Bricker	Eastland	Schoeppel
Bridges	Flanders	Smith, Maine
Butler	Hickenlooper	Stennis
Byrd	Holland	Watkins
Carlson	Hruska	Wiley
Case, S. Dak.	Knowland	Williams
Cotton	Martin, Iowa	Wofford
Curtis	Martin, Pa.	Young
Daniel	Millikin	

NAYS—42

Aiken	Hayden	McNamara
Anderson	Hennings	Morse
Beall	Hill	Murray
Bender	Humphrey	Neuberger
Bush	Jackson	O'Mahoney
Case, N. J.	Johnston, S. C.	Payne
Chavez	Kennedy	Potter
Douglas	Kerr	Purtell
Duff	Langer	Saltonstall
Ellender	Lehman	Scott
Ervin	Long	Smith, N. J.
Fulbright	Magnuson	Sparkman
Gore	Mansfield	Symington
Green	McCarthy	Thye

NOT VOTING—21

Barrett	Ives	McClellan
Bible	Jenner	Monroney
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Clements	Kefauver	Pastore
Frear	Kuchel	Russell
George	Laird	Smathers
Goldwater	Malone	Welker

So Mr. ALLOTT's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I request the distinguished minority leader to yield to me 1 minute on the bill, in order to enable me to clear up one feature in connection with the amendment just disposed of.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. During the course of the debate on my amendment this afternoon I made the statement that I had been informed that if the amendment were adopted, those directly involved would prefer that the arbitration clause be mandatory.

I further made the statement that if the amendment were adopted, I would offer a further amendment, to change the word "may" in line 9, on page 82, to "shall", in order to make the provision mandatory.

Inasmuch as I do not believe in compulsory arbitration, and agreed to offer the conditional amendment only in order to make the bill workable, and inasmuch as my previous amendment was not agreed to, I feel free to refrain from offering such an amendment as that described in my original statement, leaving the arbitration clause of the bill entirely voluntary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Maine will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 82, line 18, in the committee amendment, after the words "corporate officers", it is proposed to insert "with less than 10 years' service."

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes. I shall be very brief.

This amendment would give recognition in connection with the provision for retaining in the service, as the service might require, of those who would otherwise be left out under the present wording of the bill. I am sure an oversight was made. I have discussed the subject with several members of the committee.

If the bill as it is worded at present is passed, it will mean that 1 individual with 27 years' service with the Capital Transit Co., another with 14 years' service, another with 37 years' service, another with 20 years' service, another with 29 years' service, and another with 31 years' service will be excluded from the benefits of the provisions which apply to all other employees. My amendment applies to those with less than 10 years of service. It would give the career employees, regardless of their present status, an opportunty to remain on the job.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] to the committee amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wonder if we may have the yeas and nays ordered on final passage of the bill, in order that Senators may be informed.

I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PAYNE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. As a member of the subcommittee I heartily support the Senator's amendment. My understanding is that the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. MCNAMARA], also joins in support of it. I believe also that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the other member of the subcommittee, favors the amendment. I do not see him present in the Chamber, but I discussed the subject with him earlier this afternoon.

Mr. MCNAMARA. I am sure it is agreed that there is no objection to the amendment.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I am glad to yield back the remaining time on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the pending amendment has been exhausted or yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment, as amended, is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? Do Senators wish to use time on the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back my time, with the understanding that the other side will do likewise.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] is absent on official business attending the atomic energy tests in the South Pacific.

I further announce that on this vote, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senators from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—41

Aiken	Hennings	Morse
Allott	Hill	Murray
Anderson	Hruska	Neuberger
Beall	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Bender	Jackson	Payne
Bush	Johnston, S. C.	Potter
Case, N. J.	Kennedy	Purtell
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Scott
Chavez	Langer	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Lehman	Sparkman
Ervin	Long	Stennis
Gore	Magnuson	Wiley
Green	Mansfield	Wofford
Hayden	McNamara	

NAYS—31

Bennett	Dworshak	Mundt
Bricker	Eastland	Saltonstall
Bridges	Ellender	Schoeppel
Butler	Flanders	Smith, N. J.
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Symington
Carlson	Holland	Thye
Cotton	Knowland	Watkins
Curtis	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Daniel	Martin, Pa.	Young
Dirksen	McCarthy	
Duff	Millikin	

NOT VOTING—23

Barrett	Ives	Monroney
Bible	Jenner	Neely
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Clements	Kefauver	Robertson
Frear	Kuchel	Russell
Fulbright	Laird	Smathers
George	Malone	Welker
Goldwater	McClellan	

So the bill (S. 3073) was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for an adequate and economically sound transportation system or systems to serve the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill has just been passed be reconsidered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from North Dakota.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1939 REGARDING GAINS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1961, H. R. 6143.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6143) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that for taxable years beginning after May 31, 1951, certain amounts received in consideration of the transfer of patent rights shall be considered capital gains, regardless of the basis upon which such amounts are paid.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment, on page 3, after line 15, to insert:

SEC. 2. Certain claims against United States.

(a) Section 106 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 (relating to claims against the United States involving acquisition of property) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 106. Certain claims against United States.

"In the case of any amount (other than interest) received by a taxpayer from the United States with respect to a claim against the United States—

"(a) involving the acquisition of property and remaining unpaid for more than 15 years, or

"(b) arising under a contract for the construction of installations or facilities for any branch of the armed services of the United States and remaining unpaid for more than 5 years from the date such claim first accrued and paid prior to January 1, 1950,

the portion of the tax imposed by section 12 attributable to such amount (other than interest) shall not exceed 30 percent thereof. For purposes of section 291 (a), relating to additions to the tax for failure to file a return, the term 'reasonable cause' shall include the filing of a timely incomplete return under circumstances which led the taxpayer to believe that no tax was due on amounts received under a settlement with the United States."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1948.

SEC. 3. Certain distributions in kind.

(a) Section 115 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 (relating to distributions by corporations) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(n) Certain distributions in kind:

"(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, a distribution of property by a corporation to its stockholders, with respect to its stock, shall be (except as provided in paragraph (2)) considered to be a distribution which is not a dividend

(whether or not otherwise a dividend) to the extent that the fair market value of such property exceeds the earnings and profits of such corporation accumulated after February 28, 1913, and the earnings and profits of the taxable year (computed as of the close of the taxable year without diminution by reason of any distributions, except those described in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraphs (3), made during the taxable year) without regard to the amount of the earnings and profits at the time the distribution was made. The preceding sentence shall not prevent the application of subsection (d) to any such distribution.

"(2) In the case of a personal holding company a distribution in property shall not be a dividend to the extent it exceeds the earnings and profits of such corporation accumulated after February 28, 1913, to the beginning of the taxable year, plus the higher of the earnings and profits of the taxable year or the subchapter A net income of the taxable year, adjusted in accordance with paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (a), computed as of the end of the taxable year without reduction for any distributions made during the taxable year except those described in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (3), made during the taxable year.

"(3) This subsection shall apply to any distribution of property other than—

"(A) money.

"(B) inventory assets, as defined in section 312 (b) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, or

"(C) distributions described in section 312 (j) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954."

(b) The amendment made by this section to section 115 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 shall be effective as if it were a part of such section on the date of enactment of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939. No interest shall be allowed or paid in respect of any overpayment of tax resulting from the amendment made by this section.

SEC. 4. Application to poultry of tax on transportation of property.

(a) (1) Section 3475 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 (relating to the tax on the transportation of property) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) Poultry: The tax imposed by this section shall not apply to amounts paid for the transportation of poultry in continuous movement from the farm where the poultry was raised to a dressing plant, located within the local area of such farm, for processing."

(2) The amendment made by this subsection shall apply only with respect to amounts paid after November 30, 1942.

(b) (1) Section 4272 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to exemptions from the tax on the transportation of property) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) Poultry: The tax imposed by section 4271 shall not apply to amounts paid for the transportation of poultry in continuous movement from the farm where the poultry was raised to a dressing plant, located within the local area of such farm, for processing."

(2) The amendment made by this subsection shall apply only with respect to amounts paid after December 31, 1954, for transportation which begins after such date.

(c) No interest shall be allowed or paid in respect of any overpayment of tax resulting from the amendments made by this section.

SEC. 5. Trademark and trade name expenditures.

(a) Part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by inserting after section 176 thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 177. Trademark and trade name expenditures.

"(a) Election to amortize: Trademark or trade name expenditures paid or incurred after December 31, 1955, may, at the election of the taxpayer (made in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate), be treated as deferred expenses. In computing taxable income, such deferred expenses shall be allowed as a deduction ratably over such period of not less than 60 months after such expenditures are paid or incurred, as may be selected by the taxpayer.

"(b) Trademark and trade name expenditures defined: The term 'trademark or trade name expenditures' means any expenditure which—

"(1) is directly connected with the acquisition, protection, expansion, registration (Federal, State, or foreign) or defense of a trademark or trade name;

"(2) is chargeable to capital account; and

"(3) is not part of the consideration paid for a trademark, trade name, or business.

"(c) Time for and scope of election: The election provided by subsection (a) shall be made within the time prescribed by law for filing the return for the taxable year (including extensions thereof). The period so selected shall be adhered to in computing the taxable income of the taxpayer for the taxable year for which the election is made and all subsequent years."

(b) The table of sections of part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby amended by inserting at the end thereof

"SEC. 177. Trademark and trade name expenditures."

(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1955.

SEC. 6. Livestock sold on account of drought.

(a) Section 1033 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to involuntary conversions) is hereby amended by redesignating subsection (f) thereof as subsection (g) and by inserting after subsection (e) of such section the following new subsection:

"(f) Livestock sold on account of drought: The sale of livestock (other than poultry) held by a taxpayer for draft, breeding, or dairy purposes in excess of the number the taxpayer would sell if he followed his usual business practices shall be treated as an involuntary conversion to which this section applies if such livestock—

"(1) are held in an area—

"(A) in respect of which the President determines under the act of September 30, 1950, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1855–1855g), that a major disaster exists because of drought, and

"(B) which is found eligible by the Secretary of Agriculture for emergency assistance under section 2 (d) of the act of April 6, 1949, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1148a–2), or for relief under clause (2) of the fifth sentence of section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1427), and

"(2) are sold (whether before or after such determination) by such taxpayer solely on account of such drought."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1955.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to amend the Internal Revenue Codes of 1939 and 1954, and for other purposes."

INSURANCE AGAINST FLOOD DAMAGE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1886, Senate bill 3732.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3732) to provide insurance against flood damage, and or other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce for the information of the Senate that, following the disposition of Calendar No. 1886, Senate bill 3732, which has just been made the unfinished business, it is the purpose of the leadership to proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1896, Senate bill 3108, to encourage the construction of modern Great Lakes bulk cargo vessels; Calendar No. 1894, H. R. 483, to amend the Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947, as amended, so as to provide for appointment of doctors of osteopathy in the Medical Corps in the Army and Navy; and Calendar No. 1899, H. R. 9429, to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

The bills will be considered not necessarily in that order, Mr. President, but I should like the Senate to be on notice that the leadership has agreed to take up those bills.

It is not the intention to have any votes this evening. If no Senator desires to present any matter at this time, I shall move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow. I suggest that if we may have a full day tomorrow and can dispose of all the measures which I have announced, it is possible that the Senate will go over until Monday.

I should like to give notice that such a motion may be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, May 10, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 9 (legislative day of May 7), 1956:

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The following-named persons to be members of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for terms of 6 years expiring May 10, 1962:

Laurence McKinley Gould, of Minnesota. (Reappointment.)

Paul M. Gross, of North Carolina. (Reappointment.)

George D. Humphrey, of Wyoming. (Reappointment.)

Frederick A. Middlebush, of Missouri. (Reappointment.)

Edward James McShane, of Virginia, vice John W. Davis, term expired.

Samuel Milton Nabrit, of Texas, vice Edwin B. Fred, term expired.

Julius A. Stratton, of Massachusetts, vice O. W. Hyman, term expired.

Edward Lawrie Tatum, of California, vice Earl P. Stevenson, term expired.

IN THE COAST GUARD

Joseph A. Kerrins for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the United States Coast Guard.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, 80th Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947); title II, Public Law 365, 80th Congress (Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947); and section 307 (b), Public Law 150, 82d Congress (Air Force Organization Act of 1951), with a view to designation for the performance of duties as indicated:

To be major, USAF (Medical)

Francies Marshall

To be captains, USAF (Medical)

Francis X. Farrell
Jack R. Starrett, O946664.

To be captains, USAF (Dental)

Edward E. Davis, AO2240587.
Donald E. Kurth, AO1906888.
Edward J. Prejean, Jr., O427771.
Arthur J. Sachsel, AO1906183.
Charles W. Seamands, AO1906530.
Ira L. Shannon, AO1906564.
Milton D. Wyngarden

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Medical)

Charles M. Aaronson, AO3043103.
Donald W. Acker, AO741437.
Thorne J. Butler, AO3043222.
William H. Carranza, AO3043224.
George R. Cary, Jr.
Don L. Christensen, AO3043225.
John E. Eagleton, AO3043231.
Robert H. Edwards, O4022249.
Richard C. Froede, AO3043198.
John T. Hart, AO2218328.
James S. Harvin, AO3000787.
James H. Hockenberry, AO3043193.
Vernon L. James, Jr.
Kenneth M. Jensen, AO3043245.
Charles C. Keith, Jr., AO3043203.
Gregory B. Krivchenia
Charles K. Landrum, AO1856169.
Vernor F. Lovett, AO3043093.
William K. I. Manning, AO3043252.
John F. McCloskey, AO3043134.
Jay W. McRoberts
Gunter R. Meng
Robert T. Miller, AO3043254.
Edward H. Mills
David P. Minichan, Jr., AO2233026.
William J. Mitchell, AO3043255.
Patrick J. Moore, AO2217030.
Herbert A. Muller, Jr., AO3043256.
John T. Purvis, AO2261924.
Howard F. Rickenbach, Jr., AO3043267.
James A. Roman
Anthony N. Scalco
Richard H. Schwarz
John R. Scott, AO3043273.
Ferdinand L. Soisson, Jr., AO3042884.
Donald B. Strominger, AO3001639.
Irwin T. Taylor, AO3001894.
Fred K. Viren, AO3044156.
Forrest S. Warner, AO3041625.
Morgan E. Wing, AO2255714.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Dental)

Clair W. Andrus
Stephen T. Braum
Norman L. Esterl
James A. Hitchens, AO3001090.
Carl E. Johnson, AO730268.
Edwin B. Rosen
Robert R. H. Sutherlin, AO3043654.
John J. Travis
Wallace T. Urata, AO981869.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Veterinary)

Donald L. Anderson, AO2261570.
Charles F. Clause, AO3000154.
Ernest B. Rushing, Jr., AO3000240.
Otto S. Shill, Jr., AO3000710.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Medical Service)

Merrill B. DeLong, AO1327517.
William G. Neubrand, AO2230004.
Francis J. Smith, AO2213609.
Myrl E. Wilson, AO2241093.

To be second lieutenants, USAF (Medical Service)

James E. Bousser, AO2262010.
Elwood E. Fisher, AO3013109.
Jeremiah R. Lynch, AO3001446.
William H. Newton, AO2262019.
Walter H. Williams, AO3000093.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of sections 101 (c) and 102 (c), Public Law 36, 80th Congress (Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947), as amended by section 5, Public Law 514, 81st Congress, and Public Law 37, 83d Congress, with a view to designation for the performance of duties as indicated under the provisions of section 307, Public Law 150, 82d Congress (Air Force Organization Act of 1951):

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Nurse)

Joan M. Caddell, AN795815.
Mary J. Evans, AN2214423.
Margaret H. Maschino, AN2241704.
Margaret T. Merritt, AN2244419.
Virginia M. Niebauer, AN2241662.
Mary E. Roop, AN1912791.
Katherine I. Shealy, AN2242119.
Beatrice N. Toth, AN2242922.
Lois J. Wikoff, AN792691.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Medical Specialist)

Carolyn E. Bobo, AR3001035.
Marian J. Hayton, AR2485.

The following-named cadets, United States Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, 80th Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947). Date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Don Eugene Ackerman
Michael Houston Alexander
B. Conn Anderson, Jr.
Darrell Leslie Anderson
Gerald David Ankenbrandt
Robert Todd Barrett
Robert Chapman Beyer, Jr.
Robert Moulton Blocher
Stuart Waddington Bowen
Alfred Connor Bowman, Jr.
Robert Ellsworth Brown
Nicholas Joseph Bruno
Frank Albert Burd, Jr.
Edmund Dederick Burhans II
Dennis Lee Butler
Joel Richard Campis
Howard Ray Cannon
William Christi Carey
Darold Wendle Clonts
Thomas Joseph Cody, Jr.
James Arnold Cook
Roland Bertram Crase
Terry Wayne Creighton
William Penn Crum
Richard Joseph Daleski
Lee Armistead Denson, Jr.
Frederick Rodgers Dent III
Joseph Mark Dougherty
Paul Gustave Dougherty
Richard Patrick Dowell
Albert James Dye
Donald Lee Ernst
Theodore Martin Faurer
Hugh LaVerne Filbey
Norman Clark Folden, Jr.
Henry Ronald Gaude
James Harper Gordon
Robert English Grassberger
Merrill Anson Green, Jr.
Paul Hilger Greisen
John Martin Gromek
Alfred John Hallisey
Charles Rowland Hamm
John Arthur Hampton
Norris Brown Harbold, Jr.
Richard Henning Head
Joel Stanley Hetland
John Henry Higgins III
Alfred Hoffman, Jr.
Harold Gordon Holmquist
Gerald Lee Irwin
Paul Anthony Jakus
William Robert Jarmon
Douglas Stoddard Johnson
John Milton Kamm, Jr.
Lisle Greene Kendall, Jr.
Thomas Edward Kirchgessner
Harry Kotellos
Robert Douglas Krutz
Jerome Glen Lake
Kenneth Earl Lang
Samuel Murray Lansing
George Firmin Leonard
James Ambrose Linden
Aaron B. Loggins
Richard Wetzel Lorey
Neale Malcolm Luft
George Patrick Lynch, Jr.
Nicholas Alexander Mavrotheris
Irwin Benton Mayer
Lester Stearns McChristian, Jr.
William Wallace McClung
James Stephen McMahon
William Curtis McPeek
Stanley Herbert Meader
Porter Nelson Medley, Jr.
Mario Anthony Nicolais
Robert LeRoy Pearson
Leslie Terence Prossner
Matthew James Quinn, Jr.
Joseph Edward Ragland
Thomas Edward Reinhardt
Alan Bishop Renshaw
Rand Eliot Rensvold
Charles William Robertson
Thomas Eugene Ross, Jr.
Walter Charles Sager
Joe Edward Sanders
Donald Wade Satterfield
John Dwight Schannep
G. Richard Schaumberg
Marvin Francis Schwartz, Jr.
Jack Joseph Sharkey
John Albert Shaud
Donald Elmer Sheehan
Robert Bruce Sheridan
Jerald Henry Skatvold
Mark Edward Smith III
Perry McCoy Smith
Herbert Henry Spaeni, Jr.

Lawrence Alan Stebleton
Robert Kenneth Stein, Jr.
Robert Allan Stewart
Joseph Francis Stroface
Otis Peebles Studdard
John Samuel Sutherland
Alan Leigh Thelin
John Benton Tindall, Jr.
Charles Clayton Torrey
Edward Vallentiny
Vernon Roy Van Vonderen
Jan Edward Verfurth
Bruce McClain Wallace, Jr.
Joseph Patrick Waters
Jerome Hirsch Werbel
Robert Wetzel
William Taylor Wetzel
William Alfred White
Romain Alton Young, Jr.

The following-named midshipmen, United States Naval Academy, for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, 80th Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947). Date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Donald Joseph Alser
Spence McFall Armstrong
James Richard Arnold
Steven Ward Nixon Arnold
James Newton Barker
Allen Ellsworth Barlow
Harold Stephen Bauduit
Leonard Fred Benzi
Lawrence Wilton Berger
William Harland Black
Emil Nathaniel Block, Jr.
Bernard William Boshoven
Thomas Charles Brandt
Robert Joseph Brown, Jr.
Richard Guy Bryant
Jesse Walter Buckelew
James William Buddle
Norman Allan Burgk
Robert Salisbury Cecil
David Porter Chartrand
Charles Nicolas Chavarria
Charles Franklin Coker
John Burd Collins
Thomas McCulloch Colman
John Edwards Conway
Henry Fred Culberson, Jr.
Charles Glenn Curtis
Paul Bernard Cusick
Vernon Allan Dander
Joe Rex Davis
David Loren Debus
George Moreton Decell III
Arsenio Lopez Delgado
Eugene John DeNezza
Walter Sam Denham, Jr.
James Vincent Detore, Jr.
Nathaniel Otis DeVoll
William Maurice Dillon
Bruce Hamilton Dolph
William Peter Dunsavage
Michael Joseph Dwyer, Jr.
Duane Cameron Eggert
John Earle Elliott
James Peter Eri
Fred Henry Ernst
Philippe Bunau-Varilla Fales
Donald Otto Faust
Peirce George Ferriter
Dundas Ingoldsby Flaherty
Raymond Joseph Fleming
Donald Thomas Flood
John Wayne Forbrick
Bob Lawrence Francis
Raymond Frankenberg
Norman Lea Hutchings Frith II
Stephen George Gardella, Jr.
Daniel Tyler Garges
Stephen Ernest Gauthreaux, Jr.
Benjamin Wesley George
Jerry Lee Gibson
Kenneth Harrison Godstrey
George Bishop Gollehon
Gerry Francis Gossens
Robert Michael Greene
Sheldon Law Groner
Richard Payne Guest, Jr.
Charles Christopher Hackeling
Albert George Haddad
Harold Austin Haddock
Franklin Richard Hadley
Willard Harvey Hagenmeyer, Jr.
Hugh Elliott Hanna, Jr.
Charles Jasper Hansen, Jr.
Edmund Earl Hansen
Walter Hansen
Lyell Foster Harris
George Conrad Heidrich
Robert Theodore Herz
Fred Nyland Hopewell
Lawrence Joseph Hubert
Donald LeRoy Hugdahl
Ralph Henry Jacobson
Edward Charles James
Jerry Raymond Johnston
John Joseph Lally
Marc Theodore Wolff
Robert Duggan Jones
James Joseph Kamp, Jr.
John Karas
Richard Henry Kauffman
James George Kautz
John Daniel Kelly
Leo John Koerkenmeier
David Warren Lajeunesse
Thomas Charles Lampsa, Jr.
Gerald Barry Leavey, Jr.
Charles Allen Levis
Reed Holloman Lewis
Edward Coughlin Lovely
Roger Held Lyle
Thomas Cahoon Lynch
James Benjamin Mackey
John Flock Magagna
Armand David Maio
Lawrence Otis Marr
Jerry Patrick Masterson
John Robert McIntyre, Jr.
George James Mercuro
Charles Walter Missler
Charles Louis Mitri, Jr.
Donald Peter Murphy
Carl Harold Murray, Jr.
George Mushalko
Barton Myers, III
John Frederick Nelson
William Henry Niles
David Joseph Noonan
Mark Anthony O'Hara, Jr.
Ernest Arthur Olds
James Kelly Olson
David Lee Palmer
Edward Joseph Parent
Robert Edward Park
Kenneth Morgan Petch
Clifford Dean Peterson
George Walton Peterson, Jr.
Raleigh Edward Piatt, Jr.
Chester Allen Pilcher
Andreus August Piske, Jr.
George Emil Pitzer
Joe Daniel Pope
George Reagan
Richard Samuel Romero
George Laddie Rosenhauer
John Ellis Schaefer
John Clifford Schoep
Thomas Schwartz
William Caesar Shannon
Leo Joseph Sheehan
Richard George Shewchuk
James Cass Shortridge, Jr.
Richard Edward Smith
Stephen Arthur Soltesz
Ben Lutes Steele
William Howard Stewart
Leo Warren Stockham
Philip Long Sullivan
Richard Swanenburg
George Paul Textor
Richard Paul Tucker
Charles Duane Van Ry
Robert Fred Vaselenko
James Raymond Visage
Glenn Allen Warner
Richard Hawks Warren
George Warren Weigold, Jr.
Thomas Lee Weisner
Bernard Ira Weltman
J. Walden Westerhausen
William Edward Whitaker
Frank Durward White
George Thomas White
Ronald Litteer Widner
Oscar Eugene Williams, Jr.
Powell Jones Wilson, Jr.
James Ray Wolverton
James Alfred Franklin Wood
John Eugene Wood
Robert Emmett Zehnder

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, 80th Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be first lieutenants

Lawrence L. Brown, AO2220979.
Robert E. Buck, AO2227401.
Edward G. Bulka, AO2228534.
Weldon L. Burden, AO2228358.
Monti D. Callero, AO2228160.
Duane D. Campbell, AO2249725.
William S. Clarke, Jr., AO2228164.
John D. Collins, AO2221011.
Robert E. Craycraft, AO2227979.
Joseph E. Daneu, AO2228368.
Miles D. Dick, AO2228169.
Eugene P. Dikeman, AO2227871.
Arthur J. Disher, Jr., AO2221053.
Randall J. Dixon, AO2221054.
John J. Doyle, Jr. AO2228455.
Alexander G. Edgar, AO2221071.
Robert L. Engle, AO2227145.
Allen J. Gibson, AO3003709.
Merle Hahn, AO2228385.
Howard D. Harper, AO2228387.
Barry E. Harris, AO3002824.
John D. Hunt, AO2216925.
Jack King, AO3002997.
William A. Kobzeff, AO2251585.
Ronald J. Legner, AO3004484.
Herman W. Lehman, Jr., AO3004783.
Karl V. Lofstrand, AO3004815.
Truman A. Marr, AO3003048.
William E. Masterson, AO3005767.
Francis D. McCarthy, AO2221253.
Agamemnon R. Mourges, AO2227492.
Gerald J. Newlin, AO2254604.
Howard R. Nordeck, AO3004512.
Richard H. Rencurrel, AO2218182.
David A. Sena, AO2247526.
John D. Sharp, AO3003037.
Peter L. Smith, AO2228434.
Jack C. Snead, AO2228450.
William R. Southerland, AO2254641.
Billy W. Stephens, AO1865272.
Julian T. Stewart, Jr., AO3004858.
James M. Taylor, AO2228524.
Robert P. Taylor, AO3004629.
John F. Tiernan, AO3002516.
Virgil R. Van Haaften, AO3004545.
James L. Wallace, AO2228278.
Laverne A. Westling, AO3003614.
Ira L. Yoder, Jr. AO3004588.
John M. Ziegler, AO2228448.

To be second lieutenants

Roddee E. Lord, AO2255022.
William A. McLawhon, AO3017269.

The following-named person for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade indicated, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, 80th Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947); and section 301, Public Law 625, 80th Congress (Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948):

To be first lieutenant

Marie L. Killwey, AL2221188.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 9, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

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

O Thou infinite and eternal God, our Creator and Benefactor, who hast made us for Thyself, we beseech Thee to give us a humble spirit and a contrite heart as we again seek Thy blessing and favor in this fellowship of prayer.

Thine is the love which redeems us, the strength which sustains us, the providence which surrounds us, the beauty which attracts us, and the grace which is sufficient for all our needs.

We pray that Thou wilt take our wills and make them Thine, transforming our groping and faltering spirits into centers of light and loveliness and into channels of peace and power.

Grant that we may long to be worthy citizens of Thy heavenly kingdom, men and women of invincible good will and fellow workers with Thee in building a social order in which the principle of righteousness shall prevail and the law of love shall be victorious over hatred and strife.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

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

INCREASED PENSIONS FOR SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR VETERAN WIDOWS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the first session I introduced a bill at the designation of the United Spanish War Veterans for an increase of pensions paid to Spanish-American War widows from the present pitiful amount of $57 a month to $75 a month. I understand the distinguished chairman and members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee are all sympathetic with this legislation but that now it is caught in a roadblock created by the Bradley report. Time is running out on these Spanish-American War widows. There are not many of them left. I do hope the House will soon take action on this bill, and I suggest to my colleagues that they read Edward K. Inman's editorial in this week's issue of the National Tribune entitled "Pass the O'Hara Bill."

FORTY-THIRD NATIONAL CONVENTION OF NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, beginning tomorrow, through May 12, the 43d national convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress is going to convene at the Mayflower Hotel in the city of Washington.

The first day of that program will be devoted to committee meetings. The second day, Friday, they will begin the regular convention program. I as president of this organization am making this announcement here today because we have many Members of Congress on the program as speakers for river and harbor development and reclamation and water utilization throughout the United States. Under the constitution and bylaws of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Mr. Speaker, every Member of the House and Senate is ex officio a member of the congress and is invited and is expected to attend where possible the meetings of the convention. I urge every Member to attend some of our meetings.

MATANUSKA VALLEY LINES, INC.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7513) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to grant an extension of time to the Matanuska Valley Lines, Inc., and to Russell Swank and Joe Blackard within which to apply for patent to certain lands in Alaska, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, if the Secretary of the Interior finds that the Matanuska Valley Lines, Inc., pursuant to its certificate of conditional purchases issued on August 20, 1951, for tracts 1, 2, 3, and 4 of block 27 of the east addition to the original townsite of Anchorage, Alaska, and tract 7 of block 34 of the east addition to the original townsite of Anchorage, Alaska, complied, prior to August 20, 1954, with the provisions of the Alaska Public Sales Act of August 30, 1949 (63 Stat. 679; 48 U. S. C., secs. 364a–364e), and the regulations issued pursuant thereto, except for the requirement pertaining to the application for the issuance of a patent, he shall grant to the Matanuska Valley Lines, Inc., such additional period of time within which to file such application for the aforesaid tracts as he shall deem reasonable.

"SEC. 2. If the Secretary of the Interior finds that Joe Blackard and Russell Swank, operating a joint venture as Blackard and Swank, pursuant to their certificate of conditional purchase issued on August 20, 1951, for tract 6 of block 34 of the east addition to the original townsite of Anchorage, Alaska, complied, prior to August 20, 1954, with the provisions of the Alaska Public Sales Act of August 30, 1949 (63 Stat. 679; 48 U. S. C., secs. 364–364e), and the regulations issued pursuant thereto, except for the requirement pertaining to the application for the issuance of a patent, he shall grant to Joe Blackard and Russell Swank such additional period of time within which to file such application for the aforesaid tract as he shall deem reasonable."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN M. LEE, 1887–1956

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I report the death of a very close personal friend, a civic leader in the city of Chicago, an elder of the Democratic Party, and a former Illinois State senator and State representative—John M. Lee.

John M. Lee died on Thursday, April 26, 1956, at St. Bernard's Hospital in Chicago, Ill.

Senator Lee was born in Chicago, Ill. He was a leader in community activities during most of his lifetime. He served five terms in the Illinois House of Representatives, from 1922 until his election to the Illinois State Senate in 1933. He served in the Illinois Senate from 1933 until 1946.

Senator Lee's legislative career was marked by a devotion to the interest of the poor, the workingman, and the public in general. He was recognized as a spokesman for labor and fair employment practices. He introduced and successfully handled much of the prolabor legislation that has resulted in Illinois being recognized as one of the most progressive States insofar as labor legislation is concerned.

As tributes to his legislative skill and his interest in the workingman is the Illinois Unemployment Compensation Act, which he introduced in the Illinois State Legislature and successfully helped to effectuate into Illinois law. He was one of the legislative architects of the Illinois workmen's compensation law, the Illinois minimum-wage law, and the Illinois Department of Labor. This progressive legislation remains in our Illinois law as a monument to John M. Lee's service to the community.

Senator Lee was a leader of the Democratic Party from his early youth. He served as ward committeeman of the 18th ward regular Democratic organization from 1938 until the time of his death. In his capacity as a leader in the Democratic Party he constantly strove to help men of good will achieve public office. Numerous officials of the city of Chicago, State of Illinois, and the Nation owe in a great measure their success in public life to Senator Lee's assistance and guidance. Senator Lee was the first to suggest myself as a candidate for the Congress. My successful election as a Member of this great body is in a large measure due to his assistance and guidance. His only advice and caution to me when I took this office was to do a good job for the people of the Nation and our community.

Senator Lee was interred in Mount Olivet Cemetery in Chicago, Ill. Mass was offered in St. Sabina's Roman Catholic Church at 1210 West 78th Street, Chicago, Ill. The Reverend Patrick J. Molloy, pastor of St. Leo's Church, said the mass, and the Reverend Thomas McMahon, of St. Sabina's Church, gave the sermon.

Senator Lee is survived by his widow, Mae. To his widow I extend my deepest sympathy and assure her that her sorrow of his loss is shared by the many, many friends he has left behind.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 500 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That, during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill are hereby waived.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and at this time I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides the usual rule for the consideration of the Defense Department appropriation bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Has it now become the usual thing for the Rules Committee to report all appropriation bills with points of order waived?

Mr. BOLLING. No; that, I think, is not an accurate statement. There are a number of appropriation bills reported that do not have points of order waived. This is an appropriation bill which over the years, for a number of years at least, has contained a substantial amount of legislation and it has been customary in the past to grant this type of a rule. This is an exceptional circumstance.

Mr. GROSS. May I say to the gentleman, it seems to me that it has become the exception rather than the rule to have an appropriation bill before the House without points of order being waived.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, the able gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] has stated that this rule provides for the waiving of points of order. There was no mention of amendments. This is an open rule and amendments, of course, will be in order.

Mr. Speaker, I want to fully subscribe to what the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has just said. I have been a member of the Rules Committee for about 20 years. During those many years that I have been on the Committee on Rules there have been times when legislative committees have come before the Committee on Rules and have acquiesced in the matter of waiving points of order, but in this particular instance the Committee on Appropriations has seen fit to insert, think of it, 63 legislative provisions—which is many, many times more than have ever been sought since I have been a member of that committee.

Now, it is true that any legislative committee appearing before the Committee on Rules has the right to ask the Committee on Rules to waive points of order, and by a majority of one the Committee on Rules has reported out this rule which waives points of order. I was and am opposed to this rule.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman give the House an estimate of the number of legislative committees whose functions have been usurped by the rule that is proposed here today waiving points of order?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Well, I would say that most of them are confined to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. GROSS. I would think that functions of most of the legislative committees are being usurped by the rule being offered here today. I am opposed to this rule, and I commend the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. It was amazing to learn that the Committee on Appropriations waived points of order on these 63 legislative matters.

For instance, a Member might want some flood-control project in his district. He would go before the Committee on Public Works. The Committee on Public Works would go into the matter thoroughly, and he would be turned down. According to this theory, which the Committee on Appropriations has advanced, an individual Member can go to the Committee on Public Works on a flood-control project and be turned down and then go to the Committee on Appropriations and have that project inserted in the appropriation bill. Or, it might be that a Member is interested in some matter concerning foreign affairs. He might go before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, where it is given considerable consideration and be turned down after the most careful scrutiny and then be able to go to the Committee on Appropriations and have them insert some provision that no money in this bill will be expended unless some particular item is included. That same situation might prevail in certain departmental bills where you might have, for instance, a matter dealing with the Interstate Commerce Committee. You might go to that committee and after extensive hearings be turned down and then go to the Committee on Appropriations obtaining approval and then come before the Committee on Rules asking for a provision waiving points of order.

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

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

Mr. MORANO. Does the gentleman know whether the Committee on Appropriations was unanimous in its request for the rule before the Committee on Rules waiving points of order?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I could not answer that. I would say that the chairman of the subcommittee as well as the ranking minority member appeared before the Committee on Rules in this matter and both gave approval.

But I am not unmindful of the fact that in theory and in practice the Committee on Appropriations is definitely following a procedure here of much greater magnitude than ever before. While I am opposed to the rule, I am not attempting dilatory tactics because I have been told that it is important that this defense appropriation bill go forward to the other body as rapidly as possible.

It is my understanding that there are going to be some amendments offered to this bill, especially to section 633. That is a section which compels the Department of Defense to continue certain governmental enterprises, even though the Department of Defense feels that they are expensive, are not needed, inefficient, and not profitable. Nevertheless, under section 633, the Department is compelled to continue those unprofitable governmental enterprises in competition with private industry, even though they do not want to continue them.

Private industry, we must not forget, pays taxes. The Department of Defense comes before the Committee on Armed Services, feeling that certain governmental enterprises were not needed. Under section 633 the Department of Defense would be compelled to continue them whether they wanted to do so or not. This section forces them to do it. It prohibits them from stopping these governmental enterprises, even though they do not want to continue them, even though they say they are unprofitable or inefficient and are not needed.

Mr. Speaker, can you conceive of a proposal like that? Why should a department or why should anyone who does not want to operate an enterprise, who is not interested in it, who does not feel it is needed, be compelled to operate it? They are compelled to provide some service that they say is too expensive or is inefficient or is not needed. It seems to me that is about as ridiculous a proposal as could possibly be made.

If I were a member of a board of directors of some enterprise and we did not want to operate a certain activity, did not have any sympathy for it, how do you think I would feel if, by some edict or regulation or obiter or law or whatever, I were compelled to continue to operate it, when I had no confidence in that business, did not think it was necessary?

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

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

Mr. NICHOLSON. Can we not offer an amendment to that section? Suppose the Department of the Navy, for instance, were in an activity in competition with private industry, could they not go out of that business themselves without any legislation?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. No; this section forces them to stay in it.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Whether they want to do so or not?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Whether they want to do so or not. The Congress, under this section, compels them to do so. They say, whether you want to operate it, you need it or not, you have got to do it. That is what section 633 compels them to do.

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

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for my friend's judgment, but I do think it would be well if I point out that there is another side to this story. The Congress simply has asked that it have a look at the reasons why the Department may want to discontinue an operation, or place it under private contract. Under the terms of the section to which the gentleman has referred, since the last Department of Defense appropriation bill was passed, the Department has sent to the Appropriations Committee a total of 112 activities that it proposed to discontinue or turn over to private enterprise. In only nine instances did the Congress disagree. Only in nine instances did the Congress say, "We think the Department should continue to operate this particular activity," and in most of those nine cases there was disagreement within the Department on whether the Government should terminate an activity and turn it over to private industry. In other words there was question within the Department about the wisdom or the economy of a change in method of operation. The language has worked no hardships in operation and has required a more orderly procedure in the operations of the Department.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I thank the gentleman. I would say nine is too many. Nine is far too many to compel a department or an individual to operate something that they claim they do not need and do not want, but still compel them to go in and operate something that they say is inefficient and unnecessary.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I hope, and I repeat, I expect that a member of the Committee on Armed Services will offer an amendment striking out section 633. If I were a member of that committee I would not like the Appropriations Committee to usurp 63 legislative functions that should come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services. I do hope the Committee on Armed Services is cognizant of that, and it is just as important to other legislative committees. If some other committee can go before that committee and be turned down, and then you can go to the Committee on Appropriations and have them put in some project or development, I do not know why we should want any legislative committees.

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

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

Mr. MASON. Do I correctly understand that the gentleman is suggesting we adopt the rule, which waives all points of order, and then center our attention on removing from the bill certain sections which are objectionable? Is that it?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is exactly right. I thank the gentleman. The only way you can do this is by offering amendments and voting down these things which the legislative committees have probably considered but which the Appropriations Committee feels they are better able and more intelligent to act upon in connection with these military questions than men like the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I disagree with the statement of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] relative to section 633 of the Department of Defense appropriation bill.

This matter was thoroughly thrashed out on this floor in the last session of the Congress. It concerned section 638 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act for 1956. It was the opinion of Congress then that this section should be kept in the bill. Again this year it is the opinion of the majority of the members of the Appropriations Committee and the Rules Committee that similar language in this year's defense bill be retained. In January of this year, a subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations held a hearing in respect to section 638 of the act of 1956. This hearing was occasioned by an announcement by the Department of Defense that it was to cease particular operations by the Department of Defense. I joined with many witnesses at that hearing in opposing the view of the Defense Department. At that time I emphasized the fact that I was concerned over the attitude of the Department of Defense in relation to work that had been done for a long period of time by agencies of the Department. I was concerned about the decision to cease operation of the ropewalk and chain forging that have been carried on at the Boston Navy Yard since 1801 and 1800. The skill, knowledge, and efficiency of the civilian employees in these operations have contributed much to the national defense. These employees have labored through the so-called period of rugged individualism and the heights of free-competitive enterprise. It is no answer to tell them now, after years of service, that their operations disrupt the competitive system. In my judgment, it is a ridiculous policy. It is one that can be carried and is being carried to excess. It gives concern to any area wherein any kind of Government work is being done.

This all-consuming desire to get the Government out of business is particularly injurious to my section. The Springfield Arsenal is in my district. It is operated by the Ordnance Corps and has been the center of research and development in the production of small arms over a long period of years. It is an efficient and well-run organization. I am concerned that if section 633 were removed from this year's defense appropriation bill, there might very well be an attempt to channel the production of small arms to private industry. I am unalterably opposed to this probability. Over the past years, there have been contracts for the production of the Garand rifle let to private industry. Experience has demonstrated that private industry does not do the job as well, as efficiently, nor as cheaply as the Springfield Arsenal has and is doing. I think it absolutely imperative that section 633 be retained. To me it is a penny-wise pound-foolish philosophy to take work away from Government installations, particularly work that has been done by Government installations over a long period of years, and direct that work to private enterprise. In the case of the Springfield Arsenal, we have a going concern, well equipped and well managed. It is a plant in being, and as such, it seems to me that it is entitled to all of the jobs it can handle in the small arms field. To channel work that it is now doing into private industry would make the plant an industrial wilderness. It would result in more layoffs of highly skilled and capable Government employees with long periods of faithful and efficient service. The interests of the Government could better be served if the Department of Defense would direct more work to plants like the Springfield Arsenal, rather than curtailing production. I sincerely trust that when the attempt comes to strike section 633 from this bill, it will be overwhelmingly defeated. I will vote against the attempt to strike this section from the bill.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may sit today and tomorrow while the House is in session during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit today and tomorrow while the House is in session during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. 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. 43]

Adair	Fascell	Morrison
Ashley	Gamble	Nelson
Bailey	Gordon	O'Hara, Minn.
Bentley	Harrison, Nebr.	Osmers
Blitch	Hayworth	Phillips
Boykin	Hoffman, Ill.	Polk
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman, Mich.	Powell
Byrd	Holifield	Radwan
Carlyle	Jackson	Sadlak
Chatham	James	Short
Cooley	Jenkins	Staggers
Crumpacker	Johnson, Calif.	Taylor
Dawson, Ill.	Kearns	Thompson, La.
Deane	Kelley, Pa.	Tollefson
Denton	King, Calif.	Velde
Dodd	Knutson	Watts
Donovan	Lane	Williams, N. Y.
Dorn, N. Y.	McDowell	Willis
Eberharter	Matthews	Wilson, Ind.
Fallon	Mollohan	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 366 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. MAHON. 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. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate run throughout the day, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

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. 10986, with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 40 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Appropriations which prepared this bill consists of 15 members. Of course, each year the bill is in a sense a continuation of the bill of the previous year. We began to work on this bill specifically on the 23d of January. We had a month of overall hearings, and then we broke into subpanels for the consideration of the details of the Army, Navy, and Air Force requirements. A great portion of our time has been taken in the consideration of major policy questions involving the defense and security of the United States.

Perhaps the most controversial matters which I shall discuss will involve the intercontinental ballistic missile and the B–52 intercontinental jet-bomber program.

Before I get into a discussion of any of the details of the pending measure I would like to make some overall observations.

We meet today for the consideration of the annual defense appropriation bill at a time when the military supremacy of the United States is being threatened by Soviet Russia. We have recognized for some time the great potential power of Soviet Russia, the existence of the Communist menace, the military threat; but not until recent months has our overall military supremacy been seriously challenged.

Of course, we have recognized that the Soviet Army was larger, vastly larger, than our own. But we have taken comfort, and with good cause, in the fact that we were away out front in the field of atomic and other nuclear weapons. And we have taken comfort in the fact that we did possess the only long-range bomber force in the world. Of course, we have relied upon the prowess of our Navy.

Today the Soviet Army has not receded. The Soviets have 400 submarines to challenge our Navy and our shipping. The Germans had only 58 at the beginning of World War II.

The Soviets are threatening us in the production of atomic and other nuclear weapons, and the Soviets are producing long-range, so-called intercontinental jet bombers at a faster rate than the United States of America.

Our position of military supremacy is in jeopardy and what we do within the next 2 to 5 years will determine whether or not we are to be definitely surpassed in overall military striking power by the U. S. S. R.

After all the heavy taxes we have borne and all the money we have spent on defense in recent years it must come as a bitter fact to the American people that our military supremacy is being challenged. We have talked, and rightly so, about our military might being a deterrent to war. We have said that we must get stronger and stronger in order to negotiate at the conference table from a position of strength. That has been one of our major premises. If we do not choose our course very carefully we are going to negotiate at the conference table from a position of relatively less strength and the Soviets are going to sit at the conference table and deal from a position of greater and greater strength. It is not pleasant or reassuring to talk of these possibilities. This is the first year I think that we have talked of them so frankly. But it is better to face up to the facts which are inherent in the present situation than to go along without realizing what the true situation is.

Our overseas bases have been valuable and they are valuable. But they are becoming more vulnerable from year to year both politically and militarily. As the long-range striking power of the Soviets develops, and it is developing, continental United States becomes more and more vulnerable. By reason of the growing development of long-range aircraft and nuclear weapons, the continental United States is more vulnerable to devastating attack today than ever before in our history. We are more vulnerable today than we were yesterday, and we will be more vulnerable tomorrow to devastating attack from the potential enemy than we are today. And I make that statement despite the fact that there have been notable improvements in our defense techniques. We are just living in a world of greater vulnerability to highly destructive attack.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Is it not true that every country in the world is more vulnerable to devastating attacks now because of modern weapons?

Mr. MAHON. That is the shocking truth that I am trying to point out, that the United States and every other country is much more vulnerable today to devastating and destructive attack than ever before in the history of the world. It is a fact that modern man must face up to.

A few years ago our Secretary of State, and I do not speak of him disparagingly, talked glibly about massive retaliation. Well, the Soviet Union is developing the same massive retaliation capability that we have. The bleak fact is that massive retaliation is rapidly becoming a two-way street. I regret to say it, but we may be threatened with massive retaliation in reverse. Secretary Quarles, the brilliant and able Secretary of the Air Force, refers to the period which we are entering as the period of "mutual deterrence."

Our people are abandoning the idea of overwhelming military superiority. They talk about a period of mutual deterrence. I quote from page 830 of the defense hearing, one of the pages in the 6,500 pages of hearings that are printed. I said to the Secretary:

> We are approaching a period of atomic plenty. What do you visualize will develop as this era of atomic plenty comes upon us?
>
> Secretary QUARLES. I believe it will mean that each side will possess an offensive capability that is so great and so devastating that neither side will have a knockout capability and, therefore, a situation in which neither side could profitably initiate a war of this kind. The point is that if either side did initiate it, before that side could knock out the other one, the other could do so much mortal damage to the aggressor that the aggressor would still come out of the war worse than he went into it, which means he would have no advantage in going to war. This has been frequently referred to as a position of mutual deterrence, and I believe we are moving into that kind of a situation.

I continue to quote:

> I must hasten to say that you only have mutual deterrence as long as both sides retain that kind of capability, and the only way we can retain that kind of capability is to be most determined and most progressive to keep our forces up to that requirement.

In the further testimony on that page he said it takes both a strong stomach and a big pocketbook to meet that requirement.

The problem is that so much of what troubles us is not something over which we have control. The growing industrial and military might of the Soviet Union is what troubles us.

We have several choices. We have got to more than match the Soviet Union to keep ahead; or we have got to reconcile ourselves to be on a military parity with the U. S. S. R. or we must allow ourselves to fall behind in military strength. Quantitatively—that is, from the standpoint of mere numbers—we have already been surpassed in several fields, and Chief of Staff of the Air Force, Gen. Nathan Twining, a man of a most composed and unexcitable disposition, says that the Soviets are closing the gap from the standpoint of quality, and that is what disturbs him.

I here quote for the RECORD a portion of his testimony on page 758 of the defense hearings:

> The questions, "Are we still ahead in airpower?" and "Are the Soviets overtaking us?" assume greater importance than ever before. * * * If we are speaking about numbers of aircraft in combat units, we are not ahead, and have not been ahead for years. * * * It is in quality that we have been able to stay ahead. However, the Soviets are now closing the quality gap. This concerns us much more than comparisons of numbers.

So many statements are made about the defense program from week to week and day to day that I think we come to the point where we are not very sensitive to the things that are said. But these quotes are the sober, reflected, printed, screened statements of people who ought to know what they are talking about.

We are on the threshold of a period of atomic plenty when each side will have enough nuclear weapons to destroy the other. Not only are we on the threshhold of atomic plenty, but we are on the threshhold of an age of ample capability to deliver such weapons on each other. The argument as to which side is stronger will be somewhat pointless when both sides have the full capability to destroy the other in a give and take contest. With the dramatic entry of the Soviet Union into the field of production of intercontinental jet bombers, we are not only on the threshhold of atomic plenty, but the period of ample capacity for delivery of such weapons from continent to continent is just about here.

I am not engaging in hysterics or in histrionics. I am just stating the facts. It is not wise to be hysterical or afraid, but it does become a Nation which has as much at stake as we have to be aware of the situation which confronts us.

It is hard to know what to do in the situation in which we find ourselves. I do not have the answers. If you will read the 6,500 pages of hearings in the 5 or 6 volumes on the pending bill, you will find them extremely interesting, but you will not find the answers to our dilemma.

In March the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff went down to Puerto Rico, where they could be quiet and where they could sit down and think and commune with each other as to the plight in which this Nation finds itself. But, they did not find the answers. They only made a few minor, unspectacular changes in our program. They did not stop the threat of increased vulnerability to the United States.

Please do not misunderstand me. The members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff are men of great and proven ability. Moreover, we have some topflight civilians in the Pentagon, and, of course, the President, the Commander in Chief, is a military man of great stature.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. I recall in committee last week the gentleman paid an extraordinary compliment to Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Quarles. He expressed the highest confidence in him and his administration. I wonder if the gentleman is going to say something about him today.

Mr. MAHON. I am glad to concur in this tribute. I have already referred to him as the brilliant and able Secretary of the Air Force. I mark my words when I say he is, in my judgment, one of the finest public servants in the Government today. There are also other exceptionally capable civilian and military men in the Pentagon today.

Mr. Chairman, the defense bill is no place for partisanship, and I do not want to become partisan, though I may trample somewhat on some toes. I realize that the Democrats now have and have had their shortcomings, but I have been disturbed that about the only answer that this administration has to our problems is just money and more money, more appropriations of money from the Congress.

The military situation, relatively speaking, is bad. What is the answer given? Money and more money this year than last, and more money next year than this year. Despite occasional claims to the contrary, we have not done too well in the field of international relations. What is the administration's answer? The answer is long-range foreign aid, money and more money for foreign aid.

One would think that after pouring out billions of dollars since World War II, by both the Democratic and Republican administrations, we would have found that money is not the whole answer. The people of our country who are bearing the tax burden must be asking each other if this Government is bankrupt of ideas, lacking in imagination and finesse, and unable to come up with any answer to any major question that does not consist of just money and more money. It is the finding of a better answer than that which should engage the finest brains in the administration, and I would say the Congress and the people generally.

It comes down to this, that presently there is no adequate answer to our military and international problems. We are told that we must be patient, and indeed we must be patient. We hope eventually to ride out the stormy seas in which we find ourselves, and approach a more stable and satisfactory relationship with the Soviet Union.

I have been standing in the well of this House year after year for a long time trying to hold out a ray of hope at the time we present the annual gigantic money bill, but I regret to say that this year it is the same old depressing story that we related last year and the year before and the year before that.

Indications are that we must continue the high rate of military spending; not only continue it, but perhaps raise it a bit from year to year, as recommended for next year by Secretary of Defense Wilson. We have lost some of our supremacy and a military stalemate seems to be more or less expected in high places. It is in the offing. There may be, as Secretary Quarles says, a period of "mutual deterrence." During this period of mutual deterrence there is room to hope that mutual understanding and confidence may be nurtured. There is hope that some sort of moderate disarmament program can be agreed upon.

It is true that the disarmament conference which had continued for many weeks broke up in failure in London last week, but this does not have the effect of closing the door on future negotiations. It is true that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the so-called NATO, which we sponsored, is not fulfilling our hopes, to put it mildly. Yet there is considerable evidence that the leaders in the Kremlin recognize, and we do, that a global war would bring about unbelievable destruction and little victory for anyone.

The President's open-sky policy is attractive and sound. The Soviets have not refused to sit at the conference table and discuss it and other ways and means of achieving peace. We do not know what is happening within Soviet Russia, but we know that the country is in a changing status and that new and different policies are being considered and undertaken. We do not trust the Soviets, and we have ample reason not to, but we cannot bring ourselves to the point—and the President has brought out this fact—of discarding any hope that in the future some sort of satisfactory arrangement may be made whereby the armament race can be abandoned and military spending tapered off to some considerable degree. Our patience has been worn threadbare, but I think we might just as well face up to the long-range implications of the situation.

Through our strength and determination world war III has thus far been averted. In a measure, we have been successful. It is not beyond the realm of possibility that we may continue to avert world war III and eventually achieve with other free nations a period of relative stability and peace, a period which we so devoutly seek.

INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE

Now, I would like to get away from these generalities, important as I consider them to be, and discuss some of the other features which are in the minds of Members of Congress and the people generally throughout the country. I first come to the intercontinental ballistic missiles program that has been so controversial in the forum and in the public press.

The status of the intercontinental ballistic missiles program is one of the most controversial issues in the military field.

The very great potential destructiveness of this weapon has distrubed our military planners, and it so disburbed the members of the Appropriations Committee that we spent hours and days exploring and probing to make sure that we gave every single dime and dollar and latitude to the Defense Department in pressing for the development of the intercontinental ballistic missile.

This missile has been referred to, and probably only to a slight degree inaccurately, as the ultimate weapon. My own personal opinion, for whatever it may be worth, and I do not think anybody knows for sure, is that there is a 50-50 chance that the Soviets may be able to fire the first intercontinental ballistic missile. We are seeking through a duplicating effort, Army, Navy, and Air Force—and the duplicating effort is for the purpose of exploiting every possibility—to develop both an effective intercontinental ballistic missile, and the intermediate range ballistic missile. It is true that the Air Force has the sole control of the so-called intercontinental ballistic missile, but the breakthroughs in one field are to some very considerable extent applicable to the other fields.

Perhaps it is not clear in some people's minds just what the difference is between the intercontinental ballistic missile and the guided missile which we have been developing and utilizing in training over a period of years. I am no scientist, but the general idea is this: The ordinary guided missile proceeds at the speed of a jet bomber or a supersonic speed, perhaps faster, and the guidance factors may be applied throughout the flight. There are many different types of guidance factors.

The intercontinental ballistic missile is designed to fly through space with an intercontinental range and at a speed of over 10,000 miles an hour. In other words, a 5,000-mile flight, 30 minutes. Guidance factors can be applied only during the first few moments of flight. This fantastic range and speed would make the missile most difficult of interception, terrifying to comprehend, and the fact that it can carry an H-bomb warhead makes it tremendously devastating. The truth is that while it is expected that within a few years both the United States and Russia will be able to fly a test model of the ICBM, it will in all probability be 5 years or more before the ICBM could be fully perfected and production could begin for the use of our forces in the event of an all-out war.

Speaking of missiles generally I think there is little likelihood but that the United States, in the development of a wide variety of so-called guided missiles, is decidedly out in front of any other power.

With respect to the ICBM, the situation, unfortunately, is different. The Soviets captured during the closing period of World War II a large number of German scientists whom they later exploited and are now exploiting. They likewise captured many of the German secrets having to do with the V–2 rocket, which in a sense, is the forerunner of the ICBM.

Another important fact is that immediately after World War II the Soviets began an intensive program for the development of the ICBM. This country did not. We are trying now to make up for lost time, and whether we will be able to do it remains to be seen. History will answer that question. It is true that we have made significant breakthroughs which make it clear that we can perfect the ICBM.

One of the major problems was and is the matter of the warhead reentering the atmosphere near the end of its flight and in the area of the target at such terrific rates of speed. Normally, the reentry of the warhead at such a terrific rate of speed would result in the burning up and destruction of the warhead. Our scientists now think they have developed techniques for solving this problem. Of course, in the development of the ICBM, it is necessary to perfect a power plant, a guidance system and a warhead. Our research and development people tell us that there are no present insurmountable barriers to the ultimate perfection of this so-called ultimate weapon. I can say to the House that there are no barriers and there is not a line of testimony in the hearings to indicate there is any lack of funds for the intercontinental ballistic missile program.

We have made great progress in the last 5 years toward developing a couple of intercontinental missiles which are not of the ballistic type, one sonic, the other supersonic. They are the Snark and the Navaho.

The missile field is increasing in importance. The pending bill before you contains $2.8 billion for the continuation of research and development and production in the missile field. The missile is occupying an increasingly important part in the field of offense and defense.

THE B–52 JET BOMBER

I think everyone is interested in the controversy over the B–52, the long-range intercontinental bomber. We are making 4 or 5 a month. The schedule is to proceed up to 20 per month, which is fairly slow. We have two sources for the manufacture of this intercontinental bomber, but they are both plants of Boeing. Boeing has backlog orders of more than $2 billion for the production of the B–52.

When the appropriation bill was before the Congress last year this item became a matter of controversy, and the Congress took the initiative in increasing available funds for the B–52. After the initiative had been taken by the Congress, the Pentagon officials, including the Secretary of Defense, came to the Capitol and supported congressional determination to expedite the production of B–52's. Now the B–52 has become a controversial item again this year. Again as a result of congressional pressure the administration has stepped up B–52 procurement. In a supplemental budget request received from the President last month we were requested to provide $248 million additional for the B–52 program. This has resulted because it must be admitted that the Soviet Union is at this time producing the long-range intercontinental jet bomber faster than we are producing them. It is a disturbing factor that they are producing the bomber. It is a more disturbing factor that they undoubtedly have the devastating nuclear weapons with which it might be equipped.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. Would it not be possible to speed this program up by giving contracts to large manufacturers other than Boeing? I understand that there are several plants in America that can make the B–52. Would it not be advisable to spread those contracts so as to take advantage of every facility that can make those huge bombers? We have one in Georgia that could readily make them, the Lockheed plant, at Marietta, Ga. It is the largest and best plant in the United States under one roof.

Mr. MAHON. I believe Lockheed is now being used. Is it not?

Mr. LANHAM. It is being used to make B–47's, and to modify them. Besides they are building C–130's, and are now beginning a huge atomic project looking to the making of an atomic engine for airplanes.

Mr. MAHON. Of course, we are going to phase out the B–47's. We have about all the B–47's, the medium jet bomber, that we require.

Will the gentleman let me proceed for a few moments, and I will comment directly on the question which the gentleman has raised.

It may be that amendments will be offered to increase the funds in the bill for the B–52. I shall not support such amendments. If we had 1,000 new B–52's tomorrow, we would not have the crews to maintain and man them and the airfields to operate them from. We can integrate a new weapon into our arsenal only as fast as we can provide the facilities and train the mechanics and crews necessary for its use.

The bald statement that the Soviet Union is producing long-range jet bombers faster than we are is, as President Eisenhower has said, not the whole picture. We have a large fleet of medium jet bombers, B–47's, and we are able to give them intercontinental range through aerial refueling tankers. In other words, we still outrank the Soviet Union in long-range bomber capabilities. Of course, our B–36's are becoming increasingly more vulnerable, and they can no longer be considered as first-line aircraft. They have served their purpose well.

In all frankness, I think we must all agree that we must hesitate to sit idly by and permit the Soviet Union to secure overwhelming superiority over us in the production of long-range heavy jet bombers, even though we do have greater long-range bombing strength by reason of refueling capabilities than the Soviets have.

In this bill we provide that the B–52 program will be expedited somewhat. About 10 days ago the Secretary announced that the Air Force is planning

to up the number of B–52's in each of its 11 strategic air command wings, from 30 to 45—that is a 50-percent increase—in the B–52 bomber program. Insofar as I know, the actual figure as to the whole program of B–52's has not been released to the public and I will not give it. But one can pretty easily figure out, if you had 45 in a wing and 11 wings, you would use a considerable number of them there. It is anticipated that next year we will continue with the B–52 program with additional appropriations.

The heavy-bomber program is shockingly expensive. When we couple funds previously appropriated with the funds provided in the bill before us for the B–52, and include research and development, we arrived at a cost of the B–52 program of $5,700,000,000. Still additional funds will be needed for this additional increase which has been decided upon very recently.

This all points up the fact, which I have already made clear, that the United States and Soviet Russia are becoming mutually more vulnerable in this highly explosive world.

Now as to the question raised by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM]. I doubt that an additional source for the B–52, the tooling of another plant, would have any serious effect upon the production of the B–52 in the next 12 months and very little effect in the next 18 months. But 2 or 3 years from now, of course, it would have a profound effect. But again, in 2 or 3 or 4 years from now we may be moving out of the production of the B–52 into the production of another type of bomber which is now on the drawing boards and which has not been finally firmed up.

The truth is I think the Boeing people by putting on additional pressure—they do work to some limited extent 3 shifts now on the B–52 bomber—but by putting on additional pressure, they could produce them faster. They have so said. But I am rather inclined to agree with the Department of Defense that perhaps the program that has now been fixed is the best program that we can have for the B–52 at this time. Of course, next year or perhaps later this year we will have to take another look at that situation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to my leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Many of us are concerned over the situation. I know that my friend from Texas is, and I appreciate the remarks that he has made. But I am sure that my friend from Texas does not think that any of us who fight for a strong national defense are fearmongers, are we?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman has used a word that I believe appeared in the morning papers. If Paul Revere had not gotten on his horse and told the people what was happening, we might not be a free nation today. We need people to speak out, to speak the truth, in calmness and in frankness. A certain degree of fear is required when you live in a dangerous world. But we do not need to be panicky, we do not need to be hysterical, we do not need to engage in showmanship or headline hunting. But there is a desperate need that the American people realize the full impact of the situation which confronts this free Nation. We have been preeminent in the military field before, but we are losing ground, relatively speaking, despite the billions we are spending.

I read in the paper the other day where a man went into his office building and stepped down an open elevator shaft. It is not so important to be fearful, but it is important to be aware of the dangers lest we fall down, shall I say, the elevator shaft.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman will yield further, I might say that the gentleman's statement addresses itself to every Member of the House without regard to party. It addresses itself to every American. I wish every American could hear the stirring statement, just made extemporaneously by our distinguished friend from Texas, Mr. MAHON. We have our right to differ, and it is a good thing to have a crosssection of American life expressing its opinion, not only out through the country, but in this body. We may disagree in whole or in part without impugning the motives of others. But I felt very much disturbed when I read this morning's paper which quoted the Secretary of Defense as saying, in response to a question: "You are talking about the fearmongers now." My mind goes back to the time before Pearl Harbor when some of us were fighting with our backs to the wall to get legislation for the defense of our country in case we were drawn into World War II, as we were later on.

That is not the kind of language—and I say it temperately, not with any emotion—that is not the kind of language that I would want to hear from a man in such a highly responsible position.

We ought to welcome the penetrating mind, we ought to welcome the mind of caution, we ought to welcome the mind that asks questions to find out things, no matter in what direction. That kind of person, that kind of Member, makes a great contribution, and his motives should not be impugned.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman points up the fact that the Secretary of Defense is on a very terrific spot. He has a terrific responsibility. He is chafing under criticism. He happens to be the Secretary of Defense as we go through this most difficult period when relatively we are losing some stature in the military field. It is too bad that the Secretary used the words. It is not the first time that the Secretary has been inept in the use of phrases.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. I always listen to our chairman with profit, but in reading the report I notice that it is indicated that several Members appeared before the committee indicating that additional funds could be used for research and development, and that the committee was somewhat disturbed in that it feels we are falling behind in scientific research as compared with the Soviets. I know that we could have more manpower, we could have more equipment, but certainly we must not fall behind in research and development.

Mr. MAHON. The bill has in it $1,647,000,000, I believe, for research and development. That is almost as much as was required for the development and production of the atom bomb during World War II. It is a very large sum, but modern warfare is becoming so highly technical that larger and larger sums are required.

After the Joint Chiefs of Staff went down to Puerto Rico the President sent us an additional request for research and development funds and we granted those funds to the Secretary of Defense to be released to any of the three services. He will have a special fund of $85 million, I believe, to be used in case there is some significant breakthrough. Secretary Quarles indicated in his testimony that it might be necessary early next year to come back for more money, but the Defense Department will have available to it during the rapidly approaching fiscal year beginning July 1 nearly $69 billion for expenditure for all purposes. We want to keep some control; we want to keep our finger on the expenditures as far as we properly can. We did not feel we could give the Defense Department a blank check.

I should like to make another very significant statement before yielding the floor, that including development of experimental models and testing and that sort of thing there is in this bill today for research and development, and I underline the development, $5,500,000,000, which is a considerable sum in any man's country and in any type of bill.

Mr. EVINS. It is stated in the committee report that it is felt that a bold new approach to this field should be undertaken. Evidently the committee is considerably alarmed about the subject itself.

Mr. MAHON. The committee is and the words in regard to a bold new approach are my own. The gentleman has put his finger on a very sensitive and important, if not the most sensitive, field in the entire defense picture.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. In connection with some of the research and development money, I could point out that in addition to the $85 million fund there is an additional $50 million authorization.

Mr. MAHON. I thank my colleague.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. It is stated that the level of appropriations in this field is substantially what it was in the past 2 years. Does that mean a shifting of these funds for scientific purposes and for research purposes since there is an apparently similar level?

Mr. MAHON. We provide billions of dollars for procurement. Actually, some of those procurement dollars are not used actually to procure B–52's that go on the

line, for example, or guided missiles for the use of troops in combat, but for experimental models of some kind which are used in testing and so forth. So there is a pretty wide latitude there. I think it is a pretty healthy thing because there is a greater opportunity to move rapidly toward a solution to certain problems. One of the things that is wrong and one of the reasons why we have a czar in the intercontinental ballistic missiles program is that people get tangled up in details and in meetings and conferences, and so on, and the program gets so hobbled that it does not proceed as it should. I think probably we have done as well as we could do in that field.

Mr. EVINS. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. First, I would like to express my sincere admiration for the work which the gentleman from Texas and the members of his subcommittee have done on this gigantic bill, which amounts to about $34 billion plus, I believe. I know that in handling a bill of that magnitude many months of hard work are involved. I was interested particularly in two things that the gentleman said. First, that in his opinion the condition of the world remains as it is as the result of the recognition by each side that the other side has tremendous power of attack. And also that there was a condition of increasing mutual vulnerability on each side. Now, in interpreting that language in layman's terms, would the gentleman say at this time in the history of the development and production of weapons that a decided advantage has accrued to the offense and a subsequent lessening of efficiency on the part of the defense?

Mr. MAHON. I think that our experts would agree to that. Certainly, I would agree that the gentleman is correct. We are pressing forward so rapidly in the development of new weapons of destruction that defense is not keeping up with offense. That is one of the reasons for the increasing vulnerability of the countries. For example, the intercontinental ballistic missiles flying through space up among the meteors at 10,000 miles an hour are not things that are subject to quick interception so that is our problem and certainly one of our serious problems.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The testimony before the Subcommittee on Government Operations, of which I am chairman, from men of the caliber of General Smith, of the Continental Air Defense Command, and Gen. Curtis LeMay, of the Strategic Air Command, has borne out the statement that the gentleman has just made and a subcommittee of which I am now chairman has been studying for several months the gap in our ring of total defense, which is receiving very little attention and even some ridicule from the people of the Nation. That is the field of civil defense with relation to these potential attacks by supersonic planes or city destroying weapons. I wonder if the gentleman feels that the field of civil defense is an important field which should concern not only the civilians of our Nation but also the military people of our Nation.

Mr. MAHON. I must confess, perhaps, that along with many Members of Congress in the beginning, a few years ago, with reference to the civil defense program there was an inclination to gloss it over and push it aside. But the more we think of it, I think the more we are compelled to realize that perhaps if this terrible catastrophe of world war III comes the nation that is best prepared in civil defense may eventually be the victor—if there is to be any victor. I think it is an important field but has been too long neglected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I consumed?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has consumed 50 minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say, if I may, that I have, of course, not discussed the details of the bill. I have not even mentioned the dollar figure as to the appropriations. I have not given the details as to the number of men in our Armed Forces, the number of ships and planes provided—in short, I have not given the details of the huge defense appropriation which we are now considering.

Nobody of course will read the 6,500 pages of hearings, but I will include in my remarks which will be printed tomorrow a digest of the most pertinent facts. Of course the committee report, which was prepared by our staff—and we have a wonderful staff—contains a wealth of interesting and detailed information. We are fortunate in having a highly trained, efficient, and trustworthy staff. Members of the staff who worked regularly on the pending bill are Corhal Orescan, Sam Crosby, Frank Sanders, Earl Silsby, and Ralph Preston.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I would like to commend the gentleman for his profound statement. It is indicative of a great deal of work and study.

Mr. MAHON. I am very much flattered.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. The gentleman from Texas remembers that when the military bill passed the House last year concern was expressed about contract by negotiations. It came out of the Committee on Armed Services. Is there anything in the hearings on this bill which indicated that the Department of Defense was giving more consideration to negotiation of contracts?

Mr. MAHON. I wish the staff would hand me the study which we had made on procurement practices in the Department of Defense. Here are the hearings which contain the study. We spent many, many days in that field. We developed a lot of testimony. We have stressed our continued interest in competitive bidding and the problem of not using negotiated bidding unless absolutely required. But perhaps 90 cents of each defense procurement dollar is spent on negotiated bids. That is one reason why we often complain that the taxpayer is not getting a dollar in value for a dollar spent. We shall continue to press for a solution of this problem.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. In the opinion of the gentleman is the Defense Department changing its attitude at all with reference to defense bidding? Do officials indicate they will continue this form of bidding?

Mr. MAHON. It is impossible to have competitive bidding for instance on a bomber of the B–52 type. It is impossible to have competitive bidding on an intercontinental ballistic missile or certain types of complicated electronics equipment. But our complaint is that this field should be narrowed and more progress should be made. If the gentleman will read the hearings, I think he will find that some progress is being made.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. I want to make it very clear that if you are looking for a fearmonger I am strictly a fearmonger. I am not as happy about this bill, I am not as happy about the report, I am not as happy about the defense situation as everybody else in the committee or the House today seems to be.

I want to make one point at this time, with the Chairman's permission, and I will take some time later, but just now I want to say that we had 6 or 8 weeks of hearings when we had the Secretaries and the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the stand before this committee. We asked them day after day, "Do you want any more money for B–52's?" They said, "Not a dime." "Are you doing everything you can?" "Yes."

"Then you do not want any more?" I even said, "Please take some more."

They said "No."

Then a distinguished Member from the other body from the great State of Georgia wrote a letter, before our hearings were terminated and before we marked up the bill, and the President and the Defense agency asked us for $500 million more in less than 6 weeks after the original statements were made.

Now, that is very disquieting to me.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his statement. I do not know how happy people are. I do not think they are too happy about the situation in which we find ourselves. I think it is a good sign that the President did send up the request for additional funds; and if we can be sure that additional funds are required I am perfectly willing to provide them, but I am not willing to get down on my knees and beg the Defense Department to spend money which the Defense Department will not spend and which it cannot possibly spend effectively. While on the one hand we must give every consideration for defense, yet on the other hand we must not approach a posture of fiscal irresponsibility. So it is a rather difficult road to follow.

I think the defense picture is going to continue to change and I predict that if the need arises the Defense Department will come to Congress for addi-

tional funds for some of the programs which do give promise at this time.

In conclusion I want to thank my friends for the generosity of their compliments, and I want to thank the Members for their patience in listening to these remarks. It is a joy and a great responsibility to work as the agent of the House through the years, as I have since 1940, on defense appropriations. Generally speaking, I think we are moving in the right direction in our defense program. Of course no approach to perfection is being made.

We spent days probing Defense Department officials, asking them: "Have you considered all the implications? Are we spending the money for the right things? Are we moving in the right direction? What about our over-all defense policy?"

There are many very significant and important facts contained in this volume entitled Department of Defense Appropriations, and I hope many of you will find the opportunity to read it. Many of the statements are worthy of our deepest thought and consideration.

I now insert, at this point, further information as to the details of the pending bill.

NEW FUNDS AVAILABLE

The new appropriations provided in this bill amount to $33,635,066,000. This is $512,784,000 less than the departmental request of $34,147,850,000. More than half of the committee reduction results from items budgeted for deposit to the United States Treasury as an offset to the use of foreign currencies under mutual defense agreements or occupied arrangements, leaving an actual net reduction made by the committee of approximately $236,000,000. This is a small reduction, indeed, in a $34 billion request, and the question may be asked, Why make any reduction in these military appropriation requests when there is so much concern for the military security of the nation? Regardless of that concern, however, the committee felt that it was at the same time mandatory to effect savings wherever possible, no matter how small. None of the reduction will affect the implementation of the military programs encompassed by the budget as amended, and presented to the committee.

There is another significant fact in regard to the funds in this bill. We are withdrawing and covering into the Treasury certain large sums heretofore appropriated to the Department of Defense. Putting it another way, rescissions of nearly $320 million of funds currently available are recommended.

AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS

These new appropriations will give the Department of Defense and the three Services approximately $69 billion in available appropriated funds for expenditure in fiscal year 1957 and subsequent years. This is more than the estimated entire expenditures of the Federal Government for fiscal year 1957. However, it is estimated that slightly less than half of the amount available to the Department of Defense for expenditure will be spent in fiscal year 1957. It is necessary to provide this margin of availability in excess of expenditures because so much of the military procurement requires several years between the time that orders are placed and the time that items are actually delivered and paid for. These funds cannot be expended except for the purposes appropriated. The funds are not withdrawn from the Treasury and they do not draw interest during the period they are available but are unexpended.

On the contractual or obligation side of the picture, we find that the Department of Defense and the three services will have available for carryover into fiscal year 1957, approximately $12 billion of funds that are unobligated on July 1, 1956. About one-fourth of this amount is represented by military assistance funds made available to the Department of Defense on a contingent basis. When this large carryover is added to the new appropriations provided in this bill, the Department and three Services will have available for obligation in fiscal year 1957 some $46 billion. It is estimated that approximately $37,500,000,000 will be obligated during the fiscal year. The amount left unobligated would be reserved to meet the following general requirements:

First. Contracts for shorter lead-time items, which should be let as late as possible to assure latest technological developments, while still keeping delivery in phase with longer lead-time items.

Second. Subsequent engineering changes which experience indicates are always necessary on most equipment after it has been placed in production.

Third. First destination transportation, the cost of which is an integral part of the cost of placing items in inventory.

Fourth. Spares for initial equipment, which are generally ordered after the initial equipment is ordered or delivered.

Fifth. Work after delivery, especially electronics and other equipment for ships.

In addition to the above requirements, the Army expects to have approximately $600 million of unobligated production and procurement funds. These result from the large appropriations made during the Korean war.

MILITARY AND CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

The appropriations in this bill and the military program which it supports provides for a formidable military force. At the end of fiscal year 1957, it is expected that there will be over 2,865,000 people serving in the three military services and the Marine Corps. In support of these forces, it is estimated that, as of the same date, civilian employment will be 1,168,000. Others following me will give more detail regarding the provisions for the respective services. However, I believe it appropriate that I should give you a brief summary of what is provided for each of the services, providing a little more detail for the overall requirements of the Department of Defense and the Department of the Air Force, for which I personally assume a more direct responsibility.

For the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the bill provides $14,950,000, which is $1,483,500 more than appropriated for fiscal year 1956. The committee is proposing that the requested amounts be approved. The increase is caused primarily by the civilian pay increases authorized by Public Law 94, 84th Congress, and an expansion in the program for scientific evaluation of weapons and weapons systems.

For the so-called interservice activities, the bill provides for appropriations totaling $643,875,000. The committee reduced the budget request by $13,500,000. The interservice activities provide for claims, contingencies, emergency fund, retired pay, and the Court of Military Appeals. Reductions in the requests for claims, retired pay, and contingencies, are based primarily on the current estimates for fiscal year 1956. The requested reappropriation of $100 million for serve tools and facilities was denied. This is not reflected as a committee reduction, since the request was for the reappropriation of previously appropriated funds. However, the effect is the same, because that amount will revert to the Treasury.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

For the Department of the Army the committee has recommended appropriations totaling $7,497,582,000 which will provide for 19 divisions, antiaircraft battalions and other combat support units. The end military strength on June 30, 1957, will be 1,045,300. This includes the increased requirements in support of the Reserve Forces Act and the Distant Early Warning Line. The amounts recommended for the Army Reserve have been tailored to more clearly reflect the estimated strengths under the Reserve Forces Act based on experience to date. A rescission of $110,000,000 has also been recommended from excess funds generated in the industrial fund operations.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The bill contains $9,999,534,000 for the Department of the Navy in new appropriations, and on the other side of the ledger rescissions of $159,800,000 from stock and industrial funds.

The funds made available for the Navy contemplate the operation of an active fleet with an end strength of 1,005 ships, increasing from a beginning fiscal year strength of 985. The program includes the construction of 23 new ships and 4,629 tons of landing craft. The bill also provides for conversion of 23 ships to aid in modernizing the fleet.

In fiscal year 1957, the Navy will utilize approximately 12,600 active aircraft. The bill provides for the procurement of 1,468 new aircraft, which, when coupled with prior procurement, will provide 2,000 aircraft deliveries per year to calendar year 1958 .

The bill provides for end fiscal year strength of 672,000 officers and enlisted personnel for the Navy, and 205,735 for the Marine Corps. These show increases of 16,600 and 4,735 respectively from estimated strengths at the end of fiscal year 1956.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

The bill includes $15,479,125,000 for the Department of the Air Force. This is $187,375,000 less than the amount requested for appropriations and $739,361,830 more than was appropriated for

the current fiscal year. The budget request and the amounts provided for the Air Force anticipate continuing expansion toward the goal of 137 wings by June 30, 1957. Not all of those wings, however, will be equipped and operational as of that date, but they will be organized and in the process of building and equipping what can be termed a fighting or operational unit.

For the procurement of aircraft and guided missiles, the bill provides an appropriation of $6,048,500,000. In addition, over $1,500,000,000 of prior year's appropriations have been applied to the fiscal year 1957 estimated program requirements. These funds are expected to procure 1,927 aircraft, such as the B–52 heavy bomber, the F–101 fighter interceptor, and the F–104 day fighter. The funds will provide for nearly a 60 percent increase in procurement and development of guided missiles.

For procurement other than aircraft, the bill provides $1,100,000,000 for such things as ammunition, vehicles, communications and electronics equipment, ground handling equipment, training equipment, and other similar procurement necessary for the Air Force. The appropriation in the bill provides $750 million more than was appropriated for the current fiscal year. This increase results primarily from the fact that a large part of the fiscal year 1956 requirements were financed from funds available from unused balances of prior year's appropriations, and a realinement between activities and items financed under the various Air Force appropriations which has resulted in placing a substantial amount of new procurement under this appropriation for the first time this year.

For research and development, the bill provides $610 million. This may not be enough to adequately carry out all of the programs contemplated under this appropriation. However, no firm estimates of additional requirements could be supplied. The committee has told the Department that should breakthroughs occur in any important weapons development areas, that available funds and facilities are to be used as rapidly as required, and that supplemental appropriations will be provided.

For the operation and maintenance of aircraft, equipment, and the physical plant of the Air Force, the bill provides an appropriation of $3,684,185,000. This is $101,815,000 less than the amount requested, and $86,688,000 more than the appropriation for fiscal year 1956. However, because of shifts between appropriations, the increase provided for these purposes for fiscal year 1957 amounts to $506,818,000 more than the amount available for the current fiscal year. This is an increase of 16 percent, and should be sufficient for the planned program activities of the Air Force. For example:

Military personnel is expected to increase 2.2 percent from 1956 to 1957.

Basic military training and technical training of these personnel will remain at about the same level for the 2 years. However, pilot production will decrease about 4.5 percent.

Civilian employment is expected to decrease by 600 man-years, or 0.2 percent.

The numbers of activated wings will increase from 131 at the end of 1956 to 137 at the end of 1957, or 4.6 percent.

The active aircraft inventory supported by these funds will be approximately 23,000, including those assigned to Reserve forces and will show an increase from the 1956 inventory of only about 1 percent.

Flying hours or the hours that aircraft will be in the air, counting each aircraft flying for 1 hour as a flying hour, will increase about 7 percent over fiscal year 1956, after allowing for a small decrease in the flying hour program for transport-type activities, as proposed by the committee reduction in this appropriation.

The major installations supported from these funds will increase from 309 in 1956 to 325 in 1957, or 4.5 percent.

Now, these percentage increases are not in any sense directly related to the proportionate increase in fund requirement for this appropriation. However, they are somewhat indicative of what the fund increase should be, and certainly the increase of 16 percent provided by the committee should be adequate to take care of all reasonable requirements. The flying hour program is of course the most significant factor affecting costs under this appropriation, and the fact that a larger percentage of these flying hours are being performed in jet aircraft which are much more expensive to operate accounts for a substantial percentage of the increased fund requirements.

For pay and allowances and other items directly related to military personnel, the committee is recommending an appropriation of $3,718,440,000, which is $8,560,000 less than the amount requested, and $37,790,000 more than was appropriated for fiscal year 1956. This will provide for an end year strength of 936,000 and an average military strength for the year of 920,800. The committee reduction applies primarily to the movements of individuals and household effects in connection with permanent changes in station. For Reserve personnel, the bill provides $59,300,000, or $15,737,000 more than was appropriated for the current fiscal year. This substantial increase provides for stepped-up efforts in the Reserve program, which are expected to increase the numbers participating in the Reserve program by more than 28,000.

For the Air National Guard, the bill provides an appropriation of $258,700,000, or $66,509,000 more than was appropriated for fiscal year 1956. This increase of nearly 35 percent will permit a further expansion and modernization of the Air National Guard. During fiscal year 1957, the Guard will be more nearly equipped with jet fighter aircraft, such as the F–84, F–89, and F–94 series.

Again this year, the committee is rescinding surplus working capital in the Air Force stock fund in the amount of $50 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has consumed 56 minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this bill is, of course, the largest and most far-reaching appropriation bill that comes before the Congress. It carries appropriations aggregating $33.6 billions or over 50 percent of the entire Federal requirements for fiscal 1957.

Your committee brings its recommendations to you after 3 months of intensive work dealing with all aspects of the matter, both those that have been recently in the public eye and all possible other aspects.

The committee's labors, as has been pointed out, are reflected in 7 volumes of hearings, aggregating about 6,400 pages, and are summarized in a committee report of some 71 pages.

I think, Mr. Chairman, it is highly significant, considering the scope and the magnitude of this bill, that there is so little difference of opinion either between the members of the committee handling the bill or between the committee and the several armed services. I attribute this to the fact that this military budget in my opinion has been far better prepared and far better supported before the committee than any military budget I can recall in many years.

I want to express by appreciation to the members of the subcommittee, particularly to the chairman who has just spoken, and to the members of the Navy panel on which I served, as well as to our extremely able executive secretary and clerical staff of five members, whose assistance has been invaluable.

IMPORTANCE OF MILITARY POWER

Mr. Chairman, the military power of America and of our allies has compelled the Communist government of Russia to abandon for the time being the tactics of military aggression and to concentrate upon tactics in the field of the cold war in terms of economic and political penetration.

Under present world conditions that military power must be maintained. Lack of essential military power could have disastrous consequences.

Military power carries with it the best possible assurance that no one will be foolhardy enough to attack us—the best possible assurance of a peaceful world.

Under the leadership of our President and Commander in Chief, with his vast and successful military experience, we have been and are building tremendous offensive and tremendous defensive military power.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, is evidence of that fact.

Enacted into law it will give us the most powerful military organization ever maintained by this Nation in time of peace.

ANALYSIS OF MILITARY POWER PROVIDED

Let us analyze, briefly, the military power provided for under this bill.

Our Regular Armed Forces overall will increase from 2,814,074, the original June 30, 1956, estimate, to 2,865,558, as of June 30, 1957. That is an increase of about 50,000 and gives us a total just

about double the pre-Korean figure of 1,460,000.

Our National Guard and Reserve forces in drill pay status will increase from 967,419 to 1,099,784, an increase reflected in each of the 3 services aggregating about 130,000.

In addition, of course, there are some 4 million people in civilian life of military age, about half of whom have had military experience in Korea.

If we break down the overall increase, we find that the Army goes from 1,034,500, the original June 30, 1956, estimate, to 1,045,300, or an increase of about 11,000. The Navy, including midshipmen, aviation cadets, and officer candidates, goes from 662,714 to 678,223, an increase of about 15,500. The Marine Corps goes from 201,000 to 205,735, an increase of 4,375. The Air Force goes from 916,000 to 936,500, an increase of 20,500.

This gives a total increase of about 50,000.

On top of this, Mr. Chairman, there is a ceiling authorized in this bill, which makes possible a further increase of about 50,000, 10,000 or thereabouts in the Army and 40,000 or thereabouts in the Air Force.

It should also be noted that the operating ratio of our Armed Forces as a whole has increased since June 30, 1953, from 57 percent to 65 percent and that the reenlistment rate over all has increased from 23.7 percent to 43.3 percent in 3 years. The testimony of General Taylor indicates that the increases in these 2 fields are equivalent to an increase of 30,000 trained soldiers insofar as the Army is concerned.

AIRPOWER

What about our military planes and their power?

Well, the Air Force is going to 137 wings at the end of fiscal 1957, which compares with 127 as of today, with 98 on the day 3 years ago when Secretary Wilson took over, and with 48 as of just prior to Korea.

Modernization of planes, both in the Air Force and the Navy, is proceeding rapidly, the Navy expecting to reach a modernized percentage of 85 percent during fiscal 1957, the maximum that it hopes to attain at any time.

If we add the planes in the active inventory of the Air Force, including the National Guard and Reserves, numbering 25,342 to those in the active inventory of the Navy and the Marine Corps, numbering 12,570, we reach an overall total as of June 30, 1957, of 37,912 planes, not including the 4,000 or 5,000 planes in the Army. The operational figure is somewhat less, but it is far in excess of any overall figure that has ever been presented to the committee as representing the number of planes available to the Communist Government of Russia.

Secretary Wilson, in appearing before the Senate Committee on Appropriations yesterday, stressed the airpower of this country from an overall standpoint: power represented in our B–52's, in our B–36's, in our B–47's, and other military planes, in our overseas bases, in our refueling capacity, in our 15 Navy carriers and in other fields.

It is the overall picture, which counts.

SEAPOWER

What about the power and the number of our ships? Well, our active fleet is to increase from 984 to 1,005 vessels as compared with about 646 prior to Korea. Warships within the total are to increase from 407 to 411.

In addition, there were on hand as of December 31 last some 1,769 ships in the so-called reserve fleet.

The new construction program, calling for $1.415 billion, contemplates 23 new ships, 23 conversions, some 5,000 tons of landing craft, and advance procurement for a nuclear-powered carrier in fiscal 1958.

Emphasis is placed on the transition from a conventional fleet to a nuclear-powered fleet.

There is no question whatsoever that America has and will have the most powerful Navy in the world.

OTHER ELEMENTS OF POWER

If we turn to the field of weapons, I can only say that the evidence indicates, whether it be in respect to ballistic missiles, guided missiles, or other types of weapon, that progress is being made as rapidly as possible in the direction of providing and equipping our forces with the newest possible equipment.

The record also indicates that the firepower of a single division today is something like 85 percent in excess of the firepower of a division in World War II; that a single plane today has a firepower over 20,000 times the firepower of a single plane in World War II; for that matter, that a single plane today is capable of doing as much damage as all the damage done by bombing in Europe during World War II.

If we turn to continental defense we find that this is also increasing in power and in effectiveness. It is progressing on schedule and as fast as scientific developments permit.

Finally if we look at research and development, which has already been referred to, we find direct appropriations for fiscal 1957 of $1,647,000,000, $227 million more than provided in fiscal 1956 and $342 million more than provided in fiscal 1955.

We find in addition a probable carryover of some $76 million and testimony to the effect that in the Department of Defense as a whole there will be available over $5,500,000,000 for research and development and supporting activities. Other funds are, of course, available to other agencies.

The testimony of Secretary Wilson, the testimony of Admiral Radford, the testimony of Assistant Secretary Furnas, the testimony of Secretary Quarles, is all to the effect that the amount to be made available for research and development is adequate to meet all foreseeable needs in fiscal 1957.

These are some of the highlights of the military power contemplated by this bill, Mr. Chairman.

FORCE GOALS

The force goals recommended, I repeat, will give us the most powerful military forces ever maintained by this Nation when not engaged in a shooting war.

The force goals recommended are designed to provide military power capable of dealing with the initial phases of any war, global or otherwise; military power affording an ample base for rapid expansion if and when necessary; military power which can play its part in a balanced, powerful allied force representing the free world; military power which we can afford to carry over the years for the long pull, without undermining our economic strength.

Mr. Chairman, headlines are easy for those who criticize this or that aspect of our defense program, whether the author is or is not in touch with the details of the overall program. Criticism should, of course, be welcomed, provided it is informed and constructive. But headlines dealing with future policy in respect to some special element of the national defense picture are incidental to action on the program as a whole which the Congress is called upon to take here and now.

The force goals to be implemented by this bill are the force goals recommended after long consideration by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, by our civilian Secretaries, by the National Security Council and by the President of the United States.

They are recommended as adequate to meet all foreseeable needs in fiscal 1957.

Whatever the requirements may prove to be in fiscal 1958, fiscal 1959, or subsequently, these are their recommendations now.

Should any unforeseen emergency arise, they can of course come back immediately to the Congress.

Should the President deem it necessary in the interest of national defense, he can under section 613 of this bill waive the provisions of the Anti-Deficiency Act and spend available funds as rapidly as necessary.

Your committee after 3 months of careful consideration strongly recommends approval of the force goals to be implemented by this bill.

DOLLARS AND CENTS

To provide this military power, Mr. Chairman, your committee recommends appropriations aggregating $33,635,000,000, a figure which compares with appropriations for the current fiscal year of $31,853,000,000 and for the previous fiscal year of $28,700,000,000.

Added to the unexpended carryover, this will make available for expenditure in fiscal 1957, the sum of $68.9 billions as compared with $72.085 billions in the current fiscal year and $79.3 billions in the previous fiscal year.

The actual expenditure contemplated in fiscal 1957 is $33.9 billions comparing with $33.1 billions in the current fiscal year and $33.9 millions in the previous fiscal year.

If we look at unexpended balances, and unobligated balances, Mr. Chairman, we find, on a comparable basis, an estimated unexpended balance as of June 30, 1957, amounting to $35.7 billions, comparing with $36.4 billions as of

June 30, 1956, and $42.6 billions as of June 30, 1955; and an estimated unobligated balance as of June 30, 1957, of $9.3 billions, comparing with $10 billions as of June 30, 1956, and $16.9 billions as of June 30, 1955.

COMMITTEE ACTION

The action taken by your committee amounts to substantial approval of the funds requested, something that has not happened for many years. I repeat that in my opinion, this is largely the result of the fact that the military budget has been far better prepared and far better supported than for many years.

The cuts recommended aggregate $512,784,000. In addition rescissions are recommended in the amount of $319,800,000, giving a total for both of $832,584,000.

It should be noted, however, that of the cuts made, $276,319,000 is made on the assumption that foreign currencies will be made available in fiscal 1957 as heretofore. The balance of the cuts—$236,465,000 amounts to something like seven-tenths of 1 percent of the overall request.

It is clear that none of the recommended reductions will affect the full implementation of the military programs presented to your committee.

ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY

We all appreciate, Mr. Chairman, I am sure, the tremendous difficulties confronting Secretary Wilson and his assistants 3 years ago in attempting to put the organization of the armed services, which had been flung into every corner of the world, on a business-like basis. It was an enormous task. There is still much to be done but very great progress has been realized.

Last year, in speaking on this bill, I referred to some of the major steps taken in this direction:

I mentioned those taken during the first year of Secretary Wilson's administration under 10 major headings.

I mentioned those taken in the second year of his administration under seven major headings.

To reflect the further progress made during the third year of his administration, I include at this point in the RECORD under leave to extend my remarks, pages 170–174 of this year's hearings on the Department of Defense, and I call attention to pages 175–221 of the same hearings for further details:

STEPS TAKEN BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DURING CALENDAR YEAR 1955 TO ELIMINATE WASTE AND ACHIEVE GREATER ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY

The intensified drive to raise the level of economy and efficiency in the Defense Department, inaugurated in 1953, was continued with undiminished vigor during 1955. Notwithstanding the major improvements achieved in 1953 and 1954, noteworthy progress in this area continued to be made in 1955.

The attainment of a high level of economy and efficiency in Defense Department operations is not a onetime effort. There is always room for further improvement. New methods, techniques, and equipment are constantly being devised in private industry as well as in the Government, and management at all levels in the Military Establishment must be properly motivated to seek them out and apply them wherever appropriate.

Furthermore, the functions, activities, and personnel of the Department are always undergoing some change and new areas of waste and inefficiency inevitably crop up. These must be promptly identified and corrected as soon as they occur. This, too, is a continuing responsibility of management throughout the Defense Establishment.

Major changes in the organization of the Defense Department are now behind us but some additional organizational refinements were effected in 1955. At the Department of Defense level, the Office of the Assistant Secretary for International Security Affairs was reorganized along geographic lines similar to that of the State Department. This will not only provide the Defense Department with a more effective mechanism for the integration and coordination of the various programs pertaining to particular countries or regions, but will also facilitate coordination and liaison with the State Department with respect to military-political matters.

In the Department of the Army the traditional general staff was abolished and the military staff reorganized along lines roughly parallel to the civilian secretariat. Under the Chief of Staff of the Army there are now a Comptroller of the Army, a Chief of Research and Development, and Deputy Chiefs of Staff for Logistics, Personnel, and Military Operations, respectively. Organizational refinements of lesser importance were also effected in the other two military departments in 1955.

Continued progress was made during the year in improving the utilization of Defense Department manpower resources. Military personnel were reduced by almost 300,000, even though overall military strength, as measured in terms of major forces, actually increased during the year. The number of "noneffectives" on the military payroll—trainees, transients, patients in hospitals, and prisoners—were reduced by a total of 54,000. Civilian personnel, both in the United States and abroad, were substituted for military personnel wherever possible in support areas thereby making more men available for the operating forces. Overlapping functions and activities were further reduced through consolidation, cross-servicing, etc. For example, the Army was charged with the responsibility for providing military construction support for the Air Force overseas. This permitted the elimination of the so-called SCARWAF (Army construction troops serving overseas with the Air Force) and the saving of 16,500 military personnel spaces. Functional manpower studies and surveys designed to eliminate nonessential jobs were conducted in all three military departments with good results.

Notwithstanding the substitution of civilians for military personnel, the total number of civilian employees, including both direct hire and contract hire overseas, was reduced by about 50,000. The reduction in the Army and Navy Departments combined totaled 76,000, but the Air Force, which continued its buildup during the year, increased its civilian employment by 26,000 as compared with a decrease of about 10,000 in military personnel.

Although considerable emphasis was placed on reducing quantitative manpower requirements, even greater emphasis was placed on improving the quality of military personnel to meet the demands of rapidly changing technology and increasingly complex weapons required in modern warfare. Quotas for the intake of manpower in various mental groups were revised to reduce proportion of personnel enlisted in the lowest mental group IV who had created serious problems of personnel utilization. A reduction of group IV quotas from 27 percent to 18 percent enabled the services to recruit personnel more suitable for training in technical skills and advancement to supervisory and leadership positions. Due largely to the new military personnel legislation enacted by the Congress and intensified reenlistment efforts on the part of the services, the Armed Forces were able to retain many experienced personnel who otherwise would have left the service for civilian life. The reenlistment rate, which had dropped to 18.8 percent during the first 6 months of 1954, has increased steadily in recent months, reaching a level of about 30 percent during the first 6 months of 1955. This has substantially reduced personnel turnover, thereby permitting a further reduction in the number of personnel assigned to the training function and in the number of personnel in training status.

Action was also taken during the year to reduce the movement of military personnel, thereby reducing both the cost and time lost in travel. Specific steps include:

1. Directions to the military departments to review their educational and training requirements, reduce the rotation rate, and assure that trained personnel are being used to the greatest extent in their specialty.
2. The issuance of regulations, under the dislocation allowance provisions of the Career Incentive Act, prohibiting more than one permanent change of station during any 1 fiscal year.
3. Lengthening some foreign service tours.
4. Filling vacancies within same geographical areas so as to avoid long distance moves.
5. Encouraging the extensions and renewals of foreign service tours.
6. Improving reassignment procedures to eliminate intermediate moves between schools and overseas assignments.
7. Arranging for sea and shore moves and moves between types of ships to be made in the same port areas.
8. Increasing the number of stabilized duty assignments requiring continuity or special training and experience.

Additional progress was made in 1955 in improving supply management in the Defense Department. The Federal cataloging program, an essential step in improving supply management Defense Departmentwide, is proceeding on schedule. By the end of 1955, 2,200,000 items, approximately 76 percent of the estimated total stocked by the Defense Department, had been identified. Complete identification of all items in the supply system is expected by September 1956. Progress on the cataloging program has facilitated further progress on the defense standardization program. During 1955, approximately 123,500 items were eliminated from the supply system through standardization, thereby reducing warehousing and distribution costs. Through better merchandising methods the Department was able to realize a 3 percent greater return on the sales of surplus property than in 1954. At the same time, increased safeguards were established to assure that excess property disposed of is truly excess to the needs of all elements of the Department of Defense.

A regular review of materiel requirement, stock positions, and defense readiness of the military departments has been established to better coordinate the supply activities of the three military departments. This systematic review has served to facilitate the use of stocks excess to one department by another department. To further reduce duplication of effort in the supply area, the first single manager assignment was made in November 1955, under which the Department of the Army was given sole responsibility for all wholesale supply functions relating to food, for all of the military services. This single manager concept will be extended to the petroleum, medical-dental, clothing-textile, and photographic equipment areas in 1956. In this respect, it has been pointed out that the potentialities of single service assignment and subsequent cross-servicing in the supply man-

agement area of common use items will become a reality upon completion of the conversion portion of the Federal cataloging program. It is now apparent that single service assignment cannot be truly effective without the common language of the Federal cataloging program.

The Department of Defense in 1954 embarked on a program for the establishment of uniform standards and criteria for new construction, designed to insure proper quality of construction at most favorable cost. This program was further expanded in 1955. Uniform standards and criteria were issued for permanent types of administrative facilities, messing facilities for enlisted personnel, maintenance facilities, general warehouses, etc. Studies were made of airfields and airfield facilities, National Guard armories, Army Reserve training centers, etc. Preparation of the annual construction program and budget was speeded up and the fiscal year 1957 military public-works program was completed and forwarded to the Bureau of the Budget on the earliest date in recent years.

The first integrated program for the management of real property maintenance was issued in 1955. This program adapts proven military and business principles and practices and provides guidance for their uniform application at all levels of the Department. It covers standards, financial management, training, inspection, estimating, scheduling, work techniques, and cost control. By year end some Defense Department installations were achieving up to 30 percent more effective use of real property maintenance funds.

The intensive review of Defense Department real property holdings, begun in 1954, was continued in 1955. The total cost of leased space for military activities in continental United States was reduced by approximately $3 million. An additional number of industrial plants were sold or leased to private industry.

In order to accomplish optimum use of existing health and medical facilities and services, the military departments were directed to reduce, consolidate, or eliminate facilities in specific areas where another facility is available and can economically and efficiently provide the necessary support. For example, the hospital at Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Tex., has been reduced to a dispensary and all hospitalization and outpatient care for dependents of Air Force personnel in the area is being furnished by the Beaumont Army Hospital in El Paso, Tex. Plans were also made to accomplish this same type of joint utilization in the Tacoma, Wash., area. This is another example where unification is continuing to result in savings to the Government.

In the area of financial management, further significant progress was made during 1955. The Army has extended financial inventory accounting to bulk stocks at depots worldwide, excepting those in Okinawa and Korea, which will be converted during the first half of 1956. In addition, financial inventory accounting was extended to another 16 major installations in the United States, bringing the total to 48 as at the end of calendar year 1955.

The Air Force has brought under financial inventory accounting all of its depot and base stocks throughout the world. Procedures were developed for accounting control of all Air Force property in the possession of contractors and it is planned to put them into effect by July 1, 1956. The Navy has had financial inventory accounting since 1908, and in 1955 efforts were aimed primarily at further refinements.

Completion of this program will provide the military departments with the type of financial information required for effective management of the supply system, with specific application in facilitating reduction of supply inventories.

Financial management in the Department of Defense also has been made more effective by increasing the scope of stock funding in each of the military departments. These funds currently cover inventories of over $8.2 billion and their coverage is still being the management and control of stock of common-use-type items, make possible better distribution of supplies and equipment with a minimum inventory. By creating a buyer-seller relationship between the stock fund and the consumer, cost consciousness is encouraged at all levels.

During 1955, the Army brought the remaining inventories of consumable type items in continental United States depots into the stock fund as well as inventories of major overseas commands and selected continental United States posts, camps, and stations. Army emphasis, in the future, will be on extending coverage geographically.

The Navy, at the end of 1954, had covered in its stock fund most of its inventories of common-type consumable items. During 1955, the stock fund was extended to the printing of publications and forms. Additionally, studies have been undertaken with the view to bringing additional classes of technical items under stock funding, particularly ships, electronics, and submarine parts.

In the Air Force, during 1955, commissary inventories and also most of the common-use, standard-stock items of a consumable nature, in continental United States depots, were brought under stock-fund operations. The Air Force plans to further extend stock-fund coverage to both additional classes of items and geographical areas.

Evidence of the effectiveness of the stock-fund operations is that during the last 3 fiscal years alone, $2.5 billion have been returned to the Treasury from stock funds as inventories have been reduced through use of the stock-fund mechanism to achieve better inventory management. It is expected that inventory reductions will make available an additional $785 million by the end of fiscal year 1957 and this amount has been recommended in the proposed fiscal year 1957 budget to reduce new obligational authority which would otherwise be required.

Industrial funds are also being used to serve the same kind of businesslike purpose in commercial and industrial-type installations, and continued progress was made in extending this concept during 1955. This type of financing, by providing a complete financial picture of the operation, makes it easier for the responsible officials in the military departments to evaluate the performance of these activities. It provides local management with an up-to-date statement of costs thus highlighting areas in need of improvement. The buyer-seller relationship between an activity and its military purchasers or customers is encouraged and this, in turn, develops an attitude of cost consciousness throughout an activity.

The Army industrial fund has now been established at 18 activities and its extension to other activities such as equipment rebuild facilities, proving grounds, transportation terminals, has been programed. The Navy brought 4 additional activities under industrial fund financing, bringing the total number of Navy activities under the industrial fund to 40, excluding printing plant branches. All the major naval shipyards are now under industrial fund financing. The Navy plans to effect complete coverage of its installations of an industrial nature, and of prime importance is the present program to bring major air stations having overhaul facilities under this type of financing.

The Air Force placed 8 printing plants and 50 laundries and dry-cleaning plants under industrial fund operation during 1955. The Air Force expects to apply industrial funding to the transport operations of the Military Air Transport Service, as was specifically recommended by the Congress in connection with the fiscal year 1955 appropriation act. Also, it is planning to extend application to installations conducting major overhaul and maintenance of aircraft and components.

The above constitute only a few of the highlights of our efforts to eliminate waste, achieve greater economy, and improve efficiency in the management of the Defense Establishment. A more detailed account of the accomplishments may be found in the statements prepared by the military departments.

Reference has been made, Mr. Chairman, to the recent report by your committee investigators with reference to procurement policies and practices in the Department of Defense.

That report has been accepted by the Defense Department as helpful to the economy and efficiency which we all seek.

It covers a period running well back into the previous administration.

It states categorically that "no attempt is made to elaborate on the accomplishments of the three military services in their procurement methods and techniques" and also that "such progress has been substantial during the past 3 years."

In this connection, I include at this point in the RECORD, under leave to extend my remarks, pages 181–187 of this year's hearings on the Office of the Secretary of Defense, interservice activities and language changes, containing material prepared by the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Supply and Logistics:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (SUPPLY AND LOGISTICS)—IMPORTANT PROGRAMS TO IMPROVE EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY

INTRODUCTION

This responds to Congressman WIGGLESWORTH'S request for a summary of the steps which have been taken to date by the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the military departments during Secretary Wilson's tenure serving to improve procurement methods and techniques. (Reference: p. 186, transcript of hearings before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations, Department of Defense Appropriations for fiscal year 1957, Procurement Policies and Practices of the Department of Defense.)

PROCUREMENT METHODS AND TECHNIQUE

Since early 1953, considerable progress has been made toward increasing the improving management leadership of the procurement process. Concentrated attention has been given to the systemization of procurement regulations at all echelons. Continuing effects have been made to include all procurement regulatory material in the Armed Services Procurement Regulations. Specific regulations of major interest included the return to virtual peacetime methods of purchasing in accordance with the Armed Services Procurement Act. Progress was made in the streamlining of termination procedures. Major revisions were made in patent policies, coordinated procurement, interdepartmental procurement, and regulations concerning the inspection and acceptance of material. The attainment of uniformity was a prime objective, resulting in the publication of many uniform contract clauses and Department of Defense wide forms for various facets of the procurement process. In particular the simplification of small purchases procedures, which affect almost 95 percent of all procurement actions resulted in considerable savings in administrative expenses. An accelerated

program of compliance and effectiveness field surveys was initiated and continued throughout the period.

Another requirement program to which considerable emphasis has been given is the development of effective arrangements for the procurement by one department of materiel for all the military services. Under this program, military requirements for office furniture, office machines, and office supplies are being purchased by the General Services Administration. Within the military, 47 procurement assignments already in effect (many of which were established prior to 1953) were reviewed to determine their value. All but four were retained in view of anticipated and actual advantages to the Department of Defense. Attention also has been focused on securing procedures which result in effective coordinated military procurement. These improved procedures have been put into effect in all but three commodity areas. In addition, steps have been taken to place the performance of the military departments under continuing observation, in order to correct inefficient and uneconomical coordinated procurement practices.

SUPPLY PROGRAMS WITHIN THE BROAD FIELD OF PROCUREMENT

Unified cataloging system: The program to identify identical items in the military catalogs with a single name and number has been accelerated to the point that we were able to begin conversion to the Federal catalog system in many commodity areas in 1955. Conversion of areas where the identification process has been completed is being carried on concurrently with the identification program in other areas. Basic identification is scheduled for completion in 1956 and conversion to the Federal catalog system throughout all elements of the military supply system is scheduled for completion in 1958.

Standardization of military items: The standardization program has been completely reoriented, to obtain improvement in supply management, as well as engineering feasibility. Great reductions in the number of types, kinds, and sizes of items are being realized through standardization, with resulting economy and speeding up of supply operations. Preservation, packaging, and marking of items has been made uniform for three levels of service requirements, depending on destination and storage.

Standard basis for requirements and budgets: In 1954 we established for the first time a uniform system for requirements calculation and review, so that mobilization reserves, current buying programs, and mobilization production can be planned on the basis of a systematic and integrated analysis of all factors of both mobilization and peacetime requirements and supply, for all three departments. The system is now applied to major items of equipment that do not require unique planning procedures, and we are extending the system also to many soft goods and common-use items.

Coordinated production scheduling: A coordinated production scheduling system was established in 1954, through which schedules and production records are uniformly developed for OSD review of about 500 major items (such as planes, ships, tanks, guided missiles). Schedules are submitted and intensively reviewed twice yearly and reports of deliveries against schedules are submitted monthly. This provides the basis for control of production to insure deliveries of major items as needed, and for identifying problem areas.

Excessive length of lead time in procurement of some major items was reduced as a result of this system. Substantial economies in procurement can be realized through such work.

Modern inspection methods: We have reorganized the inspection and quality-control program to emphasize prevention of defective products rather than mere detection. We have eliminated duplication of inspection by instituting single service inspection in industrial plants. Conservation and attainment of proper standards of quality of items while in service use has been emphasized.

Supply management based on facts: We have established a realistic inventory management program to base inventories on actual rates of peacetime consumption and mobilization reserve requirements. Each item of materiel used within a service is being put under the management control of one supply-demand control point. Working stocks are being reduced to an efficient minimum and cross-hauling and back-hauling of supplies are being reduced. An annual line-item inventory has been taken for the first time, as a factual basis for programing.

Financial property accounting has been made standard procedure within the supply systems of all military departments. It has been used successfully in one of the departments for many years, and in 1953 we began to develop it in the other military departments. Today, it is the method of accounting for all but a number of small, special activities. Operations and inventories are uniformly expressed in dollar terms, permitting analysis of supply operations in terms of kinds, costs, and performance.

Uniform warehouse space and workload reports have been established to improve the flow of management information and provide better control. Optimum cross-servicing in the use of storage and warehousing facilities is being accomplished through better warehouse management practices and proper coordination among the departments.

Clearing the system of excess property: Requirements and inventory management based on knowledge of the facts have speeded the identification of excess property that has been clogging the supply system and running up costs. Energetic and well-planned disposal programs have speeded the disposal of excessive stocks without disrupting commercial markets.

Using military resources for military jobs: Through the years the military departments have established many types of activities that use military funds and resources for jobs which, in the public interest, would be better assigned to private enterprise. We are examining each and every military activity engaged in commercial or industrial types of work to determine whether there is a military necessity for it or whether the economy, the national defense, and the mobilization base would be strengthened by having the work done by business concerns, freeing military resources for military jobs. To date 462 activities have been reviewed, and 267 are closed or recommended for closing.

Single manager system: Under a single manager commodity assignment the Secretary of one military department is made responsible for the performance of all supply management functions related to a specified commodity for all military services. This assignment encompasses the entire supply field, from research and development through issue or disposal, including cataloging, standardization, requirements determination, procurement, production inspection, storage, distribution, transportation, and maintenance. The Secretary of the Army has been designated the single manager for all subsistence supplies, and we are now extending this method to many other commodity areas including clothing and equipage, medical and dental supplies, petroleum, and others. The single manager system is designed to eliminate duplications and overlapping in the assigned commodity areas.

The evolution of the single-manager system has been progressive. It is the result of study of several existing joint-service operations, and avails itself of the lessons learned from these. A joint service operation permits no single ownership of stocks, but requires very costly equity accounts to show what belongs to each service. A joint agency is largely a service organization, able to provide for certain functional tasks such as procurement and contract administration, but it can perform only at the call of the stock owner, and cannot provide single direction since there is no single head. This is not the case in the single-manager plan. There is only one wholesale stock, effectively positioned, centrally controlled, yet designed for the total Defense Department requirement, with the single manager reporting only to the Secretary of Defense.

PROGRAMS IN SUPPORT OF PROCUREMENT

Safer and speedier transportation at lower costs: We began an intensive program for improvement of motor-vehicle management in 1953. We have reduced the number of vehicles by greater utilization and better maintenance policies also have contributed to lower costs. In transportation management we have increased economy by working closely with industry on methods to increase the safety and speed of transportation of materiel and personnel. We have now established close coordination between transportation elements and the agencies responsible for control, supply, and positioning of materiel. We are giving close attention to the continuing economy tasks of obtaining equitable rates from commercial carriers, greater use of air and rail charters, and timely traffic management changes.

Mobilization planning: We have reoriented our program for mobilization production planning with industry to make sure that the items that are most important and hardest to make are provided for first. Current procurement is being integrated with our mobilization plans with industry to broaden the mobilization base.

A complete inventory of all military owned machine tools was started for the first time in 1953. The inventory produces information on the physical condition and location of machine tools, and other data needed to properly assign and use the tools, where they may be most needed, in peacetime and in mobilization.

Priorities system readiness: We have completed and are keeping up to date an Emergency Priorities and Allocation Manual to insure readiness throughout the Department of Defense for quick conversion to an orderly system for carrying out national priority controls in a mobilization if necessary.

Small business: We have issued new policy and established new action programs to insure that small-business firms are given an equitable opportunuity to compete for military prime contract awards. Inasmuch as small business is able to make a greater contribution to defense through subcontracting, we started a program in 1955 which enlists the active efforts of prime contractors who make large and expensive equipment to place as much of their subcontract work as possible with small-business firms.

CONCLUSION

All of the above programs are among those generated at the level of the Office of the Secretary of Defense to provide guidance and policy direction to the military departments. It must be recognized that in such complex fields as supply and logistics, improvements and refinements are a continuing process rather than a single one-time, dramatic effort. Existing programs and policies are under constant review seeking to develop increasing efficiencies and economies.

Examples of military departmental actions to implement current programs, and other departmental actions to improve procurement methods and techniques in the supply management field, are presented in the accompanying Army, Navy, and Air Force statements.

MAJOR ARMY LOGISTICS PROGRAM TO EFFECT MAXIMUM ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY

1. Progress in supply management: The Army has made further progress in its several programs to improve supply management. One of the major objectives in this area is to reduce depot and station stock, other than authorized reserves, to the minimum required to support the troops. We are doing this by: Disposing of materiel for which the Army has no foreseeable need; by "living off the shelf" by using up, without replacement, supplies above the level it is essential to keep on hand; cutting down on the number of different items in use; shipping direct from vendor to user where feasible; installing better methods of control over inventories and distribution of supplies in the field.

2. Living off the shelf: The most economical way for the Army to dispose of serviceable excess stocks is to consume them itself without replenishment, that is, by "living off the shelf."

3. Bypassing the depots: One of the best ways to keep depot inventories at minimum levels is to keep as many items as possible out of them altogether. To this end, the Army continues to emphasize direct deliveries from vendor to user and the use of open-end and call-type contracts.

4. Elimination of nonessential items: The Army's program to improve supply management does not end with the depot, but extends through all levels of supply to the individual troop units in the field. The Army has found that the most productive way to cut its investment in inventories is to reduce the number of items in the supply system. Four years ago, there were over 1,500,000 individual line items in the Army supply system. Despite the introduction of many new items of Army equipment in the intervening period, this number was reduced to about 950,000 as of January 1, 1956. This year we are reducing at a rate of 50,000 items per year. Our goal is to get down to between 700,000 and 800,000 items, and to stay there by dropping old items as new ones are added.

5. Better methods of control: The Army's knowledge and control of inventories has continued to improve as a result of extension of stock funds and financial inventory accounting and increased accuracy of dollar accounting and reporting. Peacetime supply economies—important as they are—cannot be the sole objective of Army supply management. The Army must also be prepared to cope with the complex problems of supplying dispersed and highly mobile combat units under the threat of actuality of nuclear warfare. This is the major purpose of a new project the Army has undertaken to devise a modern Army supply system (Project MASS). This project incorporates three major elements:

(a) Army field stock control.

(b) High-speed communications and data processing systems.

(c) Rapid movement of supplies.

6. Maintenance and repair parts management: The survival of Army troops on tomorrow's battlefield may depend in large measure upon our ability to maintain the equipment of dispersed and mobile units. This will require a streamlined system of repair parts resupply; reductions in the great number of different repair parts that confused and complicated equipment maintenance in World War II and in Korea; and increased maintenance capabilities at all echelons of command. The Army is attacking the problem of repair parts at its source—before new equipment enters the system. Maintenance engineers participate in development of equipment to insure that repair parts needs are held to a minimum.

7. Joint action with other services: In addition to the improvements in supply management that the Army has undertaken on its own initiative, the Army participates in joint programs with the Air Force and the Navy under the supervision of the Office of the Secretary. The single-manager system for subsistence as well as the extension of the single-manager concept to medical and other categories are examples.

8. Training of logistics managers: An Army supply management course began operation at Fort Lee, Va., on October 11, 1954, under the supervision of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics. As of December 16, 1955, 185 officers and 142 civilians had completed the 12-week training course. Its purpose is to give career officers and civilians practical instructions in Army supply problems and methods of solving them. This was a need which neither existing service schools nor civilian institutions have satisfactorily fulfilled. The Army plan to have its 3,000 senior supply managers—both civilian and military—complete this training. A procurement school, also at Fort Lee, has been in operation since 1950. More than 1,400 officers and civilian employees have completed the courses of instruction offered at this school. The Army is currently investigating the feasibility of establishing a logistics center at which five courses would be taught: The supply management course; the procurement management course; a requirements management course; a course in storage and distribution management; and a course in maintenance management.

STATEMENT OF MEASURES TAKEN BY THE NAVY TO IMPROVE PROCUREMENT METHODS AND TECHNIQUES

Procurement methods and techniques provide contracting officers with the tools to make the best possible contracts considering price, performance and national objectives. To make good contracts requires training and experience as well as mature judgment by procurement personnel in the execution of procurement laws, directives and instructions.

Directives: We provided our procurement personnel with a completely revised set of Navy procurement directives in the fall of 1955. This revision reduced, through consolidation and editing, the number of pages from about 900 to 500 without reducing the quality of guidance furnished.

Training: To provide necessary training to contracting personnel, we have conducted contract negotiation training for 200 people in early 1953. In early 1954 a contract termination course for 270 people was conducted. At present we are sponsoring a course in contract administration for 400 key personnel. These courses not only afford graduate level training, but result in the development of handbooks that are everyday working tools for all procurement personnel.

Procurement review: The procurement review group was established in the fall of 1955 to continually review, analyze, and evaluate our efforts and to recommend improvements.

Letter contracts: Since 1953 the number of letter contracts awaiting conversion to fixed-price contracts has been reduced from 1,150 to 61 at present.

Redeterminable contracts: Redeterminable and incentive type contracts have been reduced from 1,200 to 564.

The above two improvements make possible better cost control and repricing on a timely basis.

Negotiation restrictions: In May 1954 the Navy tightened the rules for the use of negotiated procurement and in January 1956 practically eliminated the use of emergency authority to negotiate. This action insures the use of realistic justifications in all negotiated contracts.

Contract-termination settlements: Unsettled contract-termination backlog has been reduced in 1955 by $575 million from its all-time peak of $2,578 million. Existing regulations, particularly in regard to screening and disposal of termination inventory, were clarified and revised to expedite terminations.

Financing of defense contracts: A greater share of the financing of defense contracts has been placed in private hands and reduced the Government's burden in such financing through the insertion of more stringent clauses in new contracts.

Small business: To accomplish full coordination of effort in considering and resolving problems primarily affecting small-business concerns, the Navy has had in operation since March 10, 1955, a Council of Small Business Advisers consisting of the Chief of the Office of Small Business in the Office of Naval Material and the senior small-business specialists in our major procuring activities. This council is responsible for developing new and improved policies for increasing small-business participation in Navy procurement.

Summary: Improvements in a field as complex as military procurement are a continual and progressive process rather than sudden or dramatic. The Navy now has the mechanism to continue to improve the effectiveness of its procurement, and I believe that our methods and techniques will continue to improve.

STEPS TAKEN BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE TO IMPROVE MANAGEMENT IN THE LOGISTICS AREA

Consolidation of procurement regulations: All Air Force procurement regulations have been consolidated in one book, and all procurement instructions on one subject may be found gathered compactly in one place. The new Air Force Procurement Instruction, besides reducing a 4-foot stack of regulations to less than 4 inches, eliminates duplications and inconsistencies which evolve from a system of regulations emanating from a multitude of different sources. This consolidation has been one of the most important procurement-management projects; and efforts to refine and improve the instructions are continuing.

Small business: In fiscal year 1954 small-business concerns submitted the lowest acceptable quotations on 76 percent dollarwise of procurements suitable for small business, as compared with 73 percent in fiscal year 1953 and 55 percent in fiscal year 1952. Better procedures for providing small-business concerns with adequate and timely information on proposed procurements contributed in large measure to this improved situation. Contracting officers also have been authorized to set aside certain procurements for exclusive participation by small business. In the field of subcontracting, holding by far the greatest opportunities for small business, the Air Force has secured the cooperation of 200 of its largest prime contractors in voluntarily establishing a defense subcontracting small-business program to assure an equitable opportunity for small-business concerns to provide items or services which fall within their capabilities.

Prenegotiation conferences: The adoption of prenegotiation conferences has made a major improvement in contract negotiation. In these conferences the buying team presents the negotiation objective and the procurement plan to the Director of Procurement and Production at the Air Materiel Command. The buying team comprises the buyer, price analyst, administrative contracting officer, auditor, engineer, production specialist, and others as necessary. The purpose is to have the negotiator define his objective and be sure that he has all the facts relating to the negotiation. The discussions which take place in prenegotiation meetings provide information to Air Force management both as to the quality of the procurement job and the competence of the negotiators. A major contribution of

prenegotiation conferences has been the confidence furnished a buying team where a firm pricing objective has been justified and established with the complete understanding and backing of the Director and other top people in procurement management.

Depot maintenance management: Since April of 1953 the Air Force, with the assistance of consultants, has been developing and testing an improved system for aircraft maintenance activities at Sacramento air materiel area. The system as finally developed and put into effect in the depots includes work measurement, payroll distribution, earned-hour reports, production control, and standard cost accounting. The new system will provide factual, reliable, and timely information to all levels as a basis for sound and intelligent management in the maintenance area. With the successful installation of the system in the depots, a project has been started to apply the techniques to field and organizational maintenance wherever they are pertinent. The study, which is being made by an Air Force management engineering team, has just recently begun and the target date for completion is June of 1957.

Property disposal: In 1953 the Air Force developed and issued a new set of retention criteria which were based upon aircraft programed life plus mobilization reserves. For the first time in the history of the Air Force, this policy made it possible to put the disposal program on a par with requirements computation and budgeting and buying programs. The retention criteria, complete with established retirement dates on all types of aircraft, have now been translated into an operating program to assure continuous removal of excesses from the supply system.

Mechanization of supply activities: Replacement of manual operations with machines in supply activities has resulted in reduced personnel requirements to perform supply recording and reporting functions. In addition to manpower economies, the ability of machines to rapidly and accurately compile information has permitted better and quicker review and adjustment of stock levels, discovery of surplus supplies needed elsewhere in the Air Force, and the refinement of USAF inventories.

Electronic data processing: The Air Force is developing a more responsive and economical logistics management system through use of electronic equipment for computing requirements and transmitting supply data. This equipment also opens up the possibility of centrally maintaining complete and up-to-date information on the status of stocks at bases and depots. Completion and installation of electronic systems will speed up supply transactions and increase the level of accuracy both in requirements computations and in inventory accounting.

High value item control: A relatively small number of the items in the Air Force inventory represent the largest proportion of the inventory dollarwise. Conversely, the majority of items represent the lowest dollar investment. Accordingly, all items in the inventory have been identified in one of three categories to permit more effective inventory management. Items having a high unit value are placed in category I. They are inventoried more frequently than other items and their movement through the supply system is accelerated by the use of premium communications and transportation. Aircraft engines are handled separately and are accounted for by serial number. Category II represents the second largest proportion of the inventory and is subjected to less detailed but still adequate control. Category III comprises low-cost items. By increasing stock levels on these items and decreasing the frequency of resupply, it has been possible to reduce administrative costs and packing, crating, handling, and transportation expense.

Monetary inventory accounting: Dollar accounting and reporting of inventory has been established at depots and bases worldwide, and is being used extensively as an inventory management tool. Consolidated dollar data permits the timely analysis of serviceable and reparable inventory trends, stock levels, materiel losses, and disposal actions.

Movement of POL: The Air Force has undertaken a comprehensive analysis of the petroleum transportation system in the United States. The analysis covers every Air Force base and includes the present system of petroleum delivery, base receiving and storage, source of product, and in transit terminals. The efficiency and economy of pipeline delivery for volume petroleum are apparent. Pipeline delivery at two bases has resulted in a reduction of transportation costs of about $500,000 annually. Negotiations are underway to determine the feasibility of pipeline service to 30 other bases. A proposal has been submitted to provide this service to four bases. Preliminary examination of this proposal indicates that an annual transportation economy of over $1.5 million may be realized by pipeline service to these four bases.

Secretary Wilson and his exceptionally able group of assistants, in my opinion, have made tremendous progress in the direction of economy and efficiency.

There is still much to be done, as they would be the first to admit, but they have saved the people of America literally billions of dollars, in each year that they have been in office.

Their work is reflected in many ways, including a decrease in unexpended balances amounting to $26.5 billion, a decrease in unobligated balances amounting to $6.3 billion, a decrease in appropriations amounting to $11 billion, a decrease in expenditures amounting to $9.7 billion, and a decrease in taxes amounting to $7.4 billion, the largest tax reduction in any single year in the history of the Nation.

Theirs is a fine record. The country should be grateful.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] is vice chairman of the 15-man Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations and he is also chairman of the panel for the Navy. Much of the good work, I think, which has been done on this bill was done by the gentleman from California and the members of his panel who served with him.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to my chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], and to the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], for the manner in which they have covered the presentation because it will make my presentation to you much easier. There are some matters, however, which were effected by your Subcommittee on Navy Appropriations which, I think, should be brought to your attention.

The budget estimates for the Department of the Navy considered by the committee total $10,047,600,000, including $65,600,000 submitted subsequent to receipt of the President's budget. After careful and extensive hearings on these requirements, the committee has reduced the estimates referred to by $48,066,000, and recommends an appropriation of $9,999,534,000, an increase of $871,774,444 in the appropriations for fiscal year 1956. In addition, your committee has rescinded funds in the total amount of $159,800,000, including $100 million from the Navy stock fund, $3 million from the Marine Corps stock fund, $52 million from the Navy industrial fund, $3,800,000 from the appropriation for construction of ships, and $1 million from the appropriation for ordnance for new construction. These actions have resulted in an overall reduction in the Navy program, including working capital funds, of $207,866,000. The $48,066,000 of reductions were made in several categories and are explained in detail in the report.

Briefly, however, I would like to call the more important ones to your attention.

There was a general reduction recommended by the Department of the Navy due to the realinement of the program in the Operation Deepfreeze, which is the Navy portion of the Antarctic expedition now taking place.

Under the title "Military Personnel, Navy," the committee has recommended a reduction of $5 million in addition to $584,000 due to the aforementioned Deepfreeze reduction. This has to do primarily with funds requested for travel and transportation costs associated with military personnel.

A reduction of $400,000 for similar reasons has been made in the item for "Military personnel, Marine Corps."

Under the title "Marine Corps Troops and Facilities," we cut $4 million, in general operational savings in training and station operation areas, and the firm belief by the committee that a greater degree of efficiency and economy in the use of funds for this item is needed.

Under "Aircraft and facilities," the committee recommends a reduction of $1,500,000, in addition to the reduction caused by Operation Deepfreeze's requirement. The committee reduction relates to the need to maintain a greater degree of efficiency in the areas of aircraft and airframe overhauls and in the various items related to the flying hours training.

Under the appropriation item "Ships and facilities," the committee has recommended a reduction of $3 million in the belief that the Navy will more closely scrutinize the activities in this operation and achieve a greater degree of effectiveness in the use of funds.

Under the title "Procurement of Ordnance and Ammunition," a reduction of $5 million has been made by the committee. It is apparent that if the procurement policies and practices in this field are streamlined in a more efficient fashion, and the present apparent deficiencies are eliminated, that this reduction can be achieved without any detriment to the contemplated 1957 program.

A reduction of $3 million has been achieved in the appropriation for "Ordnance and facilities," which is applied to the transportation request for maintenance of ordnance and ammunitions, as well as in departmental administration

and improvements and alterations to facilities.

Under the item "Military construction, naval Reserve forces," the committee has recommended a reduction of $7,296,000, generally due to the elimination of 2 installations in the fiscal year 1957 program, and by an application of an unobligated carryover in funds previously appropriated.

Under "Research and development" the committee has eliminated $1 million from the $67 million budget program for so-called military sciences studies, in the belief that this entire program should be carefully scrutinized and many of the studies eliminated.

Under the last appropriation title, "Naval Petroleum Reserves," the committee has eliminated $529,000 requested for exploration and drilling for oil on San Nicholas Island, Calif. It is quite apparent, from the hearings and other data submitted, that there is no present need or specific legal authority for this activity.

In summary, then, the action which the committee is presenting to you today with reference to naval appropriations, constitutes a total cut of $48,066,000 in the budget estimates, and rescissions in the amount of $159,800,000, a total reduction of $207,866,000.

I want at this time, Mr. Chairman, to pay my compliments to the fellow members on the subcommittee with whom I have worked for many years, and say to you Members of the House that we have a most harmonious family and enjoy, as much as is possible with the responsibility that we have, a relaxation that we all appreciate.

I want further to pay my compliments to Mr. Frank Sanders, executive secretary of our staff, and to Mr. Orescan and all the other members of our staff who have been so cooperative in the many things we have called upon them to perform. It is really a most pleasant situation to have cooperation of that character. I feel as chairman of the Navy subcommittee that I should express to them our sense of deep gratitude for their efforts.

Before closing I feel it somewhat incumbent on me to refer to the comments made by the gentleman from Illinois, ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules [Mr. ALLEN], this morning, in which the gentleman rather caustically criticized the ineptness, and one could read into his comments if they so desired, the mental incapacity of members of the Appropriations Committee to understand and appreciate the category within which they should function.

I have had the honor of knowing the gentleman from Illinois for a good many years, and this is the first time that I can recall the gentleman's taking the floor of the House and discussing a subject which he was so ill prepared to discuss.

In the first place, I have lived and worked with the members of the Appropriations Committee for a good many years. In fact, I have been a Member of the House for 20 years and quite pridefully say that I have been automatically reelected for 2 more years and that I will continue to serve in my present capacity on the Appropriations Committee, of course, always subject to the will of the House. I merely state that with that kind of exposure to the functions of that committee I think I know something about the manner in which they work. I do not believe there is a Republican member of that committee or a Democratic member who has any personal desire to usurp or intrude upon the prerogatives of other committees, and they are quite conversant with the parliamentary procedure of this House and the limitations involved. Frequently in conference we find ourselves confronted with the situation wherein if the military stature is to be maintained in accordance with the requirements outlined by the Secretary of Defense and his astute officials, there is nothing we can do but have certain legislation appear in the bill. It is extremenly distasteful so far as I personally am concerned, and I think I can say the same of the other members of the Appropriations Committee.

In order to verify the necessities to which I am presently addressing myself, I was advised this morning by Chairman VINSON of the Armed Services Committee, for whom I have great respect, that his committee will come up within the next few days with what he termed a clean-up bill that would take out of the present operations the necessity for any further legislation on military appropriations. When and if that is accomplished, I compliment the committee for the job. If that had been done 2 years ago we would not have to usurp the prerogatives of another committee at this time.

I want to say to the Members of this House that when you sit on the Appropriation Committee for the Armed Forces the length of time that we are forced to sit and analyze the presentations that are made to you, you will find yourself encompassed in a situation of extreme responsibility to maintain the stature of military requirements in order to defend and protect our form of government and way of life.

I cannot speak for any other member of the Appropriations Committee, but I can say to the Members of this House that to the degree we found it necessary to apply legislation in this bill, with the acquiescence of the House of course, I have no apologies to make to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] or to any other Member of the House.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Forty-two Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 44]

Adair	Belcher	Boykin
Albert	Bentley	Brown, Ohio
Anfuso	Blitch	Byrd
Bailey	Bolton,	Byrne, Pa.
Barden	Oliver P.	Carlyle
Celler	Jackson	Powell
Chatham	James	Preston
Cooley	Jenkins	Prouty
Crumpacker	Johnson, Calif.	Radwan
Dawson, Ill.	Kearns	Sadlak
Deane	Kelley, Pa.	Short
Dodd	Knutson	Springer
Donovan	Lane	Staggers
Eberharter	McDowell	Taylor
Fountain	Mason	Thompson, La.
Gordon	Matthews	Tollefson
Green, Oreg.	Mollohan	Velde
Harrison, Nebr.	Morrison	Vursell
Hayworth	Nelson	Watts
Hiestand	O'Hara, Minn.	Williams, N. Y.
Hoffman, Ill.	Phillips	Wilson, Ind.
Hoffman, Mich.	Polk	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, 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. 10986, and finding itself without a quorum, he had caused the roll to be called, when 362 Members answered to their names, disclosing a quorum to be present, and he submitted herewith a list of the absentees for printing in the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] is recognized.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, while I share the concern for the security of our Nation, as expressed by our chairman, Mr. MAHON, I do not share his fears. This concern for the safety and security of this country, as far as I am concerned, has been well demonstrated by the fact, if you will pardon a personal reference, that when I came to the House of Representatives, one-half of my life had been spent in the military service and military preparedness of this Nation.

The gentleman from Texas, I am quite sure, anticipated some comments from me; in fact, he practically invited comments. I am sure he would be disappointed if I did not make some reply to some of the statements he made. With all the years we have been on this committee together we do have some differences, but we are all amiably disposed because I think in the true sense of the word that we, despite the differences in our political party beliefs, are really friends. You cannot work and live with men as long as the members of this committee work and live together without finding yourself friendly with them.

The gentleman from Texas has mentioned that the Soviet bomber force has been improving. That is to be expected; they would be complete dolts if they had not improved. But as the Soviet bomber force improves, so does our defense; and just as we are now more vulnerable than we were 3 years ago so is Soviet Russia. As far as Mr. Quarles comment about this situation of mutual deterrent is concerned I agree that such a situation may arise, and I agree with Secretary Quarles too where he said that this situation is bad, but it is better than war. The time may come when each of us having such terrific weapons of destruction as each of us do have and will have we will run into a position of stalmate and find that neither of us will ever use some of the destructive weapons in our stockpile.

I do not agree with the gentleman from Texas when he said our military situation is bad. It is not bad. The funds that you provide this year and have been providing in past years gives you the best, if not the biggest army in the world. It gives you the biggest and best navy in the world, and it gives you the best Air Force and the greatest airpower in the world.

There was some comment about what some of the objectives and programs are resulting in. It is an old saying, but it is just as true today as it ever was: The proof of the pudding is in the eating; and the proof of the pudding of this administration's program is the fact that since the armistice in Korea, mid-1953, not one single young American has died on the field of battle and this Nation is at peace.

The gentleman from Texas made some comment about spending. Well, we could go back in history and talk about quite a bit of that, and make a lot of references to where green-back poultices had been applied to cure some real or fancied ill. I cannot help but remember that the party of the gentleman from Texas has been in power and in control of the House and Senate for almost 2 years now, and if you have within yourself such profound wisdom I am surprised that you have not as legislators brought forth measures of remedial action that would call for fewer greenback poultices and reduce spending, but I have not seen that done.

Now, talking about the money required in this budget, let me read some remarks of Secretary of Defense Wilson; and I may say in passing that there is no ineptness in his expression of these views that I shall read. You will find them on page 14 of 1 of the 7 volumes of hearings that we have had. This is the one entitled "Amendments to the Budget for 1957." You will find Secretary Wilson saying this to our committee:

> It is quite clear to me that if we had a very small defense organization and spent a very nominal amount of money, like we did before World War I, between World War I and World War II, and between the end of World War II and Korea, we would be risking the security of the United States.

And he continues:

> Going to the other extreme, if we went into an all-out armaments race—and we could not spend a great deal more than we are spending now without mobilization and controls—on that side of the picture the danger of war would be increased. We would much more likely precipitate a war in the world if we went into one of those all-out races and stirred our people up to the degree that they would have to be stirred up in order to make them pay the taxes and stand for the regimentation and mobilization. Then we would be decreasing the security of the United States by increasing the likelihood of war. So I think that we are now at about the right place. As near as I can personally figure it, I think we are. No one can say within a percent or two one way or the other that this is exactly it, but somewhere in the middle—and I think we are about there—is the point of maximum security for the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I have made the statement often, and it is still true and is self-evident, that a strong national defense is not cheap. You have heard some pretty big figures quoted to you, but those figures and those facts in these 6,500 pages of hearings should convince anyone of the fact that a strong national defense is not cheap. Next year we are told quite frankly the requests will be more than they have been for this year.

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

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

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from Texas in addressing the House pointed out that unhappily it appeared this administration when confronted with major problems had about only one answer, and that was money and more money, more money for the Department of Defense, more money for foreign aid, and so forth. Also I think I pointed out that while the Democratic Party is in control of the House and Senate it is not in control of the executive branch of the Government where the money is spent. I pointed out that it was unfortunate that a better answer could not be found than money and more money. I believe the gentleman will agree with that.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I could not help but agree to a degree. But any administration cannot spend any money Congress does not give. I would point out that many of the things for which this administration is now asked to spend money is the result of some inherited world situations and prior commitments for which there is no other remedy. Let me ask the gentleman from Texas, Is he going to recommend any further reductoin in this military budget?

Mr. MAHON. I am not.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Is the gentleman going to recommend any reduction in foreign-aid spending?

Mr. MAHON. Yes; I surely am.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Well, so far as the gentleman from Kansas is concerned, he will join you in that.

Mr. MAHON. My point is this that it is a deplorable commentary on our world and on the Democrats and Republicans that we have not been able to come up with a more imaginative answer than just money and more money. I was trying to stimulate the administration to a consciousness of that situation with an urgent plea that a better answer might be found.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Well, the gentleman's party has been in control of the House and Senate for some time now, and could control appropriations.

Mr. MAHON. We do not have control of expenditure of the funds of the Federal Government. Will not the gentleman agree that this country is becoming increasingly more vulnerable to devastating attack and that Soviet Russia is also becoming more vulnerable to devastating attack and that while we do not want to be frightened or hysterical, the military situation is very bad when large segments of the population of the earth could be obliterated overnight by the power of an aggressor.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is not the sort of situation that either the gentleman or I would choose and it is not of our making.

Mr. MAHON. My only interest is that we face up to this question and that we find the right road. I think I said that the road in defense spending that we are now following is probably approximately correct.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I agree with the gentleman on that. Our committee has faced up and has chosen the right road.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I would add further that none of this spending we are talking about now includes any of the countless hundreds of millions of dollars, yes, billions, which we provide for the military use of atomic power.

The military program that we have before us is merely a continuation of the preparedness program for the long pull that has been underway now for the last 3 years. Every young American today must look forward to the fact that for the next 10, 20, 30 or 50 years, or as long as Communist Russia remains a threat to the world, he must look forward to a period of military service and the taxpayers must look forward to carrying the burden of preparedness just that long. As a matter of fact, if it were not for the mere existence of Russia and its announced intent to dominate the world, including, if necessary, by force of arms, this military budget could be cut down to one-fourth or one-third of what we are asking, and we would be perfectly secure. But despite the fact that we have seen some smiles and heard some sweet words from Khrushchev and some of his Kremlin crew the need for military preparedness still prevails and the American public must carry the burden of that program.

About half of this budget goes for the Air Force, and at the end of this fiscal year, June 1957, we will reach the long-set goal of 137 combat wings, and we will reach it at exactly the same time as it was proposed under the previously much-discussed 143-wing program. This Air Force of ours is manned by the best pilots the world has ever produced, and they are flying in some of the best planes that any nation has ever produced.

While we talk here presently about the Air Force, it must be recognized that the United States airpower is not confined just to the Air Force alone. Although many of the comparative figures would indicate that we have no other airpower in this entire country except the Air Force, we have in addition to the Air Force a magnificent naval aviation. In addition to naval aviation we have a magnificent marine air branch. And, while we separated or divorced the Air Force from the Army just a few years ago, the Army is now building up an aviation force of its own of someplace around 4,000 planes. In addition to that, you have as a very important factor your airpower in the Air Reserve and the Air National Guard, and when you talk about planes in all of the services together, combat planes I am talking about, we outnumber Soviet Russia 2 to 1.

Mr. Chairman, there are many things in here that have been discussed. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] talked to you about them. We are providing new money for approximately 2,000 planes. Now, that is some fewer in number than we asked for last year,

but we do not have the requirement for quite a few of the lighter trainer type. However, the heavier ones are still provided for in this bill. We have to pay for the upkeep of all of our bases and all of our planes, and we have to provide money for the pay and allowances and maintenance of just under 950,000 airmen. That is a comparatively small Air Force, but it is larger than Soviet Russia's. We should recognize at the very outset that we never have intended and we do not now intend to try to compete with Soviet Russia on a man-to-man basis, and much the same thing, as I will point out later, on a bomber-to-bomber basis.

Now, the military force for which we are asking you to appropriate money is for the protection of this Nation and not for initially attacking any other. Perhaps our philosophy in that is wrong. Perhaps we should get the advantage of being the first to attack, but that has never been the policy of this Nation, and I doubt that it ever will be in the foreseeable future. But everybody knows that the force that attacks first has an initial advantage which is sometimes hard to overcome. But we have the power, we have the strength, we have the ability, we have the determination, we have the men who can and will, if Russia dare attack us, "whack back." Now, that is an old midwestern phrase that all of us out there can understand, but in the parlance of many others we call it retaliation. The two mean the same thing. We can whack back or retaliate with such devastating force that Russia could never recover or carry out any immediate subattack. Hence, our needs are fundamentally different from those of Russia, and for that reason the makeup of our forces should be and it is considerably different from Russia's makeup.

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I think the gentleman has made a very striking and very reassuring statement on America's air might. I hope that the great press services of our country will do justice to his statement in covering this meeting of the Committee today.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The press probably would cover it a little bit more fully if I had an advance copy of my speech, but I have no prepared copy and what I say may not bear much resemblance to the notes I have before me.

Let us talk a little bit about our Air Force. Of course, the retaliatory force I have been talking about is the Strategic Air Command under the command of General LeMay. That is the dominant force, that along with our other services, which has been a deterrent to war. Strategic Air Command planes are ready today, every day, and all day, to carry indescribable death and destruction to any designated target no matter how remote. The Strategic Air Command is good and it is getting better every day, with newer, faster bombers, of longer range, with improved performance, as the older, obsolescent planes go out of the picture.

And if you are concerned about the number of bombers, I will go a little bit further than the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] did and I will state that with A- and H-bombs today, one bomber—just one—can carry all of the potential death and destruction that was carried by all of our bombers on all of their sorties in all of World War II, including both the European and the Pacific Theaters.

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. Certainly, I yield to the chairman of our committee.

Mr. MAHON. Does not the very significant fact which the gentleman has just mentioned point up the matter of the vulnerability of this country and the U. S. S. R.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Yes. I am coming to the defense portion of my statement now.

Mr. MAHON. In other words, Secretary Quarles tells us that in view of the growth of the Soviets and our own power, that we are coming into a period of mutual deterrence.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Yes, you mentioned that a moment ago.

Mr. MAHON. And the fact that the gentleman has pointed out that one plane could conceivably wreak so much havoc upon the United States in the event of war should cause us to pause and ponder what our policy should be.

Mr. SCRIVNER. We have been pausing and pondering in the committee for quite a while. But, as I said, I am coming to the defense side of the matter just now.

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

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

Mr. HINSHAW. In view of the statements that have been made by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], I do not think that we should sit here and quake and quiver in fear of any attack from Soviet Russia. I decry that kind of statement.

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield now to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I do not believe in fearmongering and hysteria, as I said earlier in the afternoon. But is it not true that a calm, realistic approach to the actual facts of this situation is in order? That is what Secretary Quarles of the Air Force referred to in talking about this period of mutual deterrence. That is what I think our military people are doing. They are facing up calmly but realistically to this problem. And they are worried. You know they are worried. We all know they are worried and we have cause to be worried and that should give us the inspiration and the impetus to try to provide the best possible answer.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

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

Mr. HINSHAW. I think we should not be worried, but that Russia should be worried. I do not see why anybody should stand here and say that we should worry. Of course, we should pay attention to our needs, but worry—no.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Let me add one more word, namely, that even though I, along with other members of this committee have been living with this day in and day out, month in and month out, year in and year out, I lost no sleep last night because of fear of a Russian attack, and I shall lose no sleep tonight.

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yesterday, along with about a dozen other Members of the House, I had the privilege of seeing a fire power demonstration at the Eglin Field in Florida. I saw the same demonstration about 10 years ago. I am amazed at the progress we have made in the last 10 years. I daresay the things we are using now would hardly have been in the realm of imagination when the gentleman served in World War I. The progress we are making would make the American people bulge with pride. I hope that in the future we may put more emphasis on research and on the possibility of doing things even in a greater and a better manner than we are doing today. I think 10 years ago the B–29 was the "top dog" of all our planes. Today it is the B–52. We saw the B–52 perform yesterday. I am not sure that 10 years from now it will be our best plane.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Why wait 10 years, if the gentleman will let me interrupt? You are not going to have to wait more than a year to see some of our advances. Every day that goes by we are bringing out bigger, better, and faster planes of all kinds. We are not static. We do not freeze a model, we continuously improve and bring them out, so that we have a constantly modernized Air Force. It costs a lot of money to do it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think that is right, and that is the way we should proceed.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Since these questions have been raised, you would think perhaps that we have been absolutely asleep at the switch as far as our continental defense is concerned. That is far from the truth. As a matter of fact, your Air Defense Command is going to increase and it too, is going to cost you more. Of course we do not have everything we would like to have, but it is improving rapidly. Today on bases throughout the world American pilots in American jet fighters and flighter-intercepters are on the end of the runway ready to go at a moment's notice, and that includes members of the Air Reserve and the Air National Guard.

We are spending literally hundreds of millions of dollars, yes, billions, upon far-flung radar screens going clear up into the Arctic, through mid-Canada with the radar picket planes flying across into the Atlantic and into the Pacific, and with Texas Towers in the Atlantic.

All of those things are part of our defense. Any of you who have ever studied military matters know that there is a period of time when perhaps the

offense is on top, and then the defensive measures come along and they are superior to that offense. Then finally the offense comes into supremacy again. So it is a constant battle between attack and defense.

While some could, and it is easy to do, draw a terrific picture of what would happen if Russia were to fire an intercontinental ballistic missile 200, 300 miles in the air, at a speed of 10,000 or more miles an hour, and say, "Oh, there is no defense," today that is right, but that flight is some time off. When that day arrives, I have enough confidence in our scientists to know that when that vehicle is ready to go into the air there will be a defense against it. Hard to do? Sure. But I have watched these men in the laboratories, I have watched these scientists, I have seen them do things and accomplish missions that I would at one time have said were absolutely impossible, they would be nothing short of a miracle, but these scientists have accomplished the aims.

Just the mere operation of these radar screens and all that is going to cost you right around half a billion dollars a year, and not much sooner will we have them installed than there will be new, more effective, longer-range radars that we will immediately have to procure, and start replacing the old ones. Then perhaps about the time these improved sets get to working there will be still better ones and still better ones, ones which will detect these missles in the air. Then of course we will have to replace the old ones and here again a terrific lot of money will be required.

I said we had the newest, fastest, most modern types of planes on bases ready to go today. We have. Some that will soon be in operation have performance features which have not yet been disclosed. When they are you will see what I am talking about when I say that as far as I am concerned we have a defense against any potential Russian attack today and in the foreseeable future—although the cold facts are that some enemy bombers could get through.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I want to say to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas that today I presented for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list of the 44 questions asked and the answers given by General LeMay, head of the Strategic Air Command. I do not think it is a matter of fear or confidence so much, but I do think you will find in his answers straightforward, categorical statements on our air defense that every Member of Congress ought to read and study.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Of course, we have the Tactical Air Command and we have the other commands, but time does not permit me to go into the details which you will find in the report. There has been some discussion about missiles, but others will discuss that subject in detail. We were told and the members of the committee acknowledged that the missile program was not near as dark as some people have painted it, that we were going full speed with the work so far as possible around the clock; and that there had been no lack of funds for the missile program. We were told too that while the Soviets may be ahead in some fields of missile development, they are not ahead in all fields and taking the problem as a whole the United States is ahead in this program. If you think I am coloring the picture a little, you can look at the record at page 1225 of the hearings and find where Democratic members of the subcommittee on appropriations who heard Assistant Secretary Robertson give his testimony state that they had found his statement very reassuring and that it was a splendid presentation.

There are a lot of things, as I said, that we could talk about, but let us go to this bomber matter for a few minutes. Of course, there is a great deal of attraction to this hokus pokus about pioneering up into the atmosphere above the atmosphere clear on up into the ozone and beyond where, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] said, the comets speed. We have been talking about bombers and what we have done and what Russia is supposed to be doing and about B–52s and the fact that we have augmented the production and speeded up the production of B–52s and that we will have all of these B–52s, much sooner than we otherwise would have them. On a military program as complex as this, we could talk for many hours. But let us just look at something else for a minute and see what the outstanding military authority of this Nation has to say on this subject. I am referring, of course, to President Eisenhower, the civilian Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. I am reading from a verbatim report of a news conference which he held last week on Friday where Mr. Clark, of the INS asked the President whether he saw any cause for concern in the reports of the B–52 bombers and that we were lagging behind schedules:

EXCERPTS FROM PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S PRESS CONFERENCE, FRIDAY, MAY 4, 1956

Question (Robert E. Clark, INS): "Mr. President, do you see any cause for concern in the reports that delivery of B–52 bombers to the Air Force is lagging behind schedule in the light of reports out of Russia that Soviet production of the same type of planes is forging ahead of us?"

The President: "I think we ought to broaden our vision a little bit more widely than looking at one particular phase or part of an organization when we begin to compare our position with those of others.

"Here was testimony in one particular part, the Strategic Air Command and, of course, it is disappointing that 37 of these planes had to be held up in delivery for modification because of some defect.

"It is, of course, a usual experience in these 'hot' airplanes, you have to go through modifications. We had to do it in the war. Indeed, I had to establish a plant in England to modify planes that were coming over from the United States before you could use them in combat.

"I am told or informed that, first of all, this defect has been—is being corrected, but I want to call your attention to these—there is still a lot of testimony to come forward.

"We have the most powerful Navy in the world. There is no navy that even approaches it in power, and it features one thing, air power.

"No one has talked about that. We have bases around the world, established for the particular purpose of using the medium bomber, and not being forced to make all your bases in the United States and therefore depend on intercontinental bombers."

And the President continued in his conference:

Now, remember, no matter how efficient a plane is in terms of long range, if the further forward you can carry it, the less time it is in the air, and the more efficient it operates in war. So I think by the time the Defense Department gets done presenting its full picture, the United States will see that they have had great bodies of men who have not been idle; who have not been indifferent to the security of the United States, and who have carried their duties, their responsibilities forward to the point that they will, the United States will, feel a lot better than just on this one piece of testimony.

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Then another question came from the CBS correspondent, Von Frend, who asked him whether that meant that the administration does not plan to step up the intercontinental-bomber program. The President again spoke:

The President said:

No, I don't think you can say that in those terms.

We have stepped up the originally agreed on rate of B–52 production, we have stepped it up twice since this administration has been in, and I don't know what the Defense Department is going to recommend next. But what I do want to say is that the whole question of airpower is not confined to one simple type of airplane.

Then Mr. Evans, of the New York Herald Tribune wanted to know whether or not despite the B–47 medium bomber force overseas "Do you say that it is vital that we try to stay ahead of Russia in production of the long-range bomber?"

The President:

No. I say it is vital that we get what we believe we need. That does not necessarily mean more than somebody else does. We have got to get what we need.

Then he continued in answer to another question:

Well, I said, first of all, we need in each type of bomber, in each classification of ship, we need what our requirements demand, and that doesn't necessarily mean that we have the same as anybody else.

Now we could go on for hours on this bill, as the chairman said. There are 6,500 pages of the printed hearings, and perhaps an equal amount off the record. But let us get to some other matters. One of them relates to the testimony of Mr. Trevor Gardner, at page 869 of the Defense hearings, and you can read the whole story. I think you will find that Mr. Gardner had two great objections. He felt that time had been lost through the system of committee reviews, where each important program had to be reviewed by committees, and he thought one man should be in charge of the missile program, a step that was underway when he made his plans. Then he

feared that perhaps some day there might be something happen if all three of the services kept working on the missile program; not that it had, but that it might. Second, he felt that the program of building and flying a few planes first before buying a large number was wrong. Despite what the congressional committees have developed as it relates to the McDonnell Navy plane fiasco, which certainly demonstrates the wisdom of flying before you buy, because they did not fly before we bought a large number.

Mr. Gardner also wanted to buy a large quantity of planes that had not yet been built, hardly off the drawing boards or in the design stage. No prototype at all. He thought, too, that the step by step research and development program was too conservative.

Mr. Gardner did say that the missile program had not been held up because of lack of funds. He did not say that Russia was ahead. He said it might be in some fields, and that in other fields we were ahead, although we might now be starting in to losing the lead in our planes, which we have not yet lost. So this was just an honest difference of opinion between him and Secretary Quarles.

Then one of the other side issues was the hearing of General Ridgway relating to some articles he had written for the Saturday Evening Post. He reasserted that he was surprised when the President said that there had been unanimous agreement by the Chiefs of Staff on the four levels for fiscal year 1955. You will find this by reading the hearings starting at page 596 of the defense hearings and carrying on up to page 615. When you read that you will find he had no reason to be surprised because he had repeatedly said that there had been unanimous approval of the program. General Ridgway was disturbed, of course, about the reduction in the size of the Army, and to hear him you would think it was the first time any such thing had been done; but it is not, and if you want to see what has been done under various administrations, not only Republican but Democrat as well, look at page 627 of the hearings and you will see where the departments had sent up to the office of the Secretary of Defense and then up to the budget certain sums which were asked. These were reduced, even in time of war. Should you think this is confined to Republican administration? You can find what a Democrat, former President Truman, has to say on page 592. General Ridgway did concede there should be some modifications in his language and he did say that there were no threats against him for his views and that he was not seeking to indict anyone.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield briefly to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I would like to ask the gentleman a question with reference to page 47, the Air Force.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I hope the gentleman will excuse me but I would not like to get into that right now.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Very well.

Mr. SCRIVNER. General Ridgway did say that he had had full opportunity to express his views clear on up to the President and that some of them were accepted, and he did say that he felt that airpower had been exaggerated and that he held to the view, and quite properly I agree, that all three services taken together were the real deterrent to war.

So, all in all, there was not anything new in his views. So we can pass from that.

We can summarize briefly the testimony of Secretary Quarles who, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. MAHON, our chairman, has described as the best expert in the Pentagon in the field of research and development. He told us about the future plans, that we were getting into the Air Force an ever-increasing number of guided missiles such as among many others, the Talos, Bomarc, and Falcon and the Matadors already in operation. We had a great deal of talk about missiles. Secretary Robertson and General Schrierer of the Western Development Command gave very comprehensive statements. Some of us thought the general was perhaps a little too optimistic as to it, but he assured us that it could be done by the date fixed, perhaps earlier. As a matter of fact, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] asked Secretary Robertson why it was if we could produce these things we did not fly them and within a couple of days, as though by some sort of telepathy, the Air Force did fly a missile for 2,000 miles, and it could have gone much farther.

The testimony of General Twining, of course, was quite interesting, but because of the limitation of time I will have to be brief that and put some of that in the RECORD.

General Twining is sold on the effectiveness of the Air Force, and quite properly. He said it is good. He told us about many things, including the reason why we did not have a turbo-prop bomber such as the Russians are reported as having. He told us that our jet-type bomber with tankers was more effective for us than the turbo-prop job.

He also stated that he recognized the force and effect and power of Navy Air and Marine Air, and although he did not mention it, I am sure he meant to have included the Air Reserve and the Air National Guard.

He had a lot to say about our Century series of fighters. He felt that our F–102 was superior to anything the Russians had in this field of fighting. Now, the Russians may have more, but they need more, because that is a defensive weapon. If and when the time comes that Russia may build a group of long-range bombers General Twining has indicated that our defense is ready and capable of meeting such an attack should it come.

He also asserted that ours is not a second-class Air Force.

Then, too, he discussed the comparison of quality and quantity of our planes and those of the Soviets.

On page 761 of the Defense Department hearings, General Twining said:

> These comparisons must be qualified. Except to indicate relative effort and progress, matching similar types is meaningless. More meaningful comparisons would be to match our bomber offensive capability against their defenses, including their radar, their fighters, and their missiles. Similarly, we must compare Soviet bomber capability against our defenses.
>
> Our own defenses and Soviet attack capabilities are both increasing. By the time the Soviets have a bomber force large enough and effective enough to wage a global war, our defenses will be formidable. Our present F–100 would be effective against the Soviet Bison, comparable to our B–52, but the Soviet Bison is available now only in limited numbers. By the time the Soviets get a sizable force of Bisons we will have the F–101, F–102, and F–104 in quantity, and this will provide us with an even more effective defensive weapon.
>
> Comparing our attack strength with Soviet defensive strength reduces itself to the question: Can our bombers get through? The Soviets have thousands more jet fighters than we, but they also have an enormous area to defend. In my judgment, the Strategic Air Command continues to have the ability to get through.

If you want to read more of that, turn to page 761 of the defense hearings.

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to take up so much time, but with the interruptions I hope you will pardon me. After all we have been working on this bill for about 4 months and this additional time is merely about 1 minute for each billion dollars of this defense budget.

In closing let me pay a tribute to the Reserve. The Air Reserve is doing a very fine job, as is the Air National Guard. The Air Force knows that when the chips are down, if the bell rings, they must depend upon citizens or civilian soldiers. We know that if war comes the citizen soldier, the weekend soldier, will outnumber the regular force 4 and 5 to 1, just as they did in World War II and just as they did in Korea. The training of these men in the Reserve wings is on a par with the regular Air Force, and many of them, even though they may be putting in only the weekends and drill nights are maintaining their proficiency. They are sacrificing their time from their homes, from their families, from their work and from their vacations in order that the Nation may stay strong.

There are 24 of these Air Reserve wings, tactical, bomber, fighter-bombers, troop carrier, and other support types. There are over 100,000 men operating over 1,200 planes training at over 40 bases and over 100 Air Reserve centers. They deserve a great deal of credit for their defense contributions.

The Air National Guard, which is composed of 27 wings with interceptor, light bombers, and reconnaisance planes are of inestimable value to the security of this Nation. Most, if not all, are D-Day units, ready to go. Many National Guard planes with National Guard pilots are at this very minute on the end of runways throughout this Nation ready to take off with their brother airmen of the Regular Air Force, as a part of the 24-hour alert air-defense program.

Practice alerts show that these 70,000 air guardsmen on their 94 bases with their 2,000 planes which are instantly available are an important part of our airpower, and they all deserve a great deal of credit for their time and effort.

I am sure the members of the Committee on Defense Appropriations will say that the presentation made by all the services through their witnesses this year was the best prepared and the best presented of any year. Their statements were concise, they were factual, they were so full and complete that we did not have to act as cross-examiners and dig out every little facet of information needed to form our judgment.

I firmly believe, as does the chairman of the committee, that this is a sound budget we are asking of you, and I urge the House of Representatives to give its unanimous approval to the bill as we have presented it to you.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation for the cooperation and able assistance given me by the entire subcommittee, particularly by the Army panel, by the committee staff, and, of course, by the chairman of the committee, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], who, incidentally, has just been reelected with the blessings of both Democrats and Republicans in his district. That is bipartisanship of a very satisfactory type.

Mr. Chairman, we feel that in the budget presentation given to the committee this year we received the best presentation that it has been our privilege to hear from the Army. It is obvious that the Army is a hard-working team; it is on the ball; it is doing a job, and it is proud of its accomplishments.

I would like to give you the Army strength figures which are carried in the current budget. At the end of the third quarter of 1956 the Army had a strength of 1,063,500 people. At the end of fiscal 1956 it is calculated that the Army will have 1,040,300. At the end of fiscal 1957 under the budget now before you it is planned that the Army shall have a strength of 1,045,300. These include increased strength figures which have been requested for the Reserve Forces Act and for the distant early warning line.

Now, I would like to point out something that is of more than usual significance in these figures. The original figure programed for fiscal 1956 for the Army under the budget which was first submitted to the Congress a year ago was for 1,010,000 people. That figure was later revised upward to provide for 1,025,000 people at the end of fiscal 1956. Now, obviously, manpower alone does not give a real indication of strength or of effectiveness. However, I must point out that the Army has been subjected, even in recent weeks, to the peaks and valleys type of program which is the most costly type of defense, the type of defense which is injurious to the morale of personnel, and it is the type of defense that does not permit effective long-range planning.

Within the programed military strength we can point to an important accomplishment in that we have more combat units programed for the fiscal 1957 Army than at present. That indicates the Army is making a more effective utilization of its strength, putting more of its men into combat units and fewer men into supply housekeeping, and other noncombat activities.

General Taylor, Army Chief of Staff, testified, however, before us that he considered the optimum strength for the Army at this time would not be 1,045,000, as we are programing for, but 1,300,000, and General Taylor is a great soldier, a military leader whose knowledge is unquestioned.

Now, I do want to say emphatically, that we have a good Army, we have a strong Army, an improved Army, probably the strongest peacetime Army in the history of our country. I must go a step further, however, and say it is not the Army that certain optimistic statements from some highly placed people in our Government have indicated. I think the American public may have gained the impression from some of these statements that we have an Army that can be moved over night from Washington or San Francisco or any other place to Europe or to Korea or to Indochina or to any spot where trouble might develop. That simply is not the situation and it will not be the situation for a long time to come. Our objective is a highly mobile striking force, a striking force with adequate air transportability, with lightweight weapons and equipment, including tanks, and with atomic capabilities. The Army possesses some of all of those qualities. But to leave the impression that today's Army is an air transportable Army, with airborne weapons, which can be moved anywhere in the world almost overnight is simply ridiculous. Because of what has been said or inferred, many people do believe this. When the chips are down we have to admit that we would be straining ourselves materially to move one division to any distant part of the world within a matter of hours, and that they would have to leave the greater part of their heavy equipment behind. That division would possess, however, considerable atomic capabilities.

It boils down to this. We could get a lot more Army if we were willing to spend the money for it. We have taken a chance that the money that we have programed, backed by the recommendations of the people who are expert on defense, makes this an adequate budget for this time. The committee recommends the figures that are to be presented to you today and I shall give you those figures.

The revised 1957 budget estimate, including supplemental funds for the DEW Line and for the Reserve Forces Act is $7,761,425,000 compared with the 1956 appropriation of $7,329,953,000. The committee has recommended a reduction. It recommends an appropriation of $7,497,582,000. That means that the current bill is $263,843,000 below the 1957 revised estimates. But it is $167 million above the 1956 appropriation.

That reduction—and I want to emphasize this—that reduction of $263 million includes $228 million which is the amount budgeted to replace deutschemark support from the German Government; there is some question whether the German Government will continue to provide that deutschemark support for our forces overseas. If it does not, we shall have no choice but to go back and replace all or a considerable part of the $228 million thus deleted.

There is in this bill a rescission of $110 million from the Army Industrial Fund which is to go back into the general fund.

A great part of the money carried in the Army budget is, of course, for military personnel. That amount is $3,556,000,000. These are fixed costs about which very little can be done. They include uniforms, they include food, they include housekeeping costs. Those costs vary little from year to year. There is a slight reduction in the cost of food, not because of less adequate rations but because of reductions in the actual cost in the market.

Maintenance and Operation carries a recommended figure of $2,954,531,000. While this is a reduction of $237 million below the figure requested by the military personnel it is $123 million above the 1956 appropriation. That increase over last year was occasioned by an increase in civilian personnel costs. Although there will be 3,000 fewer civilian workers in the Army this year than last year, their salaries are higher and they cost us a net of more money.

There is a considerable increase here for the Reserve Forces Act. Seventy-three million dollars in additional money is included for the Reserve training program. Seventy-seven million dollars additional is included for research and development. Military construction for Reserves and National Guard carries the full amount of $40 million which was requested by the Army and which is programed and listed in the hearings. Incidentally, a list of the facilities to be constructed appears on pages 1344 through 1350 of the Army hearings.

On Reserve personnel, we have been impressed by the recent showing of progress in the 6 months' training program. It started out slowly. It looked as though it might be a failure. But in recent months there has been a considerable step-up and, as the Army moves into and gains more acquaintance with it, and as the public becomes more fully cognizant of what this program means and offers, we feel it will continue to grow. The Army wanted to budget for 100,000 trainees. Actually they now have 27,000, so it appeared that 100,000 was entirely too optimistic a figure to plan for. As a result, we have made a cut of $8 million in the amount that was requested by the Army. We feel that money will be adequate, but the committee does not want to take the position of limiting either the Reserve training program or the National Guard program, and the committee invites the Army to come back for supplementals if more money is needed in either of these programs.

I should like to touch for a moment upon research and development, because in research and development we have recommended the full amount of the budget estimate, $410 million. This is

$77 million more than was programed for 1956. We feel that it is a good program which possibly is being carried on as rapidly as it should be. There is not complete accord in the committee on that feeling. There is some apprehension that we may not be going fast enough in research.

General Gavin, who is doing an excellent work as head of Research and Development, stated to the committee quite frankly that he could use to great advantage additional money in this program. Yet the fact that there already is in this program $77 million more than we had last year, plus the fact that the Secretary of Defense has $50 million that he can use wherever he wants to in research and development, makes it appear to us that there is enough money in the program. We hope we are right. We certainly have no inclination to limit that essential activity.

Production and procurement, which always is a costly item, does not carry any requests for new funds under this bill but it does carry the approval of an obligational authority for $1,386,000,000. This will come out of money already on hand which has been accumulated in recent years primarily as the result of not buying as much equipment immediately following the Korean war as had been programed. This new obligational authority includes a shift of emphasis to the procurement of new weapons in the fields of guided missiles and aircraft and in the atomic fields. Actually major procurement has been held back awaiting the development of new, more modern weapons and equipment.

In other words, let me say that we have not made major cuts in the Army budget. We do not feel that major cuts are justified. We do not feel that there is room for complacency in considering the world picture. The strength of the Army in personnel has been markedly reduced over the period of the last 3 years. It should not be scaled down further or cut too deeply in fund requests. We cannot with safety go below a certain nucleus of a hard-hitting military force, which we believe we now possess. We feel there still is so much need for improvement of the Army in air transportability, in new-type light weapons, and in atomic capability, that we cannot afford to pare too deeply into the present budget structure of the Army.

A short time ago, the editors of this Nation stated that they considered the Russians are winning the cold war. Certainly, the Soviet peace offensive with its emphasis and achievements in diplomatic and economic spheres of activity cannot be ignored. But the thing that we are primarily concerned with today, as we discuss the military appropriations bill for the fiscal year 1957, is that the Soviets also continue to make decided military progress and that they may be ahead of us in very important fields. A number of national figures believe that the Soviets are ahead of us in guided missiles, one field where I do not think we dare let anybody get ahead of us. Statements made by the Russian leaders indicate that they are cocksure about their progress in guided missiles and that they may know they are ahead of us. Very recently there appeared in some of our leading publications the flat statement that the Russians stole the recent world atomic show which carried emphasis on peacetime utilization of atomic energy. The statement has been made time and again that the Russians are educating and training more scientists and technicians and engineers than we are. I do not think we can afford to be unmoved by these manifestations.

I do not think the Congress is unmoved or unconcerned by these dangers. I do not think Congress can be numbered among those who are complacent about our defense and our military posture in the world. Year after year the Congress in its judgment, and I respect its judgment, has taken the collective best opinions of the Nation's ranking military leaders and has, on the basis of their advice, provided the money which has been deemed essential for the defense job at hand. Although we have to depend on these experts for guidance, there is our own responsibility to evaluate the information which is given to us, and then to give to you the soundest and best recommendations we can advance. And that I confidently believe is the basis upon which today's bill is presented.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation bill for the Department of Defense is a measure of outstanding importance both because of the astronomical sums involved and because of its direct bearing on the safety of our Nation and of the free world.

Providing as it does directly for the expenditure of over $33½ billion, it dwarfs all other current appropriations and roughly equals a half of the budget for fiscal year 1957. Thousands of items included are vital to the well-being of our Armed Forces and many of these items, did time permit, are of such significance as to warrant long and searching discussion. As has been pointed out, this subcommittee has held hearings contained in 7 volumes totaling 6,419 pages of on-the-record testimony, and has heard many hours of additional testimony which, because of its highly classified nature, cannot be printed.

Because of the vastness of the field it would be futile not to admit frankly that in many important instances time and human limitations have not permitted the subcommittee to more than scratch the surface and make spot checks here and there.

Nevertheless, we believe we have marked up a good and sound bill. It is brought to the floor with remarkable unanimity by this committee.

Perhaps it would be well to summarize briefly the problems this bill is designed to meet.

The major objective is simple to define. It is to provide the funds necessary to maintain adequate Armed Forces to protect our country and to so deter aggression against us and the free world that the calamity of war is minimized now and in the foreseeable future.

This requires that we maintain a posture of readiness, not only at the moment and during fiscal 1957, but for many years to come.

We must be capable of meeting on the instant either a so-called brush-fire war or an all-out conflagration. This seriously complicates the necessary posture as we must be ready at all times to meet different types of threats.

A localized outbreak might occur in many different parts of the world. We must have the capacity to check it promptly, lest it spread, irrespective of location and climate. Likewise, we must be ready to react on a moment's notice with devastating force against any aggressor who might initiate World War III and, in case of such a catastrophe, be in a position to hold the enemy at bay while expanding and mobilizing our forces and production for all-out effort.

Another factor of utmost importance is that this posture of readiness must be maintained for an indefinite period. We must not strengthen it as of today or tomorrow at such cost that economic collapse might occur later and make us vulnerable years from now. Our potential enemies are hoping for just that.

Of course, if our economy could afford it, it would be desirable to have larger forces in being. We would be more comfortable if we had more divisions battle ready, more air wings, more fighting ships and marines. There is not one of the Chiefs of Staff but would like to have more men and tools with which to discharge his heavy responsibilities. On the other hand, the larger our standing forces, the greater the drain on our national economy. A radical increase in our forces also would have worldwide political repercussions and intensify rather than reduce present tensions.

Likewise to meet any sudden emergency, the larger the stock of weapons, equipment, and munitions on the shelves—the better, but the rapid obsolescence in many categories makes this dearly expensive if the emergency does not develop in the immediate future. It is also recognized that an assembly line in being, made possible by a stretch-out in procurement, would be of more value in case of an all-out mobilization than to have more of the item completed and in storage. The long lead time necessary to get a new assembly line in operation might well result in a serious shortage at the most critical period. The situation requires maintenance of a large production base capable of rapid expansion but also requires at least a minimum number of skilled workers in many fields and to retain their skills, they must be employed.

The National Security Council, the heads of the departments, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as well as the Bureau of the Budget and numerous other agencies are constantly confronted with these factors in a world where there are constantly changing technical and political conditions.

The bill now before us represents generally the best answer that our leaders have been able to bring forth to meet the complicated requirements.

The active strengths in the Army, Navy, and Air Force have been only slightly increased or, in some instances, slightly reduced.

Emphasis has been placed on securing ever-increasing firepower, mobility, and combat readiness and as a corollary better planes, ships, weapons, missiles, and equipment of all kinds. Speed, power, mobility, and quality are everywhere important. A well-balanced team on the ground, at sea, and in the air is essential and is what this bill seeks to provide.

Research and development always is and should be of top importance.

We believe that this measure contains adequate financing for research and development which, because of its very uncertainty and the indefinite time elements involved should be kept up constantly at nearly maximum level, year after year, regardless of the size of forces in being.

At long last a determined and promising effort is being made to build up our Reserves. This bill contains sufficient funds to meet current estimates in this important area and our committee has made clear that if there is greater acceleration than anticipated, it will gladly recommend additional funds when needed. Well-trained reserve and National Guard units will reduce the necessity of larger active forces and provide adequate security at much less cost.

Much has been heard of late of the importance of missiles in general and the midrange and intercontinental ballistic missile in particular. The testimony indicates that this bill contains about all the financial support that can be effectively used for missiles. It provides for some duplication which, though highly expensive is wise, and in fact a necessary precaution. We cannot afford to put all our eggs in one basket and we cannot afford to discard old and proved weapons and methods for new and untried although probably better ones. The cost must be met as necessary insurance until the new and better have been fully tried and tested.

Also we must be ready for the alternate types of emergencies I mentioned earlier. Weapons like an H-bomb with megatons of destructive force cannot be used in many situations. The foot soldier with bayonet and hand grenade at times is the only practical means of meeting the requirements. We must possess a large inventory of weapons and a variety of means of transportation, and be capable of great flexibility in their use.

In broad terms then, this is the problem this bill seeks to solve. The order is huge and so is the cost. On its overall sufficiency rides our fate and that of the free nations of the world.

The whole must be coordinated and kept in balance, and this is a task requiring the best brains and judgment of our leading experts, and they have been called on to give us just that. It is something that should not be altered piecemeal. If it is changed here and there it may throw the whole picture out of balance and destroy what is meant to be a carefully rounded out whole.

It would be easy to recommend funds to supply more planes or defense weapons, but overspending would, if carried too far, upset the national economy. Also, it is not sound business in any field to be weighed down by a surplus of spare parts. This not only applies to spare parts in the military sense but also to such things as engines for planes that do not exist, or to supply planes which you cannot use because there are not trained crews or maintenance men to handle them or airfields and bases from which they can operate, as our distinguished committee chairman mentioned in his remarks.

The emphasis should be on reorganizing to meet the new changing conditions.

One thing, I think, that has been made particularly clear to us is that, certainly, there is no sign of a push-button type of war in the foreseeable future where the foot soldier or the man with the bayonet, the man who can go in and hold and retain ground and keep order, will be replaced by machinery. We need ground forces today as crucially as we have ever needed them, but they are undergoing a great deal of transformation occasioned by the rapid changes in firepower because of new weapons and also the defensive problems that are involved in new deployments, wider areas of battle, which are envisaged as a part of an atomic war. With that comes more complication in communications. There is a great deal of money in this bill to provide adequate communication systems in this electronic age.

Another thing that is particularly gratifying in the reports of this year with respect to the Army and with respect also to the other services is that the efforts of the Congress and of the Defense Department to improve conditions or to improve fringe benefits and to make service life more attractive seems to have begun to pay off. There is nothing more expensive than constantly training new recruits. It is rather interesting to note that reenlistments in the Regular Army in 1954 were at a rate of 21.1 percent. By 1955 they had jumped to 60.2 percent and for the first half of 1956 to 64.8 percent. It gives us a great deal more for the taxpayer's money when a trained veteran reenlists. We have not only a better Army because we have trained men right there, but it also means that we do not have to have another trained man detailed to instruct. So the quality of our Army has improved materially. The providing of better living conditions and better advantages for our service people seems to be paying real dividends.

Another thing the Army has done, and I think it is to be commended, is the emphasis that has been put on using as many people in actual combat positions as possible rather than to have a big overhead of noncombat troops. The figures on that are very interesting, too. In 1950 the ratio of combat forces to all forces in the Army was 1 to 1.63. As of now and programed for the coming fiscal year it is 1 to 1.1, a drop of more than 50 percent.

We have discussed the reduction in forces. However, it is believed that our Army even though it is not as large as some would like does carry tremendous fighting power. One of the things that is obvious and on which a great deal of work is going forward is transportation of all sorts and communications of all sorts that I mentioned before. Some of that involves air development, helicopters, and special-purpose planes, which do not, to any great degree, come under the scope of the Air Force or Navy missions. When you hear about the 4,000 planes or aircraft that the Army is working on, do not be confused about that. There is no duplication there because, as a matter of fact, there are many functions that are necessary in modern battle where you need to get up in the air, which is not flying in the accepted sense of long flights or of the type of flights that is allocated to the Air Force and the Navy Air Force. We have to build up an air branch in the Army if we are to have a thoroughly modern Army, one that can be deployed correctly and efficiently.

The Navy is emphasizing new developments, too. Nuclear propelled submarines have revolutionized many things. There is more emphasis not only on missiles but on ships that will carry the missiles.

Mr. Chairman, I think I can assure the members of this committee that we have a dedicated team working in the Defense Department. Personalities may appeal to one more than another, but by and large I have never had the privilege of working with finer civilian and military officials than have come down and told their story to our committee. As my panel chairman has said, I think we have had the best justifications and the best presented case by the various agencies that have appeared before us that we have had in my experience.

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

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am quite sure that my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER], will agree with me when I make this statement, I think that we now have the finest liaison between the Members of the Congress and the Pentagon that we have ever had. The members of the liaison staff are extraordinarily fine, outstanding officers and agents, and they do a remarkable job for the Members of the Congress. No longer does it take two or more weeks to receive answers to congressional mail. They are really on the job, and I am sure the gentleman will be glad to make a statement in their behalf in connection with his presentation today.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I fully concur with the statement of the gentleman with respect not only to the liaison officers but all personnel in the Armed Forces that have been specially delegated to work with the Congress. They have done an outstanding job as a whole, and they have been well chosen for the assignments.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, this bill deals with $36 billion, and it is obvious that this House is reconciled to the acceptance of this bill and this report by this committee, because, while we are talking about military matters, there is not a corporal's guard on the floor.

There are not 36 people here, hardly $1 billion a Member, as of this hour of the debate. Of course, I am satisfied, as I look about me to see who is here, that a great degree of appreciation and intelligence for the problem before the House is ably met by the Members who are present.

Mr. Chairman, I find this room today thick with an atmosphere of omniscient complacency, and out of an abundance of caution, if for no other reason, I violently take exception and beg to disagree with that attitude toward this bill and toward the circumstances with which it deals: the status of national defense.

I would like to begin by referring for a minute to the attitude of the Secretary of Defense to acts of Congress dealing with appropriations for national defense. Last year you will recall I was active in protesting and objecting to the Department of Defense demanding a cut in the Marine Corps of 15,000 men; this great elite combat corps of which we are so proud and the Nation is so proud. This Congress saw fit to agree with me and to disagree with the Secretary of Defense. And this Congress assisted, by passing the appropriation bill and restoring to the Marines 15,000 men and the necessary dollars for the support thereof.

That bill became law, was signed by the President of the United States. Despite that fact, the Secretary of Defense in his wisdom refused to utilize that money and refused to raise the Marine Corps 15,000 additional men.

Further than that, Mr. Chairman, he has imposed upon it this year a force strength which amounts to a cut of an additional 4,000-plus men.

At the hearings of the Defense Subcommittee this year I said to him, "Did you not in effect veto an act of Congress?"

And he said, "Yes."

I asked him if he consulted the President and he said, "No."

I asked him if he consulted the Attorney General on such a delicate and highly controversial constitutional question of law as between the administrative and the legislative; and he said, "No."

I asked him if he consulted the Chief Counsel of his own department, and he said, "No," that in his judgment he would not agree with the action of the Congress.

This very day, Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a statement from the Associated Press, taken from our ticker in the corridor, which shows that that same question was raised in the other body, when the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, Mr. CHAVEZ asked Mr. Wilson the same question on this problem:

Wilson said be believed Congress came to a "pretty snappy decision" last year in providing for an increase in the Pentagon-proposed manpower level for the Marine Corps.

Subcommittee Chairman CHAVEZ wanted to know why the Defense Department had asked to shift extra funds Congress voted last year in order to put 215,000 Marines in uniform.

Wilson said the Joint Chiefs of Staff had agreed on a personnel allotment of 193,000 Marines and the Corps itself "had not asked" for the increase. There had been sentiment in CHAVEZ's group for the higher level.

"While I wanted to give due consideration to what the committee had suggested," Wilson said—

I repeat this for the purpose of emphasis. Here is a beau geste, indeed. Quoting Mr. Wilson:

"While I wanted to give due consideration to what the committee had suggested—"

And add this parenthesis from me. We are certainly grateful for that consideration at least.

"I didn't think it was quite proper for a committee to set the force level exactly, especially without hearings."

For that reason, Wilson said, he decided as a compromise to leave the Marines where they were—

He decided—

between 200,000 and 205,000.

Now that is the situation. The Congress proposes and the Secretary of Defense disposes. And that is the end of that, constitutionally and every other way, in case, Mr. Chairman, you are still interested.

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

Mr. FLOOD. Yes, of course.

Mr. FORD. Would it not be fair to say at this point that the amendment to which the gentleman referred in reference to the Marine Corps Fund for the fiscal year 1956 was defeated in this body. It prevailed in the other body by a 1-vote margin. In conference I believe $47 million was made available for this additional increment of about 15,000. After the appropriation bill was signed the facts are, I believe, that instead of going down to the ceiling as recommended by the President for the current fiscal year they went down about half way or thereabouts. The net result was that there was a compromise between the figure approved by the Congress and the figure recommended in the President's budget for fiscal 1956.

Mr. FLOOD. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan I have been quoting Mr. Wilson, and I think Mr. Wilson is a far superior authority on what he did or what he thinks than I. But the fact does remain that the Act of Congress was as I stated, and the fact also remains that Mr. Wilson did exactly what he told the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. FORD. The point I am making is that the sum of $47 million, which was the amount for the additional personnel for the Marine Corps for 1956, was used in part, and there were more men kept on active duty for the Marine Corps during this fiscal year than had originally been planned.

Mr. FLOOD. Except, and this is the point I make, that the Secretary of Defense did not comply with the Act of Congress.

Mr. FORD. Of course, he has ample precedent for that in the case of the previous administration.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman is going to follow me and he will do it well and ably. He knows the point I make. I know the point he makes. I hold a brief for nobody. I am not writing an editorial, I am merely reporting the facts. The record will establish all this.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, in addition I am concerned about the status of the Army. I was going to propose in due course an amendment to the Army bill asking that one more division be restored to the Army. I want you to know, Mr. Chairman, that the Chief of Staff of the Army, who knows far more about this problem than I do, and even you, Mr. Chairman, tells my committee, and I am on the Army panel, that to do the job he thinks should be done under all the circumstances the United States Army should be next year 1,300,000 men. That is the testimony of the Chief of Staff of the Army, not mine. Next year the administration is going to give the Army a little over 1 million men. They will have at least 275,000 men short of what the Chief of Staff of the Army says and thinks he should have. Oh, of course he agrees with the budget. Oh, of course he accepts the budget. Oh, of course he goes along with the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I am just telling you what he told my committee. You draw your own conclusions. Your Army will be short 275,000 men to do the best job that could be done. You are not going to get the best job with 1 million men, says the Chief of Staff of the Army, not me.

I wanted to raise that one division, $117 million, less than 22,000 men. I am satisfied that amendment will not prevail. I am satisfied this House is reconciled to the report and the action of this committee, and there is no sense of my flying in the face of them under that circumstance. I dissent. I cannot agree. If it were in my power, Mr. Chairman, I would vote the money for maintenance and supply, for materiel, and for men to raise the United States Army to that figure which the Chief of Staff says he can do the best job on under the circumstances existing in the world today, to 1,300,000 men.

Here is the situation. We do not have the biggest or the best army in the world—we do not have it. The pride of our Nation since we were born has been the power and the might of our Army. We do not have the biggest and the best army in the world today—somebody else has—we do not. We do not have the biggest and the best Air Force in the world today—somebody else has. We do not have the biggest and the best submarine fleet in the world today—somebody else has. We do not have the biggest and the best merchant marine in the world today—somebody else has. What have we left? What have we left? That is the situation. We are no longer top dog. Somebody is bigger than we are. Somebody is more powerful than we are in various areas—too many areas. We are settling—we want to make a deal—we are not the biggest, the strongest, the most powerful. The American people think so—well, they are wrong. That is no longer the case. If the American people know the truth—if the American people had the facts, and if the American people are satisfied with the second best Air Force, then that is up to the American people and I will not disagree with them, but I am sure they do not want it that way. I am sure they do not know it that way. But that is the way it is. He who prefers peace and prosperity in that situation must debate with me. I am not

that interested in balancing a budget—I am not that interested in getting elected. I am concerned more with the national security beyond question—beyond reasonable doubt, than I am with a balanced budget in an election year. Make this very clear, Mr. Chairman—I do not say that we are weak and defenseless. There is very little said by my colleagues today with which I can too much disagree on quality of men or nobility of performance in the records of our Army and Navy and Air. I find no quarrel and certainly I do not challenge. That is the way the situation is. Now this is the problem. Here are the two questions. I am not challenging the integrity or the patriotism of anybody in the Pentagon.

Certainly, Mr. Wilson and the civil Secretaries of Army, Navy, Air, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff are honest and sincere and loyal and patriotic Americans. I would be the first to defend any one of those men against any attack on those qualities, and I would do it proudly knowing I was right and the accuser and the attacker would be wrong. But is it lese majeste, Mr. Chairman, for me to disagree? Do I fly in the face of the gods in the House of Representatives if I cannot concur? Is that a question to my integrity and to my patriotism and to my honesty? I am sure no one will say me yea. So hear me, Mr. Chairman, this is the question—not the affirmative arguments made by my friend: How good the Air Force is; how good the Army is; and how great and good the Navy and their records are. With that I concur, but hear this: Has the administration decided that supremacy in the air is too costly and must yield to the balancing of the budget. Has there been a top-level decision that it is not necessary to stay ahead of Russia; that maintenance of a striking, yet not superior, long-range bomber force would be sufficient? Mr. Chairman, thereby hangs a tale. Has there for the first time in the history of the United States been a change at the highest level of the administration's defense policy that that is what is going to happen? Do you believe that the American people want to accept the fact that we are going to be a second best long-range bomber force, simply because our overall airpower is safe and good? I say, Mr. Chairman, that no matter what the effect, no matter what the strength or ability of the overall airpower, Marine, Navy, National Guard, Reserve and all the rest, I say the American people will never accept an administration policy which says that the long-range bomber Air Force of the United States must be second to anybody, regardless of what the airpower is in every arm of our department.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Yesterday the Secretary of Defense said something about fearmongers, those who defend the strength of our military defense and so on. Does the gentleman have any comment on that subject?

Mr. FLOOD. The Secretary of Defense has a special and peculiar genius for saying the wrong thing at the wrong time. That is just another glaring example.

Mr. Chairman, let us inquire for a minute about the bomber. It has been emphasized today that our medium bombers B–47, of which we have some 1,400, is a great striking bomber force; and nothing could be truer than that. That is great. We are lucky to have them. I am delighted, and so are you. That is the reason given for allaying your fears about the lack of a great B–52 long-range heavy striking force. Do not worry about that, we are told. Suppose we are No. 2 to Russia in heavy long-range bombers. Suppose they have a greater striking heavy bomber force than we have; we have the great medium-range bomber force that with tankers can cover a 1,500-mile radius. We have got them spotted in our positions all around the perimeter of Russia. There is where my friends fail in their thinking. Where are the bases from which these bombers must take off and to which they must return? In the United States? No. Not in our Territorial possessions? No. Every one of these bomber bases is in foreign territory, under the jurisdiction of a foreign sovereign power, north, east, south, and west. Let me direct your attention to the political instability on the face of the earth today. Let me direct your attention to the political instability of these allies, alleged allies and neutrals, where our bomber bases are located. Let me direct your attention to the fact that Soviet Russia has perfected a 1,500-mile ballistic missile, every one of them directed to and aimed at our bomber bases in those foreign countries. Let me ask you when the lid goes off what will be the first thing struck? In 1 hour against our bomber bases for our medium bomber planes, and then where are you? Where are you if even a part of that attack would succeed? Yes. Some of our medium bombers and sacrifice planes might get through.

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Those things are all true, but I say out of an abundance of caution if for no other reason, in keeping with the great purpose of the defense forces of this Nation, that upon ourselves we depend when the chips are down when we know we must, as we always have.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, in this business there is no margin for error; no margin for error is pemitted in national defense, none; and in this budget there is absolutely no margin for error.

Let me point out to you what I mean. Secretary Wilson in testifying before the other body's committee yesterday said:

> This is an austere budget; this is a minimal budget; this is pared right down to the last dollar. There is no margin, there is nothing extra; this is right down to the limit; we have no cushion.

Let me call your attention to page 41 of this committee's report on this bill, and here I read the Air Force statement made by Gen. Nathan Twining, Air Force Chief of Staff:

> The program I have outlined in the budget for fiscal year 1957 is austere. It meets only our most essential needs on a minimum basis. To keep this minimum program going and to reach and support 137 wings, will require an increased budget in 1958.

What is there sacred about 1958? Is it just because it is an even number? Mr. Chairman, I will tell you what will happen in 1958. The minute November of 1956 this election year passes you will see requests for money coming to this Congress next year asking for another couple of billion dollars for the Air Force. A B–52 costs $8 million. Thirty B–52's cost $240 million.

Let me tell you what the problem is besides that: You must have the runways, you must have the airbases and you must have the personnel. We do not have them. Do you know that? We do not have them.

Not only do we not have the B–52's, we do not have the air bases from which to fly them if we did have them; and if we did have the airbases and if we did have the big bombers themselves we do not have the crews to man them anyhow; and the crews we do have are getting out of the Air Force. Ninety percent of them at the end of their 4-year hitch are leaving the Air Force. Why? Because you take care of everybody else. The goose hangs high, peace, prosperity, everybody eats high on the hog, everybody is driving a General Motors automobile, everybody has a beautiful house, but not the personnel in the defense establishments. You have your Air Force wives, your Air Force personnel, and your Air Force children. At Sidi-Slimane and other Air Force bases in North Africa they live like cattle, having to go to outdoor latrines, living in tents in the desert summer and winter.

You have no housing for the defense people, you do not educate them, you do not give them a chance, you do not properly care for their dependants, you do not give them a proper medical program for their dependants, you do not give them a proper life insurance program, you do not pay the enlisted man in any branch of the service, the Air Force especially, proper money. You pay them according to grade, you pay them according to their classification; you do not pay them according to skills.

And let me tell you what happens, Mr. Chairman. Talk about the great plane orders, remember this: If you had 100 B–47 bombers on the line tonight do you know that 30 percent of them could not take off? Thirty percent of your 100 bombers could not leave the ground; and of the 70 that did take off, 15 of them would turn back because of mechanical defects. In other words, only 55 of your 100 bombers could get going. Do you know that? We do not hear about that; but that is the way it is, because you have not the crews, you do not pay them, and you cannot keep them. I do not blame them. How would you like to be a crew chief working alongside of me? I leave the Air Force at the end of my hitch, say that was 30 days ago. Now, I come back as a technical representative hired by the Air Force getting $1,200 a month. Last month I was your buddy in the barracks.

Now I work as a civilian alongside of you. You get $250. I say to you, "Hello, sucker." What is a man going to do when his hitch is up? He is going to get out of the Air Force. He is going to get his $1,200 as a civilian and work alongside of your son getting $250 a month. That is what is the matter, too.

Do not stand up here and tell me, Mr. Chairman, about the great Air Force we have. You do not have it. But we must have it. What good is an Air Force if you cannot put it in the air and keep it there. You do not have the B–52's, you do not have the air bases to put them on, you do not have the crews to keep them there. That is where your Air Force is. Those are things you must examine.

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

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Is it not true, may I ask the gentleman, if in the bill now before us there is a projected congressional cut of $236,465,000 in the budget as submitted by the President and Commander in Chief?

Mr. FLOOD. That is right, and I am against that. Is that clear? Let me add this, too: Much has been made today about the foreign aid bill and what is in the foreign aid bill. I refer to the President's foreign aid bill. Men have come down here today and defended this budget, to which I object as not good enough or big enough, for the national defense to balance the budget. I am not interested in balancing the budget if I think national defense is in jeopardy. These men say they are against the President's foreign aid bill. Let me tell you, I am against this budget and I am for the President's foreign aid bill. I am for giving the President every dime he wants for next year and for the next 10 years if he wants it. Put that in your pipe and smoke it.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I thought the gentleman said just a little while ago that the situation throughout the world, or in most parts of the world, was very unstable

Mr. FLOOD. There is no question about that.

Mr. GROSS. Well, we have spent $60 billion and we have received nothing for it.

Mr. FLOOD. I am not interested in that. I am interested in paying a very expensive premium on an absolutely necessary insurance policy. That is what I will pay for and I know what the facts are.

Mr. GROSS. What good is an insurance policy if we have already spent $60 billion and have produced no friends in the world.

Mr. FLOOD. I am not interested in friends. You cannot buy friends any more than you can buy the love of a woman. I want security. I have the money and I will pay for it.

Mr. GROSS. After we have spent $60 billion?

Mr. FLOOD. That is for what we have today and we have this roof over the head of the Congress, here in this Capitol. That is worth $60 billion of anybody's money.

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

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. Although the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I may have some differences on this bill, I should like to emphasize one point which he has made that is not tied in with the foreign-aid bill frequently enough. If we do not appropriate enough money under the foreign-aid bill, the military part of it, we would undoubtedly have to make a substantial increase in the military funds for our own forces. Under the foreign-aid bill we are able to get substantial land, sea, and air support, which we get more cheaply than we would if we had to do it entirely on our own. I agree entirely with the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I thank the gentleman from Michigan. Let me pay him the highest form of compliment that I can think of. I could not have said that better myself.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other thing I want to add and that has to do with air tankers. Let me emphasize to you—I do not think you know—the United States of America has no air tankers for B–52 bombers. Let me repeat that. The United States of America has no air tankers for B–52 bombers. Do you know that? Your air tankers are for your medium-type bombers. I might add that the best of our intelligence and information indicates that as far as we know the Russians have no air tankers of any kind that we so far are able to determine, and our Air Force has perfected the technique of air tankers for use with our 1,500-mile B–47 medium bombers. We have a done a beautiful job on that. There is much more on this bill I want to say but my time is up.

Mr. Chairman, I include as part of my remarks an article appearing in the Reader's Digest as well as articles appearing in the Washington Post and Times Herald, the Evening Star, and an article dealing with General LeMay's statement before the Senate investigating subcommittee:

[From the Reader's Digest of May 1956]

DO WE WANT THE SECOND-BEST AIR FORCE?

(By Francis and Katharine Drake)

(The first of two articles telling what must be done for the United States Air Force at once if Soviet Russia is to be deterred from ever starting World War III. Written after 4 years of patient research at Air Force bases across the world, this is the story of men, the humiliating record of how a great Nation is treating those on whom it depends for its very existence. The second article will concern machines—the truth about the combat planes our Air Force has and others it desperately needs.)

Creeping paralysis is today overtaking our entire Air Force. One-third of our planes are grounded for lack of sufficient skilled men to keep them flying. In Strategic Air Command, the world's No. 1 peace-enforcer, 30 percent of our precious global bombers are earthbound, powerless to strike back at an aggressor. In Tactical Air Command (responsible for shorter missions) it is the same story. In Air Defense Command (entrusted with the defense of our cities), hundreds of our latest jet fighters are unflyable in battle.

This shocking situation is of formidable important to the Nation. Unless it can be remedied, it will eat the heart out of our ability to deter aggression. World War III can be prevented only so long as we can maintain peace by deadlock, i. e., promise total destruction to any aggressor starting total war. Our planes must be able to take off at the drop of a hat and cancel out many hundreds of key enemy targets in one great saturation attack. We are losing this vital ability.

It is a grim fact that today, out of every 100 of our global bombers, 30 are grounded at any one time. Moreover, of the remaining 70 that take off, 15 more have to turn back because of malfunction in the air. Only 55 can be depended on to strike their targets. These appalling figures are not guesswork. They derive from current practice missions.

This wholesale breakdown in combat readiness is due to one main factor: the inability of the Air Force to hang on to its skilled help. Recent dropouts have been as follows: 1954, 186,000 failed to reenlist; in 1955, 213,000; in the first half of fiscal 1956, the rate has risen to 280,000.

The critical part of these losses is that the dropout rate is highest among the men who are needed most—the skilled technicians who are the mainstay of the service. In SAC, for example, 80 percent of the K-system-bombsight mechanics eligible to quit in 1955 did so; so did 88 percent of the radar technicians, 81 percent of the electronic experts, and 75 percent of the jet-engine mechanics. In that year 42,600 of SAC's trained men left the Air Force.

Because of these losses SAC is only 50-percent manned in the high-skilled levels. Its flight personnel has been similarly hard hit. Today its brilliant flying teams cannot fully muster even 1 crew apiece for its global bombers, whereas we should have 2 crews for each ship.

To replace these losses the Air Force is perpetually enlisting fresh volunteers. But it's an endless struggle: no less than 90 percent of the newly trained skilled technicians quit at the end of their first 4-year term. This means that the average skill of our airmen is constantly sinking. Modern combat planes are tremendously complicated weapons, involving a total of 239 assorted skills. Men who work on them need long and costly training. It takes an enlistee 3 years to qualify for bomber maintenance; it costs $25,000 for his training. It takes 5 years and costs $618,000 to train the triple-rated commander of a B–47. When such men quit, not only does their training cost go down the drain but the same amount again must be forthcoming to train replacements.

In 1955 personnel losses in SAC alone cost the taxpayer $837 million. Losses for the entire Air Force totaled no less than $2 billions. In short, taxpayers are being forced to pay for the training of 10 men to retain 1.

What is back of this mass walkout? Why are so many of our most capable young men turning their backs on an Air Force career? The answer is twofold. First, pay at the skilled levels is miserably low, far below that offered by industry. Second, living conditions are miserably inadequate.

There is a public impression that all service families enjoy the life of Riley—free housing, free medical care, generous insurance, income-tax exemption, cut-rate buying at base stores—fringe benefits that traditionally bridged the gap between service and industry pay. This is not true. Today fringe benefits are all but nonexistent. The Government has reneged on them.

To appreciate the predicament of tens of thousands of Air Force personnel, suppose

we trail Airman Bill Smith through his first hitch.

Bill is 19 when he joins the Air Force, intelligent, ambitious. Classified for radar training, he spends the first 30 months rewardingly enough, his head in a book or over a workbench, learning his job from master technicians, training for duty in SAC. Living in barracks he has few expenses, few complaints.

Then he makes airman first class ($140 a month before taxes), sends for his girl, marries and applies for family housing. The recruiting promise was free housing for married personnel—but SAC has 90,000 families and only 16,800 houses. Instead of free quarters, Bill is given the regulation $77 a month allowance to rent civilian accommodations in the nearest town, 15 miles distant (most bases are isolated), plus $1.05 a day for food.

There are plenty of areas where $77 would rent comfortable quarters; but the vicinity of a large, underhoused airbase is not one of them. For every vacancy, many applicants line up. When landlords see uniforms, rents soar; like most civilians, landlords think Uncle Sam pays for everything. Near some bases, especially in the South, Air Force families are paying as much as $100 a month for unheated wooden shacks with outdoor privies. Overall, there are some 250,000 Air Force families who are forced to chip in $20 to $50 a month above their quarters allowance for shelter.

The Smiths finally get a furnished apartment for $95, including utilities. Besides this, Bill must dip into his own pocket for around $20 a month for gas and oil to commute to and from the base daily. After paying rent, taxes, gasoline, there is $29 a week left out of his pay and allowances for living. Food averages $15 a week. That leaves the Smiths exactly $2 a day between them for clothing, supplies, spending money.

Mrs. Bill figures on economizing by shopping at the post exchange, where discount prices are supposedly traditional. She has an uppercut coming. She finds that food prices are no cheaper, frequently higher than downtown; stocks are restricted, selections less attractive and there are no specials. The newlyweds require some basic equipment. They find an electric grill priced at $23.50 in the PX; the duplicate sells for $17.50 downtown. An identical set of dishes sells for $1.55 more at the PX than in the five-and-ten. When Bill squawks, he is told that base stores are now forced to make high profits and turn them over to welfare funds for swimming pools and other recreational facilities which Bill, in common with the public, assumed were paid for by the Government. (In 1955, SAC PX's alone turned in no less than $3 million net profits to welfare funds.)

The grapevine gives Bill the background of this squeeze play. Retail merchants have an aversion to low-priced sales by the Government to servicemen. Their powerful lobbies are agitating in Washington to have base stores closed altogether, have already succeeded in restricting their stocks, raising their prices, imposing a 3½ percent surtax on all foods and a 10-percent tax on all PX sales—a strange gesture of gratitude to the airmen who are protecting their homes and families.

About this time Bill junior is on the way, and Mrs. Bill runs smack into one of the bitterest of all service grievances—lack of th promised medical care. The Air Force, overall, is 40 percent short of sufficient doctors, nurses, beds, facilities, equipment, even drugs, to care for its uniformed personnel alone. In SAC there are only 413 doctors to handle 180,000 men, scattered all over the world. The 304,000 SAC wives and children must make do with whatever care is left over. Men rate prior attention at all times; wives and children, even emergency cases, are often kept waiting for hours.

Of the doctors provided, over 80 percent are draftees fresh out of medical school, almost all of whom quit as soon as their 2-year hitch is up. There are no house calls, even for patients too ill to be moved. Only a minority of Air Force babies can be born at base hospitals, for lack of facilities. A shocking proportion of their mothers suffer from inexperienced handling and are forced to undergo subsequent repair work. At one of our largest bases, a veteran medical officer, a career doctor, told the authors: "Don't worry about exaggerating our troubles. It isn't possible. No matter when we get through there are always 50 more waiting outside."

At Bill's base there is no obstetrician, virtually no prenatal care, no guaranty of a bed when the time comes. The Smiths wind up doing what most Air Force couples have to do. They borrow from their families, get a civilian doctor and junior is born at the city hospital. From then on, the battle of the budget, on $2 a day, becomes a nightmare of spaghetti menus, patched shoes, evaporating savings.

But there are things on the credit side too. There is the sense of fraternity shared only by men who stand guard over their country, the pride of belonging to an elite corps. Then too, an air base is a sociable place and, with hundreds of families in the same fix, nobody puts on airs, troubles are shared, everyone helps out. Dependents' Mutual Assistance, a volunteer organization started by Mrs. Curtis LeMay (wife of SAC's fighting boss), is a lifesaver at SAC, especially during those long weeks when men are away on global missions.

There comes the great day when Bill, superbly trained, master now of the most secret equipment in the Air Force, is tapped by SAC for the big stuff; he is aglow at having been found worthy of such great responsibility. He works with tough, dedicated men, from whom a nod of approval counts for more than a page of praise from anyone else. Hearing those eight screaming jets blast his B–52 in from a global mission, listening to the blow-by-blow from her crew, is an incomparable thrill. Bill becomes proudly possessive, my crew, my plane. He averages 14 hours a day making sure that his job is perfectly done. But now comes the career haymaker.

With its critical shortage of maintenance men, SAC is obliged to hire technical representatives from industry to help out. Often as not these technical representatives are ex-airmen themselves, trained at the taxpayers' expense. Working alongside Bill on identical jobs, the civilians are earning up to $1,200 a month, compared to Bill's $247 (including allowances). When Bill thinks about reenlisting, the facts of life on the outside are brought home to him.

Here they are: Everywhere big industrial concerns are desperate for skilled help. Their representatives visit every base, their advertisements fill every paper. Highly paid jobs are waiting for all trained Air Force technicians. A C–124 panel engineer, drawing $194 from the Air Force, can make $545 for the same job with an airline. A master sergeant, drawing $400, can make $745 on the outside. A line chief, earning $375, is offered $600 as an airline lead mechanic.

These are only starting wages. Opportunities for promotion are unlimited. Firms are gunning for tens of thousands of additional skilled men over the next 5 years. The blandishments of industry, quite aside from high wages, are multiple and persuasive. They include the 40-hour week, paid vacations, group medical and dental care, moving allowances, retirement schemes and, frequently, valuable profit-sharing privileges.

The Smiths put in some sober thinking, but no amount of figuring can alter the essentials. The Air Force offer: a $639 bonus to reenlist; present pay $247 a month; eventual top pay, $450 a month; eventual pension, $152 a month after 20 years' service. The industry offer: present pay $550 a month, unlimited opportunity for advancement, and valuable fringe benefits. Bill has to decide what is best for his wife and baby. He quits.

The factors impelling enlisted men to leave the Air Force apply equally to officers. Officer pay checks are bigger, but so are the demands upon them, including regular assessments for charities (non-service), clubs, incessant entertaining of VIP's and Congressmen. Out of 2,500 SAC pilots eligible to quit before 1958, no fewer than 2,000 plan to do so. This will have the alarming result of breaking up no less than 1,000 combat-ready crews. Who can blame these young men, when industry is waiting with pay scales which within 2 years will enable them to earn more than a brigadier general, in 8 years to earn more than a 4-star chief of staff of the Air Force! (A chief of staff earns $15,000 a year; a senior airline captain up to $20,000.)

If conditions in this country are unhappy, those prevailing at our bases abroad are worse. Even in up-to-date countries like England and France, thousands of our service families are living in privation. In Japan conditions are disgraceful, but the low point comes in Africa.

French Morocco, the Air Force's greatest overseas bastion, has been the scene of indiscriminate bombing and shooting. Here USAF families are quartered as much as 65 miles from bases; they live in insanitary, jerry-built houses, near turbulent native areas, without telephones, transportation or protection. In Sidi-Slimane, wives and children, hurriedly rescued from impending mob violence, have had to be housed for months in canvas tents pitched on mud 2 feet thick. For lack of barracks, airmen are crowded into wood-and-canvas Dallas huts, which leak in winter and are insupportable in the desert heat of summer. With few French doctors available, hospitals (mostly of the quonset hut type) are inhumanly crowded.

At one of them, staffed by 4 doctors for 5,000 souls, the authors saw men, women, and children crowded into the same ward. Male patients were required to use outside latrines in all weather. Women and children shared a single toilet which, shielded by a sheet, was in a cubicle occupied by a dying woman. Americans would burn with shame to hear foreigners snickering at the way in which the richest country in the world treats some of its finest young people.

The mass walkout caused by Air Force living conditions is gravely imperiling the advantage we have enjoyed over Russia. The Soviet Air Force has no trouble in keeping its skilled men. The reason is not, as many might suppose, the duress of the slave state. On the contrary, the Russians have made their Air Force careers so attractive, so laden with honor and prestige, that volunteers throng to join it. Soviet air officers enjoy the top 5 percent of the national living scale, with a standard of comfort excelled only by the Politburo. Their pay—nearly three times that of the infantry—is untaxed. Only the best housing is good enough for them. Many supplies, including uniforms and cigarettes, are free. They rate a 50-percent discount at all stores and restaurants and on all forms of transportation. A single valor decoration entitles the wearer to free travel for life. Enlisted men share the same benefits in proportion to their ranks and skills.

Secretary for Air Donald A. Quarles sums up the USAF problem thus: "I can think of no invention, no new aircraft, no weapon, that would increase our Air Force capability in a measure so great as would be achieved by providing a stable corps of trained personnel."

If peace by deadlock is to be preserved, the Secretary's goal must be achieved. It can be achieved if the Congress, supported by the

people, wills it. After 4 years of researching Air Force personnel problems at home and abroad, evaluating the living conditions of officers, airmen, and their families, it is the belief of the authors that it would require the following minimum program to reach the goal:

Pay: The present Air Force method of paying by rank should be replaced by the industry system of paying by skill, and pay will have to be increased by at least 50 percent for the highest skills. (A recent Gallup poll showed that taxpayers were almost 3-to-1 in favor of raising service pay.) This move would actually save money, for it is cheaper to raise a skilled man's pay from $3,000 to $5,000, providing he reenlists, than it is to spend $25,000 a year to train his replacements.

Since even a 50-percent raise will still not equal the pay offered by industry, the difference must be made up by (a) restoring the $1,500 tax-exemption formerly granted servicemen, and (b) restoring the fringe benefits that have traditionally formed part of service pay, as follows:

Housing: Construction must be radically stepped up. The Air Force is 250,000 units shy; it has only 20,000 under construction for the whole of 1956. There is a way to build the necessary houses and still save the taxpayers' money. The Air Force is now paying out $450 million a year in quarters allowances. This money disappears into the pockets of civilian landlords. Under the Capehart law, however, the Air Force has the power to order new houses, assume the mortgages and pay them off out of this same quarters allowance. As things are, we shall pay landlords $3½ billion of rent during the next 8 years and have nothing to show for it. For the same money, in the same time, we could house every family in the Air Force, and have no further capital disbursements thereafter.

Medical care: A bill (H. R. 9429) has been introduced, providing for a group-insurance scheme under which service families would be able to use private doctors and hospitals, at Government expense, whenever service facilities were unavailable. This scheme would cost $10 a month per family. It is a good scheme, way overdue, a product of long study by numerous commissions. If it is adopted, it will banish at one stroke one of the major hardships of service life.

Commissary and PX privileges: The value of these privileges should be restored immediately. It can be done by removing the 3½-percent surcharge on food, the 10-percent tax on PX sales, reestablishing nonprofit prices and throwing out lobby-finagled curbs on what may be stocked and sold.

Education: Present Government subsidies toward college degrees should be made available to men who stay in the service, instead of being restricted to the men who get out. The Government now offers a man $639 for his first reenlistment, but, if he does not reenlist, it offers him $5,280 for a free college education. It would cost only $1,600 to subsidize the same education, through evening study, for men who agreed to reenlist for, say, another 6 years. This would not only raise the standard of education throughout the service but provide a major inducement to an Air Force career.

Life insurance: This should be increased to at least $25,000. The present maximum of $10,000 was established nearly 40 years ago when widows could bring up children at one-quarter the present-day costs, and when the hazards of jet flying were unknown.

Air Force surveys indicate that if some such program were put through, the reenlistment rate for skilled men would jump to about 65 percent, which would be ample for all needs. Such a retention of trained men would permit a tremendous cut in the everlasting retraining programs. Without buying another new plane, we could greatly increase our combat readiness. SAC estimates that with even a 5-percent improvement in maintenance and operation, it would be enabled to place 200 additional bombers over targets on any given day.

From the human point of view, some such program is shamefully overdue. Men who forgo the freedom and rewards of private industry and dedicate their lives to the defense of their country can never be repaid solely in money. But one thing we can do is to make sure that they will not be deprived of a decent American standard of living while guarding their country.

In the words of former Secretary for Air Harold E. Talbott: "We have the master weapons and the master plan. To persist in treating the master help like stepchildren is a reckless policy, for trained men are the only people in the world who can give plans and weapons any meaning. Our diminishing supply of skilled help in the Air Force is the most critical problem facing the Nation today."

Every American citizen who values the safety of his country should write his Congressman now and demand a decent living for the men who guarantee our safety.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald]

Russia Caught Up in Air in 11 Years

(By Drew Pearson)

It was on May Day, 2 years ago this week, that the United States got its first shock indicating that Russia was on the way to forging ahead of us in airpower.

As American and allied military attachés stood reviewing the usual May Day exhibition of Russian military might, a giant jet thundered over Moscow housetops at an altitude of only 250 feet. The bomber was so tremendous that its shadow literally spanned the great Red Square as it flashed through the morning sunlight. American observers quickly noted that its four intake vents seemed larger than any they had seen at home, that the heavy plane easily kept up with swift jet fighter squadrons.

Messages of shocked reaction immediately burned the cables to Washington. But Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson refused to be alarmed. He dismissed the new bomber as a single, hand-built prototype assembled by the Russians to scare the Western World into more defense spending. He noted that the plane had only four engines and pronounced it an underpowered showpiece. Air Force generals disagreed, but Wilson overruled them.

Real shock came a year later—1955—when the Russians flew their prize bomber across the Moscow skyline again. By that time the lone giant of the previous May Day had company—18 more big battle planes. Of these, 13 bore routine Red air force markings. Six, with no markings, apparently were so fresh from the factory they hadn't been assigned to combat units. Each sported a new underbelly bulge, an ominous modification that experts identified as extra room for the H-bomb.

Eleven Short Years

Our intelligence agencies went to work compiling technical data. All available facts on the monster bomber were secretly supplied to our own manufacturers. They were asked to figure how long it took the Russians to produce such a plane. The whole Soviet air buildup was reexamined, and the fantastic truth emerged.

In 11 short years, the Russians had not only caught up with us in design, but outstripped us in production of jet planes. Numerically, the Soviet Union today has the world's largest air force. She has more combat planes than this country, and her factories are producing them faster. She has accomplished this so secretly that our intelligence has repeatedly been caught napping.

Our technical intelligence has made detailed examinations of 14 Soviet planes since 1945. These airplane autopsies showed that Soviet technology lagged behind us from 1945 until 1952. Since 1952, the Russians have equaled our best efforts in air weapons. In some categories, we are slightly ahead; in others, they are superior.

American manufacturers concluded from their secret study that Russia's giant jet Bison completed the cycle from drawing board to military service in 4 years—compared with the 8 years which the United States spent developing the B–52. The first Bison appeared over Moscow 2 years before our intelligence thought it could be possible. When the Russians flew 19 in formation a year later, the United States had only two complete B–52's.

Sealed in Factories

American agents report the Kremlin sealed engineers, technicians, and workers into plant 23 in Moscow and refused to let them out until they had built the Bison. The imprisoned personnel, working around the clock, set an astonishing production record.

The Soviets are now turning out the Bison at plant 23 at the rate of 5 every month. They are using unskilled labor wherever possible, taking short cuts and holding down design changes. Soon, says Air Force intelligence, plant 23 should be making 10 Bisons per month. Russia already has 20 jet-powered Bisons assigned to combat units. Our total of B–52s ready for combat is only 3. (In both countries, of course, many more of the big jets are near completion.)

On top of all this, Kremlin Czar Nikita Khrushchev has now boasted that Russia will also develop the first intercontinental guided missile with a hydrogen warhead. This missile will be capable of hitting anywhere in the world with a destructive force measured in millions of tons of TNT. Our experts say Khrushchev would not risk losing face by making this open boast unless he was sure of himself.

Note: The Eisenhower administration's economy program, more than anything else, has cost us air superiority. Administration spokesmen excuse this on the grounds that peace prospects are better, hence there is less need for a big Air Force. Air generals warn, however, that we must gear our strength to Russian capabilities, not guesswork on Russian intentions.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 4, 1956]

World Air Supremacy—Is United States Yielding Lead?

(By John G. Norris)

Has the administration decided that supremacy in the air is too costly and must yield to balancing the budget? Has there been a top-level decision that it is not necessary to stay ahead of Russia, that maintenance of a strong yet not superior long-range bomber force will be sufficient?

The question, in effect, was posed yesterday by the House Appropriations Committee and earlier in the week by some startling statements by Gen. Curtis E. LeMay and Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson.

In approving President Eisenhower's 1957 defense budget largely as submitted, the committee declared it is evident that the U. S. S. R. will probably equal this Nation in offensive air power within a very few years unless plane production and the planned size of the Air Force is substantially increased. The question to be resolved, it stated, is:

"Should we attempt to stay ahead of the Soviets * * * or * * * attempt to maintain what is determined to be a sufficient Air Force equipped with the best modern aircraft

to act as a deterrent to any possible aggression?" The committee report said the position taken by Wilson and other Pentagon officials in its long hearings was that "the current Air Force budget is based upon the latter determination."

During public hearings before a Senate subcommittee, General LeMay said the Russians now have more long-range, modern bombers than he has in his Strategic Air Command; that the Reds are building them at a faster rate than the United States; and that, by 1958–60, under now-approved programs, the Communists will achieve superiority.

His warning did not get much attention in many sections of the country. Many newspapers featured another statement by LeMay: that as of today, the United States holds the upper hand and could win any war Russia might start—though with substantial losses. This was more comforting, even if it has been said many times before.

When Secretary Wilson was asked for comment on LeMay's words, he conceded that Red bomber output now exceeded that of the United States. But he would not agree that the Reds necessarily would pass this Nation in strategic air power within 2 to 4 years.

Wilson did not disagree, but said that too many "assumptions" of future Soviet action were involved to make such a forecast. And he defended the present B–52 bomber program as adequate for the present. The Pentagon chief termed LeMay a "dedicated specialist" in terms that recalled the administration's past treatment of military dissenters as being "parochial."

These developments suggest that a major change in United States military policy may be in the making or already decided. Yet little public interest seems to have been aroused over Wilson's qualified admission of growing Red superiority in air power. LeMay has been testifying on the vital questions at hand in Senate chambers almost empty of spectators. The thousands of spring visitors to the Capitol have been sitting in on more dramatized committee sessions or staying out in the sunshine.

It is true that the usually colorful SAC commander's appearances before the special Senate Armed Services Subcommittee investigating the question of Russian vs. United States air power have been unspectacular. At the instance of Chairman STUART SYMINGTON (Democrat, Missouri), LeMay largely has confined his statements in open session to reading prepared answers to written questions, previously submitted to the Defense Department for security clearance. He has volunteered nothing.

Nor has the Symington subcommittee been pressing for headlines. Apparently they are seeking only to make a factual record of Russian gains that will force the Pentagon into action. The Democratic majority on the group wants to avoid criticism of political partisanship or of disclosing information that will breach security.

Yet veteran Capitol observers question whether a Senate investigation of Administration policy can get anywhere without big headlines and aroused public interest. And SYMINGTON'S record of criticism of Republican defense policy and mention of his name as a dark-horse Democratic presidential candidate seem to have led some to dismiss disclosures of Red air gains as politics. So far, the vital question whether the United States has decided to abdicate its current air power only has been posed, not clearly stated.

One suggestion often heard in military circles is that the failure to put additional billions into holding air supremacy is an election-year decision. Worried military men hear that there was a high-level decision to balance the budget this year, and then boost arms spending to meet the crucial Red threat after the election. It is more assuring to them than the thought that a second-best air force is enough.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of April 12, 1956]

WILSON LINKED TO CORPS CUT

Congress has been told Secretary of Defense Wilson ordered the Marine Corps to hold its strength 14,000 troops below the number for which appropriations were voted.

Testimony by Gen. Randolph Pate, commandant of the Marine Corps, under questioning by a House appropriations subcommittee, has just been made public.

General Pate said, "obviously the Marine Corps of 201,000 is not as effective a Marine Corps as 215,000. It was necessary to deactivate some supporting units of small size."

He said that while "I don't think there was any great material damage done to the corps," the Marines "would not have the staying power were we in combat that we would otherwise have."

Chairman SHEPPARD of California asked General Pate why the "special desire of Congress," reflected in an appropriation for a 215,000-man corps, was not carried out. Mr. SHEPPARD said the Marine Corps personnel plan calling for a strength of 201,000 by next June 30 "was actually a decrease of 4,170 from the strength at the beginning of the fiscal year."

General Pate replied: "We were not allowed to go to that strength." Mr. SHEPPARD asked, "By whom?" and General Pate said, "The Secretary of Defense."

WARNING VOICES

Gen. Curtis LeMay, chief of the Strategic Air Command, was talking in grim terms before the Senate Investigating Subcommittee when he compared American and Soviet long-range airpower—now and in the near future. And his conclusion that our superiority today may become inferiority by 1958–60 is one that both Congress and the executive branch should weigh with the utmost seriousness. For the blunt-spoken bomber chief, the answer is action—now, not later. Action, in his terms, would mean a stepped-up program of building B–52's and KC–135 refueling tankers, more SAC bases on the North American Continent and greater attention to developing even more powerful successors to our best planes of today.

In evaluating American deterrent power, General LeMay used a yardstick similar to that employed by Trevor Gardner, former Air Force research secretary, in a Look magazine article discussing missile development. It is, in short, that the Russians, apparently unrestricted by conventional budget considerations and interservice rivalries, are devoting a relatively greater effort to building or perfecting the critical weapons. There is, perhaps, no complete certainty on Russian progress either in quanity or in quality. There is evidence enough, however, to lead these two men—each an expert in specialized fields of air strength—to fear we are losing ground in an obviously vital race. There are others, with qualifications, who do not share these fears and who report encouraging progress in missile development. The Army, for example, has announced a new superior supersonic weapon of the Nike type and a significant scientific breakthrough on atomic weapons. But the years 1958–60 are close at hand. Those who have the ultimate responsibility for the national security should not be content for time alone to prove that we can get by safely with the present effort—or worse, that we cannot.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG].

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, may I, as a member of this distinguished subcommittee, pay my compliments to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], and to the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], and to all of the members of this subcommittee, who have worked so closely together on what might be termed the most important appropriation bill to come before the House this year, or any other year, for that matter. It is a trying task and one of great responsibility, but, as has been said, we have worked together in harmony primarily in the interest of the defense and security of this country.

Mr. Chairman, in his state of the Union message, and in his budget message, President Eisenhower called for the maintenance of a Military Establishment that could deter aggression, preserve peace, and command the world's respect. The budget before us today is designed to build and sustain that kind of a Military Establishment. It will keep our Armed Forces strong, without transforming our Nation into a garrison State. It will give us the greatest military strength in our peacetime history, without placing on us an unendurable economic burden. It is not designed to match the enemy man for man, missile for missile, or bomber for bomber; but it is designed to provide overall strength of such variety and such striking power that war will be unthinkable.

It envisions only relatively slight increases in the actual size of our Armed Forces; but through increasing adaptation and use of nuclear power it will provide potential strength far beyond the quantitative increases that have been programed.

It is a large budget, but it is of a size that can be sustained indefinitely, if need be. As the President has wisely said:

> To build less would expose the Nation to aggression. To build excessively under the influence of fear could defeat our purposes and impair or destroy the very freedom and economic system our military defenses are designed to protect.

Mr. Chairman, the emphasis on new strategic and tactical weapons, including guided and ballistic missiles, and the increasing use of nuclear power as a means of propulsion, reflects, of course, the most revolutionary development in the history of warfare. With all possible speed, our strategic Air Force and the carrier forces of the Navy are being equipped to use nuclear weapons. The Army, the Marine Corps, and the tactical air units also have atomic capabilities. Our great new families of missiles are virtually all being developed to make use of atomic warheads. Wisely, the Appropriations Committee has called attention to the need for phasing out old-style and obsolete weapons, as these new and more powerful instruments of war are adopted, to avoid pyramiding defense burdens on our countrymen's backs.

As a member of the Navy panel of the defense appropriations subcommittee, it has been my particular responsibility and privilege to review the budget requests

of the Navy. I should like to deal with those requests in the next few moments.

I think it may be said fairly that, never in history, has a major branch of our Military Establishment undergone such far-reaching changes in so short a time, as has our Navy. As our overseas responsibilities and commitments have broadened out to cover virtually the whole free world, so also have the responsibilities of the Navy been broadened. And these new tasks and responsibilities were assigned at a time when the Navy was in the process of passing from steam to nuclear power; from gunpowder to nuclear weapons; from guns to missiles; and in the air, from propeller-type planes to supersonic jets.

There was a period, following the development of atomic power, when the role of the Navy in our defense program seemed uncertain. Today, however, sea power and sea-air power are recognized as the spearhead of our striking forces.

As the committee report aptly points out, the free world today is actually a large oceanic confederation, interlinked and interdependent, militarily and economically. If the free world is to survive, we must keep open the sealanes, control the seas, and if need be, project the armed might of the United States to any territory.

It is for this reason that the continuing emphasis on the relative strength of any one branch of our defense establishment is unrealistic. If a surprise attack should ever be launched against this country, or against any of our allies in such a way as to menace our own safety, it will not be turned back by reason of numerical equality with the enemy in any one category of weapons. It will be turned back by a multiplicity of attacking weapons, launched from land, sea, and air, against the enemy's bases, at long range and at short range. And among the most maneuverable, and swiftest of these counterattacking systems will be the Navy and the naval air arm. So far from rendering the Navy obsolete, the atom age has, if possible, increased its strategic value and importance.

The budget which is before you calls for the appropriation of approximately $10 billion for the Navy, of which more than $1.7 billion is for aircraft and related procurement. This is an increase of more than $871 million over the sum budgeted for this item in this fiscal year, and is a fair reflection of the greatly reinforced emphasis which is being placed on the naval air arm.

You will recall that the President, last week commented that we have today the most powerful Navy in the world, and, he said, it features one thing—airpower. I wish to deal with that in a moment.

Naval airpower begins with ships, however, and the present budget takes that fact into account. It envisions a fleet of approximately 1,000 ships, including some 15 large carriers, all equipped with aircraft with atomic capabilities. It includes 2 nuclear-powered submarines, the *Nautilus* and the *Sea Wolf*, with 12 more to come—6 already under construction and 6 funded in the present budget. In addition, the bill before you envisions the addition of another carrier of the *Forrestal* class, 12 destroyers and frigate guided missile ships, 1 nuclear-powered, guided missile cruiser, and 4,629 tons of landing craft. This bill also provides for the conversion of 23 ships, as part of the continuing program to modernize the fleet, and it will enable the Navy to begin work on nuclear powerplants for another carrier and another guided missile vessel.

With respect to aircraft, the bill will enable the Navy to procure about 1,468 new aircraft, and these, when coupled with prior orders, will insure the addition of about 2,000 new planes a year through calendar 1958.

The Marine Corps will be maintained at a level of 3 combat divisions and 3 combat air wings, with provision for an increase of 4,735 personnel to bring its total manpower to 205,735 by the end of fiscal 1957. Naval manpower is fixed at 672,000 officers and men, for fiscal 1957, an increase of 16,600 over the end strength set for June 1956.

It is not so much the quantitative strength of the Navy that is impressive today, but the qualitative growth and development of the Navy is decidedly striking.

The Navy is, normally, perhaps, the most complex of our armed services. It operates on land and sea; it operates in the air, and it operates under the sea. Moreover, it is not simply an aggregate of fighting units, but a carefully integrated system of striking power. As the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Burke, said in the hearings:

> Our ships, planes, and their organizations are, almost without exception, designed as multipurpose rather than single-purpose instruments of war, both because the multipurpose instrument is more economical than the single-purpose one, and because we believe that it is more efficient.
>
> The core of our striking power today is the attack aircraft carrier. Our carrier task forces, supported by mobile logistic support, can strike and restrike the enemy repeatedly over an indefinite period of time. Able to move over 700 miles a day, they can select their own launching sites at will. They are elusive targets, hard to find. In times of tension, short of conflict, they are impressive envoys.

Mr. Chairman, among the other types of powerful striking units in the Navy are the nuclear-powered guided-missile submarine, and the long-range jet-powered water-based aircraft, with its mobile tender bases and mobile fleet support.

I should like to take a brief moment, in this connection, to comment on the role of the aircraft carriers. In recent years, there has been extensive reevaluation of their functions and capabilities. Written off by some, with the dawn of the atom age, they are regarded by most naval men today as among our most valuable defense assets. A carrier task force, with its powerful air arm, its guided-missile ships, its submarine and antisubmarine forces, is perhaps the most versatile fighting force in the world. It is vulnerable, yes; anything on earth is vulnerable today. But it is less vulnerable than a fixed land base. Its position cannot be pinpointed by an attacking enemy, because it does not remain stationary. If the task force is sufficiently dispersed, it cannot be wiped out; and it cannot be immobilized by politics or saboteurs. It is a seaborne, sovereign part of the United States, swift-moving, elusive, and powerful.

So far from being obsolete, our carrier task forces are increasingly the key to preservation of the freedom of the seas in peacetime, and a weapon for massive retaliation if war should come.

Is the budget for the Defense Establishment adequate? In the next few days and weeks, we shall doubtless hear the point argued at length. Insofar as we on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee are able to judge, after exhaustive hearings, it will be adequate. It will provide all the services with all of the funds that they can wisely use. It will probably not provide any of them with all the funds they want. Ever since 1778, as Admiral Burke recently observed, the services have been asked whether they are satisfied with what they got, and the answer is often "No"; because nobody is satisfied with what he gets—ever.

This budget will add great new strength to our Defense Establishment, however. It will discourage aggression, and make war unthinkable to anyone but a maniac. In a nation such as ours, more cannot be expected, and less should not be provided.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, 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. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when debate is resumed on the pending measure H. R. 10986 tomorrow that general debate proceed for not to exceed 2 hours and that the time be divided equally between the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO REVISE AND EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken today may have permission to revise and extend their remarks and insert brief excerpts.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. MAHON. 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 to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DOMESTIC SHIPPING INDUSTRY

Mr. BONNER. 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.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill, by request, which I believe is worthy of consideration by the Congress. For sometime now I have been greatly concerned over the plight of the domestic shipping industry, which has not until now been able to reestablish itself to the level of importance in our domestic transportation system which it enjoyed prior to World War II and which was completely disrupted during the war. Aside from its importance to our national economy as a vital link in our transportation system, domestic shipping has always been relied on by this Nation in time of war or national emergency to meet our initial military requirements in the shortest possible time.

While I am not yet ready to endorse all of the provisions of this bill, I do, wholeheartedly, applaud those who requested its introduction for their imagination and willingness to try something new and different in an effort to rehabilitate this trade. It may well be, upon careful scrutiny, that this new approach to develop and expand the coastwise trade will do much to get this segment of our shipping industry on the road to recovery.

For this reason, I have introduced this bill and hope soon to hold hearings before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to determine the merits of the bill and whether it, or some acceptable substitute, may not provide a start toward remedying the ills that have beset our coastwise shipping trade for the last decade.

The bill which I have introduced would direct the Secretary of Commerce to charter for operation in the coastwise trade up to 20 Government-owned tankers now in the Reserve fleet, with the requirement that the charterer have constructed on the tanker a special cargo deck suitable for carrying cargo containers which could be quickly and easily loaded and unloaded to and from the vessel, thereby greatly reducing the cost of handling cargo, one of the principal deterents to the rehabilitation of the coastwise trade.

The bill would also require the charterer of the tankers to enter into a commitment with the Government requiring him to construct, for each 2 tankers chartered, one new high speed tanker also suitable for carrying cargo in containers. The charterer would also be permitted to trade-in two obsolete dry-cargo vessels for an allowance of credit on construction of the new tankers, such credit being paid by the Government to the shipyard building the new vessel.

Needless to say, such a program would also provide a much needed shot in the arm for our vital but depressed shipping industry.

I repeat, that while this bill may not be the complete remedy needed to revitalize the coastwise trade, I think it offers a program well worth inquiring into.

VETERANS' PENSIONS

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this morning there appeared before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs Donald R. Wilson, past national commander of the American Legion. His statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY DONALD R. WILSON, PAST NATIONAL COMMANDER, THE AMERICAN LEGION, BEFORE THE HOUSE VETERANS' AFFAIRS COMMITTEE IN CONNECTION WITH HEARINGS ON THE REPORT OF THE PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION ON VETERANS' PENSIONS (BRADLEY COMMISSION), MAY 9, 1956

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, we are here this morning to consider the impact of an attack which has been made on the Congress of the United States, established veterans' organizations and the veterans whom they serve.

On April 23, 1956, the Commission on Veterans' Pensions, headed by Gen. Omar N. Bradley (which we shall refer to hereafter as the Bradley Commission) transmitted to the President its final report, setting forth so-called findings and recommendations.

This 410-page document had the effect of stopping, for the moment at least, the progress of important legislation now pending before this committee.

We can understand the House Veterans' Affairs Committee's concern with the document and its desire to probe into the alleged factual studies and recommendations which the document contains. We, of the American Legion, believe that this House committee has been a conscientious, understanding, and progressive guardian of the programs helpful to the American veteran. We can understand, therefore, why it paused in its deliberations on important legislation. The Bradley Commission's report was preceded by press intimation that studies made for the first time would have an impact upon veterans' benefits. The Bradley Commission's report itself asserts, in substance, that its findings and recommendations cannot be disregarded by those who have the future well-being of the country in mind.

It is understandable, therefore, that this committee would want to assure itself that there was nothing in the Bradley Commission report which would alter the conclusions which this committee may have drawn from the extensive hearings which it has held on legislation involving compensation and pension bills. We can understand further that this committee would want to assure itself that there was no substance to the Bradley Commission's indirect and somewhat concealed attack on this committee's stewardship, conscientiousness, and awareness of the importance of the various veterans' programs.

The American Legion is of the opinion that the Bradley Commission's report is a scare document which is unfair, unworthy of the Commission that produced it, and in many material respects factually unsound. It should be promptly relegated to the obscurity which it deserves. Meanwhile, this House Veterans Committee can continue with the important and progressive work which it understands so much better than the Bradley Commission and report out the pension and compensation legislation which it has been considering.

It should be mentioned that the American Legion has been studying the general subjects which are encompassed within the Bradley Commission's report for a great many years. As to the specific studies made by the Bradley Commission, it must be stated that the American Legion has been studying these with particularity since April 4, 1955.

National Commander Seaborn Collins was deeply conscious of the fact that under the slogan of "efficiency and economy in government," there had been previous and substantial assaults upon the structure of veterans' program. He correctly diagnosed that the activities of the Bradley Commission, even though dressed in the robes of presumably advanced social and economic thinking, could easily produce an equal and similar assault on those programs by branding them as inconsistent with recently developed concepts of social planning and advancement, and economic orderliness and well-being. He believed that the American Legion should prepare itself in advance to receive the results of the Bradley Commission's studies. He believed that the American Legion had an obligation to make an objective survey of its own program in the light of modern conditions. He believed it essential to determine whether there could be merit in the proposition, rumors of which had already been heard, that social progress made anachronistic the 150 years of legislation by the Congress acknowledging that a special obligation was owed to those who had served and saved the Nation in time of war.

On April 4, 1955, National Commander Collins appointed Carl J. Rees, Deward H. Reed, and Donald R. Wilson as members of a special committee and charged them with the responsibility of reviewing the veterans' program as it had developed and of placing it in proper perspective with reference to the welfare of society as a whole. The tenure and function of this special committee were continued by our present National Commander Wagner.

In this assignment, the American Legion's special committee was assisted not only by a research specialist, but also by the rehabilitation commission and members of its staff and the members of other commissions and staffs within the national organization of the American Legion and many of the State organizations of the American Legion.

The report of the Bradley Commission, therefore, is not entirely new to the American Legion. The trend of the activities of the staff of the Bradley Commission has been carefully noted and the tenor of the Bradley Commission's final report was reasonably accurately forecast weeks in advance of the publication of its report.

PRELIMINARY COMMENTS ON BRADLEY COMMISSION REPORT

However, well-intended, the Bradley Commission's report comes to us filled with clichés, self-contradictions, inaccuracies, looseness of expression, non sequiturs, statistical monstrosities, and thrilling discoveries of the obvious. It is a disappointing piece of work. It is tragically preoccupied with extolling the virtues of social security, not for what it is but for what it may be at some indeterminate time in the future. It is on this altar that the veteran is to be stripped of the dignity of a special status which, throughout the history of our country, has always been accorded to him. Now, under a new concept, arbitrarily and un-

necessarily announced by a mere Commission of the executive branch of the Government, the veteran is told that since he performed no special service, the Government owes him no obligation in his declining years other than to give him a general right, if properly employed, to buy and pay for social security like any other citizen.

The presumptuous nature of the Bradley Commission's pronouncements is an insult to the Congress of the United States, the consistent guardian of the welfare of the veteran. The Bradley Commission, with only the wisdom of 13 months' activity on the part of governmental theorists, has concluded that the Congress, which has had 150 years of experience in developing the veterans' program and in keeping that program intact and progressive while at the same time legislating for general social needs, doesn't comprehend its full responsibilities to all the people, including the veteran, and that by discharging one of its responsibilities it must forget that historically it has an additional responsibility to the Nation's defenders.

The report is discouraging and dangerous—discouraging because it belittles the contribution of the veteran to his country—dangerous because, by stealth cloaked in compliments, it exalts the welfare state and denies that there is any room in such a state for according to the veteran a special dignity because of service to country.

MAJOR AREAS OF CONCERN

It is probably not appropriate at this point to submit a point-by-point analysis of the recommendations of the Bradley Commission. This is a project which can more successfully be discharged at a later time by the duly constituted commissions within the American Legion and their respective expert staffs. Nonetheless, the American Legion does believe that it has the obligation of pointing out to this House Veterans' Committee a general frame of reference within which specific comments on specific recommendations may be fitted. The accomplishment of this task can best be achieved by a consideration of the following major questions:

(a) Is there, at present, any clear national philosophy of veterans' benefits?

(b) Does the concept of social-security benefits preclude the orderly and economic development of pension benefits to veterans?

(c) Has the program of disability, rehabilitation, and readjustment benefits been reasonably effective in serving the legitimate needs of the qualified veteran?

(d) Has the Veterans' Administration been reasonably successful in the performance of the functions for which it was created?

The report of the Bradley Commission may be properly embraced and considered within these four questions which will be discussed in the order in which they were stated.

(A) IS THERE, AT PRESENT, ANY CLEAR NATIONAL PHILOSOPHY OF VETERANS' BENEFITS?

The Bradley Commission arrives at the astounding conclusion that because the present structure of veterans' programs, like the common law, is only an accretion of laws based largely on precedents built up over 150 years of piecemeal development, there is, therefore, no national philosophy of veterans' benefits. The Bradley Commission then indulges itself in a peculiar form of self-aggrandizement and proudly announces that it, by its own labors, has developed, apparently for the first time, a philosophy whose guiding principles can enable the Nation to discharge its obligation to veterans generously. If this announced accomplishment were true, we would all be eternally indebted to the Bradley Commission for its contribution. Unfortunately, for the Bradley Commission, its philosophical creation is composed of the body of philosophical principles evolved over the course of our country's history. The Bradley Commission has merely emasculated or distorted some of the already well-known principles by the introduction of new and dangerous concepts which would destroy the philosophy of veterans' benefits as it has evolved. The Bradley Commission would substitute a set of sociological principles not particularly related to the peculiarities of the veterans' problems.

The Bradley Commission's most radical departure from the existing philosophy of veterans' benefits is to be found in the statement that military service in time of war or peace is merely an obligation of citizenship and should not be considered inherently a basis for future Government benefits. It is apparently in the making of this statement that the Bradley Commission feels that it has made a major contribution to the philosophical concept of veterans' benefits. In fact, it is in the making of this statement that the Bradley Commission has cruelly departed from the philosophy of veterans' benefits and has laid the foundation for a wholesale assault on the veterans' program.

We take it that the history of aid and benefits to the American veteran which has evolved out of the constant concern of the Congress is a record of general devotion to the welfare of those citizens who have had to give up their normal civilian activities in order to defend the country in times of war and danger to our national safety and security. Veterans' benefits have come to be regarded, therefore, as special, and as benefits to be added to those benefits which the veteran may obtain as a citizen alone. We are not unaware of the current encouragement which has been given to the argument in many quarters to the effect that being selected or volunteering for service to the country in war is merely the discharge of one of the duties of citizenship. The argument continues that, by virtue of having done only what is required of a citizen, the veteran cannot logically consider himself to be a member of a special group of citizens. We would acknowledge the validity of the argument up to a point, but we would demand that the argument be carried to its only logical conclusion. It is true that one who serves in the Armed Forces of this country is discharging an obligation of citizenship. However, the fact which has escaped the Bradley Commission and others who pause at that point is that there are some who failed to discharge it. It is not sufficient to gloss over the disparity between the discharge of these obligations of citizenship by saying that in modern war all people are subjected to hazards. So long as we maintain our Armed Forces, so long as we call them defenders of the country, and so long as we subject them to the necessary disciplines and deprivations which an adequate military establishment must demand we have created for them special obligations, duties, hazards or responsibilities which set them apart from the role which they would play as citizens alone. By reason of their peculiar sacrifices and hazards they become a class of citizens select in nature and distinguished by peculiar service. No governmental commission, no amount of sophistry can deprive them of that special status. The claim of special status for the American veteran is an eminently sound and valid claim.

Acknowledging that historically the veteran has been regarded as a special class, we may also further conclude from the study of the history of veterans' benefits that the Congress has, through legislation, further subdivided the veteran class into those who are disabled as a result of their military service and those who merely by virtue of their military service are entitled to recompense. The Congress has consistently endeavored to maintain an equitable ratio between compensation payments and pension payments. At the same time, the line between service-connected and nonservice connected benefits and pensions has moved steadily in the direction of more inclusive benefits for a larger proportion of all veterans. A liberalization of benefits has almost inevitably followed every war as the needs of veterans increased. These obligations assumed by the Government throughout our history have never been limited to mere recompense for physical loss or suffering because of military service, nor have they been limited to men who actually were in the battle line.

It is through the establishment and refinement of principles such as the above that our present veterans' program has evolved and developed. If the Bradley Commission would depart from this history and this experience, it must carry the burden of proving conclusively that the departure which it recommends is not only necessary, but that it will not do violence to the moral obligation which the Nation owes to its defenders.

The Bradley Commission has failed to carry this burden of proof. It has contented itself with the pronouncement of platitudes in justification of a radical departure from acknowledged and well-established practices.

(B) DOES THE CONCEPT OF SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS PRECLUDE THE ORDERLY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF PENSION BENEFITS TO VETERANS?

Much of the Bradley Commission report is a concentrated effort to establish a preconceived notion that the Social Security program has become an adequate substitute for veterans' pensions. This is a significant and hostile part of the report. It reflects little sound or honest thinking, but it does mirror the antagonism long noted in certain sections of the administrative branch of the Government toward veterans' pensions. Successive studies by the executive branch of the Government under both major political parties have attempted to find rationales for justifying the elimination of pension benefits.

The most noteworthy predecessors of the Bradley Commission report were the two Hoover Commission reports of 1949 and 1955. Both of these had the flavor, not of objective studies but of planned attacks.

The sections of the Hoover Commission Report dealing with veterans' benefits were so obviously biased and malicious that no firm platform was established from which an attack could be launched that would convince the Congress. Antagonism in the Hoover reports ran high, but the arguments were weak and specious and obviously labored.

Even before the failure of the second Hoover report, busy brains in some branches of various Government agencies were casting about for a new device that could be used to provide a more successful platform from which to destroy large segments of the veterans' program which Congress had labored so hard to establish. Several years ago, someone in the Government conceived the idea that it could be argued that the social security program should make a splendid rationale for finding that veterans' pensions and some other veterans' benefits are no longer necessary. Where the idea began is not certain. It was put forth clearly in the Hughes study made by the Bureau of the Budget in 1953. The thought was quickly parroted and gained great currency in the executive branch of the Government, particularly in several agencies that do not deal intimately enough with veterans' affairs in their day-to-day operations to have a clear notion of what the veterans' programs are and how they operate in detail.

About a year and a half ago, the notion that social security is today an adequate substitute for veterans' pensions was worked into a public statement of the President—not, we believe, by the Administrator of

Veterans' Affairs, but by someone closer to the President than to the veterans' program. At that time, August 1954, President Eisenhower grudgingly signed a bill increasing by a small amount some of the existing monetary payments to veterans and their dependents. He stated, as he signed it, that he did so reluctantly and that it was his opinion that such benefits were probably no longer necessary because of social security and other general welfare programs of the Government.

He said that he would appoint a committee to look into this matter and to study the whole structure of veterans' pensions and compensation. Thus was the Bradley Commission born.

It should be noted that the theory that general welfare programs have, or should be considered to have, displaced veterans' pensions had not in any way been demonstrated. No specific conflict between the veterans' pension program and the social security program had been pinpointed. No facts had been arrayed which clearly showed that social security was, in fact, serving the purpose which veterans' pensions previously had served. The idea had merely been deliberately repeated with increasing frequency, but always without clear demonstration. The final results of the Bradley Commission report affirm that it struggled to justify this concept.

However, the Bradley Commission has been able to do no more than simply to repeat the thesis again. It does repeat it and it states affirmatively that it is its opinion that the advent of the general welfare programs, and social security specifically, has brought about a new era in which pensions for veterans are no longer necessary. It specifically says that all pensions should be tapered off and eventually eliminated. This is a softer and, on the surface, a more friendly approach than the one taken by the Hoover Commission. That is, it has much more molasses and less vinegar than the Hoover reports.

Only one thing is needed to convince the American Legion and veterans generally, that veterans' pensions can be ended and social security can be accepted as the perfect modern substitute; that is, to demonstrate clearly and factually, rather than merely make unsubstantiated claims, that without damaging the contractual rights of its present participants, social security, in its actual workings and design, is in fact a program that would and does offer to the Nation's veterans—in recognition of their war service—the same security and the same special consideration for special services rendered to the Nation in time of national danger that the pension program has provided.

Unfortunately, the Bradley Commission has been unable to carry this burden successfully.

Undoubtedly, the Bradley Commission would have given a clear demonstration if it had been able to. It is to the discredit of the Bradley Commission that it continued to advance and strengthen the argument by repetition in the face of a patent inability of establishing the point with a factual demonstration. On page 133 of its report, there is a passage headed "Need for a Factual Approach." The Bradley Commission, under that heading stresses that "Our national policies must be developed in the light of a full factual picture." We commend adherence to that thought to the Bradley Commission. We search in vain for the facts that permit the identification of social security as a substitute for veterans' pensions. None are offered. Actually, no factual demonstration is possible for the reason that social security is not and cannot be a substitute for veterans' pensions. If an attempt were made to make it so, it would work mischief not only to the veterans' pension program, but to the social security program as well.

Social security is based upon a tax placed upon some, but not all, individuals, in the form of compulsory insurance premiums, based upon the amount of money earned in certain not all-inclusive private employments. When its benefits, not always the maximum, are paid the amount of the benefit is in substance based upon the length of time worked in such private employments as may be covered by the law and the amount of money earned during that time. These are the essential facts of social-security coverage and benefits.

The Bradley Commission ignores these facts. It philosophizes that the veteran is not entitled to a preferred status. Then, on the basis of its disregard for the facts and its enunciation of a radical and unacceptable change in our basic philosophy, it states, as a supposedly constructive conclusion, that veterans must be rewarded for their war service in times of personal need by merely paying to them an amount based upon what they earned, provided they worked in private employment covered by the Social Security Act, and like all other citizens in such employments, paid the tax levied upon them during the years that they were so employed.

Social security is, in essence, an insurance contract whereby, for a stipulated payment, one party is obligated to compensate the insured upon the happening of a contingency. Veterans' pensions are not based upon a contractual relationship with the Federal Government. They are based upon the performance of duty in defense of one's country in time of war. They are not payable to all veterans but only to ones in need.

As a form of compulsory insurance which was never intended to meet even the minimum needs of its beneficiaries, social security cannot be considered as a substitute for veterans' pensions, but must continue to occupy the role originally intended for it, namely that of providing a base upon which can be erected other benefits.

The veteran who, as any other citizen, has fulfilled his social-security contract, is entitled, as a matter of law, to receive the benefits of that contract. It is a tragic error to say that he is entitled to nothing more. The ingratitude and contempt which produced such an error are emphasized by the basic factual differences between the two programs.

The requirements for payment of benefits under social security and pension plans are completely dissimilar. Veterans' pensions are payable by reason of honorable wartime service, with the basic criteria for payment predicated upon unemployability due to a prescribed degree of disability. Unemployability, without more, will not establish entitlement to pension. The additional requirement of a prescribed degree of disability is a necessary factor in showing entitlement. Under Social Security, unemployment is only a determinant in arriving at a figure that will eventually be paid. Unemployability is not a factor. Under the pension program, age is not a prerequisite to the payment of benefits. It is a factor for consideration with respect to pensions. Under social security, age is a definite requirement.

Under the veterans' pension program, there are income limitations which must be met. This factor insures that only veterans in financial need can receive a pension. Under the social-security program, income is a factor only if earned. Because payment under social security is a right based on monies contributed, benefits are not confined to the needy as such.

When you add to these factors an acknowledgment that social security was never intended to meet even the minimum needs of its beneficiaries, it becomes all the more impossible to reconcile the establishment of social security with the proposition that it should supplant all other benefits. Such a substitution would leave untouched and uncared for the vast numbers of those who, prior to age 65, because of prescribed degrees of disabilities making them unemployable, are in need of financial assistance. It would deprive them of the dignity of claiming such assistance as a gratuity from a government which they had well served.

Thus, if you want a blueprint for creating mischief, we can think of no better means than to adopt a national policy that would attempt to make Social Security serve the very different function of veterans' pensions.

The Bradley Commission professes that there is at present an overlap or conflict between veterans' pensions and social security. It does not pinpoint any such overlap or conflict beyond these general terms.

What is the relation between the two? The fact is that social-security benefits bear neither more nor less relation to veterans' pensions than any other income a veteran may receive. Social-security benefits are so much money in the veterans' pocket. The money is no different from money he may receive as pay for working, as dividends from stocks, as retirement pay from an employer or as proceeds from an annuity. Any conflict or overlap between the pension program and the social-security program can be no different from any conflict or overlap created by any other income which the veteran may receive.

Is there an overlap or conflict between any of these sources of income and the pension program? It is almost tragic that the Bradley Commission is unaware that by long-established law, an overlap that it conceives to exist does not exist at all. One of the conditions which a veteran must meet today in order to qualify for a pension is that his income from other sources must meet a "needs" measure, prescribed by establishing levels of other income which—if the veteran is over them—will disbar him from receipt of a pension.

Thus, all income which a veteran may receive is now, and has been for some time, considered to contain the germs of overlap or conflict with the pension program. The overlap was removed by laws which are today, and have long been, part of the existing veterans' pension legislation. Social-security benefits are, under today's law, included in that income which would disbar a veteran from a pension if it contributes to raising his non-pension income above the income levels stated in the law. It is this automatic check that prevents any overlap.

Believe it or not, on page 18 of its report, the Bradley Commission recommends a change in the law by which the receipt of social-security benefits would be considered as income that would count in determining a veteran's need, for pension purposes.

It is not funny that a distinguished Commission proposes that the law be changed to make it what it already is.

Summing up this preposterous mess of argument over nothing, the factual approach so strongly urged by the Bradley Commission yields just this:

1. Social security cannot be made to serve as a veterans' pension program without doing mischief to both programs.

2. The only possibility of an overlap or conflict between the veterans' pension program and any source of other income including social-security benefits has long been properly taken care of by provisions of the veterans' pension laws.

We can report very briefly regarding this matter of social security.

First, the argument repeated by the Bradley Commission will continue to be used—in the same specious form as in the past—in the hope that more and more repetition will persuade more and more people—so that this

pure figment of a hard-working brain in the Bureau of the Budget may create a chink in the armor of veterans' benefits through the "big lie" technique.

Second, when the day comes that social security provides security to war veterans, pensions will be taken care of automatically. When social-security benefits actually do that, such assistance which will carry all veterans over the income ceiling prescribed in the present pension laws will make itself known by the workings of the present law. On that day, the Veterans' Administration will report that it is paying no pensions, because other programs have carried every living veterans' income over the needs ceilings defined in the pension laws. According to the figures of the Veterans' Administration, that condition has not yet arrived.

(C) HAS THE PROGRAM OF DISABILITY, REHABILITATION, AND READJUSTMENT BENEFITS BEEN REASONABLY EFFECTIVE IN SERVING THE LEGITIMATE NEEDS OF THE QUALIFIED VETERAN?

Primarily, the Bradley Commission approves of the program of disability, rehabilitation and readjustment benefits which has been developed for the American veteran. It finds that we have developed reasonably successful methods for meeting the needs of our veterans. It asserts that the service-connected needs should be accorded the highest priority among the special programs for veterans and that service-connected compensation and death benefits should be liberal and even generous. It further states that the rehabilitation of disabled veterans and their reintegration into useful economic and social life should be a primary objective.

We cannot and do not take exception to such laudatory and sound statements. Nonetheless, we do have serious questions regarding the approach which the Bradley Commission employs toward the problem of improving the services which are offered to the service-connected class of veterans and to the rehabilitation and readjustment phases of the veterans' program.

We, of the American Legion, would certainly be the first to concede that none of these programs are perfect. We recognize now, and have recognized throughout the course of our existence, that there is a constant need for change. We cannot concur, however, in some of the radical, unrealistic and ridiculous suggestions adopted by the Bradley Commission.

(1) Presumptions

As illustrative of the type of improvement which the Bradley Commission suggests, and of the viciousness of it, we mention its recommendation that the presumption of service connection for chronic diseases, tropical diseases, psychoses, tuberculosis, and multiple sclerosis should be withdrawn. The Bradley Commission goes even further and states that there is otherwise in the law sufficient protection for the veteran to establish service connection of any and all diseases, and that accepted medical principles can reasonably and accurately establish the onset of a disease and the disability process.

It is apparent from a recommendation such as this that, while the Bradley Commission pays lipservice to the duty owed to the service connected, it would destroy the ability of large numbers to establish service connection. It has vastly overrated regard for the extent of medical knowledge. It credits the field of medicine with an omniscience which most doctors wish that they possessed.

Then the Bradley Commission compounds this offense by completely disregarding the fact that the question is not entirely a medical one. It is also in part a legal one. The purpose of a presumption is to free the veteran from carrying an unconscionable burden of proof in the establishment of the service-connected origin of a disease or a disability. As a part of the theory that the veteran should be given the benefit of the doubt, the principle behind the granting of a presumption says to the American veteran that it would be unfair in some cases to require him to prove medically that a given disease or disability did in fact have its inception during the course of his service, or resulted directly from that service. It states in substance that, in those instances in which it would be unfair to impose such a burden upon him, he is entitled to a presumption that the disease or disability did emanate from his service. This is a rebuttable presumption. It imposes upon the Government the burden of going forward with the evidence. It enables the Government, if medical knowledge is what the Bradley Commission says that it is, to rebut the presumption and to deny the veteran his service-connected status.

It is the opinion of the American Legion that until American medicine has reached a point where it can determine with more than a reasonable degree of accuracy whether in fact certain types of diseases did or did not have their inception during the course of man's service, the veteran should be entitled, in the areas of doubt now listed, to the presumption that his disease or disability, within reasonable periods now or to be specified, was the result of his service. Even if medical knowledge ever reaches the point where it can definitely establish the onset of a disease, there would still be no vice in continuing the presumption so long as it is a rebuttable presumption. The knowledge that would eliminate the necessity of a presumption in favor of a veteran would also enable the Government to rebut the presumption.

The inclination of the Bradley Commission to reach absurd results at the expense of the veteran makes many of its recommendations suspect and belies its announced motives.

(2) Rating schedule

The Bradley Commission is dissatisfied with the present rating schedule. We, of the American Legion are also dissatisfied in some particulars with the rating schedule. As a matter of fact, our rehabilitation commission has for a considerable period of time constantly suggested changes in the rating schedule and is now ready, when the time comes, to suggest specific improvements in connection with it.

We do not object to a review of the rating schedule, nor to a revision of it. However, we want to know, with more than a reasonable degree of certainty, the basis upon which the review is going to be conducted, and the basis upon which revisions are going to be made.

Our present rating schedule is founded upon the theory of the average impairment of earning capacity. As an average, it is not an absolute guide in the individual case. We know, however, from our experience that we cannot administer any program which is geared solely to the individual case. We have accepted the best standard we are able to find.

The Bradley Commission, by its research and in some of its charts, has established that, for the most part, the average impairment of earning capacity theory has done a remarkably wonderful job. The Bradley Commission's charts show that in most categories of disability, the amount of disability compensation drawn by the disabled veteran—when added to the amount which he is able to earn from whatever job he holds—is remarkably close to the average annual income of the nondisabled veteran. It is apparent, therefore, that the average impairment theory has been a reasonably successful standard.

The Bradley Commission is concerned, however, with the establishment of other factors which might be worked into a rating schedule. It is concerned with compensating a veteran for pain and suffering, for social inconvenience, for increased mortality, and so forth. If the Bradley Commission wants to add a figure which will take into account these factors, in addition to the figure established to compensate the veteran on the basis of the average impairment of his earning capacity, we certainly would have no objection to such a review. However, we do not dignify even the average impairment theory by calling it a scientific formula. It is merely a guide. It is one of the best guides that could be worked out under all circumstances. We would not want to have the Bradley Commission or anyone else think that you could reduce either the impairment of a man's earning capacity, or an evaluation of his pain and suffering, or his social inconvenience, or his increased mortality to a final and absolute and completely compensatory formula. We are willing and anxious to have the service-connected disabled veteran compensated further than he now is, but we caution against leading the American public to believe that this is being done in accordance with an absolute, compensatory formula.

Nonetheless, we do believe that a new rating schedule should be promulgated. It has been 10 years since the promulgation of the 1945 schedule. The comments and disability evaluations contained in the present schedule represent the consensus of medical opinion of a period sometime prior to 1945. The nine extensions to the 1945 schedule have led to some confusion and have made the use of the present rating schedule unwieldy, thereby decreasing its efficiency and accuracy. There are other contemplated changes which, if incorporated into further extensions of the 1945 schedule, will further complicate that schedule.

It is our belief that a new rating schedule could be made to represent the sum total of medical and technical knowledge of the Veterans' Administration, the major veterans' organizations, and the medical profession, acquired in the years since 1945—all of which would tend to produce evaluations that would be more compatible with present medical knowledge and experience.

(3) 10-percent and 20-percent ratings

Perhaps no area of the Bradley Commission's report more glaringly demonstrates duplicity and factual inaccuracy than the section on 10 percent and 20 percent disability ratings.

First of all, the Bradley Commission is shocked by the fact that there are over a million veterans in this disability area. The Bradley Commission now finds it wrong that there should be so many such veterans, and because of their numbers proposes to eliminate them.

The Bradley Commission attributes the large number of awards in this area, in part, to the alleged fact that there is a requirement that no further examinations are scheduled once the veteran's disability reaches the prescribed minimum rating for his condition. This is a flagrant misstatement of the Veterans' Administration's requirements. On this erroneous basis, the Bradley Commission proposes to meet its commitment to deal liberally, even generously, with these service-connected cases by reducing or destroying the entitlement of the largest single group of disabled veterans. It questions but does not refute the medical soundness of these ratings. Then it proposes to settle these so-called medically unsound ratings by an immediate outlay of money. In other words, it wants to buy off claims which it thinks are invalid even though many of the 10 percent or 20 percent disability ratings today can turn into the 100 percent service-connected disability ratings tomorrow.

The Bradley Commission's treatment of this sensitive and important segment of disabilities is confused, distorted, inconclusive,

and unconvincing. Even so, it is presumptuous enough to ask the Congress to buy this package, the contents of which are not known even by the Commission.

(4) *Statutory awards*

The Bradley Commission is apparently deeply distributed over the existence of statutory awards. It has recommended in substance that consideration should be given to incorporating statutory awards within a comprehensive rating scale that will encompass economic, physical, life-impairment and other factors.

From an historical standpoint it can be said that the Congress of the United States has, for almost a century, recognized and shown concern for the problems of those who have lost their limbs, or their ability to see, or who are otherwise seriously disabled.

A study of the history of statutory awards will reveal that the Congress has long been of the opinion that the same criteria cannot be employed in evaluating the disabilities of the group which is the subject of statutory awards as that employed in evaluating the disabilities of those less obviously disabled.

We cannot understand what objection the Bradley Commission has to the exercise by the Congress of a power which the Congress obviously has to legislate certain so-called statutory awards. We must conclude that for some reason the Bradley Commission wants to save money by abolishing statutory awards which the Congress thought to be meritorious.

This is merely another instance where the words of the Bradley Commission tend to cover up what must obviously be its real motives.

(5) *Education, training, and readjustment programs*

As to education and training programs and readjustment assistance programs, the Bradley Commission seems to be of the opinion that they have been properly devised and used; that they must be recognized as the best way of discharging the Government's obligation to the nondisabled; and that such programs not only benefit the veterans, but contribute materially to the stability of the society in which they live.

We are, of course, inclined to agree with these general statements. We have long been aware that no piece of legislation, nor its administration, can be entirely perfect. We are aware of certain abuses which occurred under the GI bill, but we are also familiar with the fact most of the possibilities of abuse were cured when the time came for the enactment of a Korean GI bill.

Even now there are additional improvements to be made in connection with the administration of these programs.

We are concerned with the Bradley Commission's intimation that by conferring these benefits, the Government has discharged its entire obligation to the non-service-connected disabled veteran. We point out that the Government has an acknowledged continuing obligation where need exists. If the Bradley Commission is of the opinion that these programs have eliminated need, it is factually in error. So long as need exists, there is a void for pensions to fill. No amount of Bradley Commission statistics will change this concept. However, it may be pointed out that because of these programs the numbers in need will probably be fewer. If this be so, the Bradley Commission's general pension scare is considerably discredited.

In addition, we are not persuaded that the Bradley Commission is completely in accord with the proposition that these education and training programs and readjustment assistance programs are primarily the function and the responsibility of the Veterans' Administration. We detect in certain of the recommendations of the Bradley Commission an effort to disestablish some of these programs from Veterans' Administration and to turn the administration of those programs over to other agencies. We are deeply disturbed by any such effort on the part of the Bradley Commission or any other agency of Government. We have fought too long and too hard for the establishment of a separate Veterans' Administration and for the establishment of the concept that the affairs of the veteran should be treated as a separate entity by a special branch of Government.

The type of proposal which would "phase out" veterans housing by merging it into FHA and those proposals constituting a wholesale attack on veterans preference and other proposals which would eliminate or curtail veterans' benefits make the Bradley Commission's entire report suspect. Words of praise are so frequently followed in the report by suggestions which would dismember and destroy the veterans' program.

(D) HAS THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION BEEN REASONABLY SUCCESSFUL IN THE PERFORMANCE OF THE FUNCTIONS FOR WHICH IT WAS CREATED?

On this question, the Bradley Commission concludes that, on the whole, a reasonably effective job has been done by Veterans' Administration in furnishing veterans with the benefits intended by Congress.

We are in accord with this general conclusion.

The Bradley Commission is concerned, however, with clarifying the mission of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reflect his positive responsibility for the comprehensive analysis of program and long range policy development, including the function of advising the President. The Bradley Commission suggests further that the Administrator's personal staff should be augmented to include the highest caliber professional advisors in such fields as economics, statistics, public administration and sociology. The Bradley Commission further recommends that the research and statistical resources of the Veterans' Administration departments should be strengthened. It suggests that serious consideration be given to making the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs a member of the Cabinet, and that in any event, the President should establish a Cabinet Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs as a special member.

We are aware, of course, that such professional personnel as has been suggested may possibly, with charts and graphs and statistics and statistical projections, submerge the Administrator and overburden him with that type of detail which is so dear to the heart of the average governmental researcher and statistician. Nonetheless, a reasonably strong Administrator of Veterans' Affairs should certainly be able to discharge more fully his obligation to the veteran and to the country by a proper analysis of the material which could be prepared for him and upon the basis of which he could provide a greater degree of leadership in the field of veterans' affairs than he now does. In this connection, we would suggest that no real leadership in the field of veterans' affairs is possible until the complete dominance of the Administrator by the Bureau of the Budget is relieved.

There are other suggestions made by the Bradley Commission in connection with the office of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. One of these is that an additional limitation should be placed on his authority by more precise requirements and definitions and that the rules to be promulgated by him in large matters affecting the eligibility of veterans for benefits or involving changes in program objectives should be made subject to advance notice to and advance review by appropriate agencies of the Government.

So long as such a recommendation does not interfere unduly with such independence as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has been able to salvage, we would see no serious objection to the recommendation. However, we would strenuously object to the elimination of the authority of the Administrator by making him subservient to, or dependent upon, the approval of other agencies of Government prior to taking a proper action in the field that is exclusively within his own domain.

The Bradley Commission also suggests the establishment of a central administrative review, without affecting the ultimate finality of decisions by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. There is no great vice in the establishment of such review. It is true that it might well result in a standardization of decisions in different sections of the country. It is an additional expense; it is an additional step in the prosecution of a veteran's claim. We suggest that such problems as have developed might be just as ably handled by the present Board of Veterans' Appeals.

Finally, the Bradley Commission suggests that the laws affecting veterans should be codified and that in that process of codification, emphasis should be placed on simplification with mindfulness of the direct personal impact of the statutes, and that similar treatment should be given the related regulations.

Certainly, there can be no objection to making veterans' laws and regulations more simple in language and in clarifying and codifying those laws and regulations which govern such a large segment of our population. We warn, however, that such a project of codification and simplification could easily be turned into the vehicle for the embodiment of such changes as have been suggested by the Bradley Commission. The House of Representatives recognized such a danger as we now point to and specifically provided in the bill which it recently passed that the codification which it authorized be not used to change existing law.

SUMMARY

The Bradley Commission and its staff have labored mightily and expensively to bring down a very small bird. In spite of the presumed omniscience of the employees of the staff of the Bradley Commission, we, of the American Legion, are disposed to place the fate of the American veteran where it has always been—in the hands of the Congress of the United States. The Congress developed and will continue to develop a clear national philosophy of veterans' benefits. It will continue to relate those benefits properly to the other areas of legislation with which the Congress concerns itself for the social betterment of all the people. It will insist upon protecting the veterans as a class to which it acknowledged, during periods of war, a special obligation. It will not abandon that special obligation by substituting for it, as suggested by the Bradley Commission the opportunity to participate in social-security benefits which as citizens we are already entitled to do and for which, if we participate, we will have paid monetarily. It will continue to work effectively and constructively to take care of the demonstrated needs of the disabled veteran. It will protect him from overly egotistical individuals who would misrepresent the breadth of medical knowledge and destroy the veterans' capacity to obtain the benefits of presumptions in establishing his service connection. It will protect its right to concern itself with special classes of disabilities which it believes may be best handled by the use of statutory awards. It will preserve the integrity of the rehabilitation and readjustment benefit programs, protecting them against absorption by agencies of Government which believe that the veteran is owed no special obligation and which would seek to build little empires of their own at the expense of the best administration of the veterans' program.

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, if a courageous and independent individual, will be able to administer the program that the Congress has defined for him, recognizing that, as a member of the executive branch of the Government, he must have due respect for the remaining members of the executive branch of the Government and the programs which they administer.

We must reluctantly conclude that the Bradley Commission, in its report, has demonstrated that it bears close resemblance to the previous Hoover Commissions. It is another step in a little understood effort to represent the veteran as the creator of large problems adversely affecting the rest of America, who must be chastened, reduced in dignity, and made to forget that at one time he was assured of the gratitude, respect and continuing regard of all.

We do not know how many dollars have been spent in these efforts to diminish the stature of the American veteran, but whatever dollars have been spent have been wasted. We suggest that the time has now come to stop these senseless investigations of the same subject over and over again. The Congress is a capable body, aware of its legislative enactments in their entirety. It is accountable to the people. It is aware that many of those people who elect it and support it are veterans to whom pledges were made and will not be broken.

CONCLUSION

It is the American Legion's hope that by offering this broad analysis of the Bradley Commission's report, it may have been helpful to this House committee. We have tried to make it clear that there is nothing in the Bradley Commission's studies or report which should deter this House committee from continuing such action on pending bills as it may think proper.

We, of the American Legion, are interested primarily in the pension bill, H. R. 7886, and equally in the compensation bill, H. R. 9767, pending before this committee, on which we and others have testified at considerable length. This committee has shown great deference to the work of the Bradley Commission by scheduling hearings on its report. We suggest, and respectfully recommend now, that these pension and compensation bills which the House committee has so thoroughly investigated and which are so vital to so many veterans and their dependents, be now promptly handed to the Congress for its determination of their merits.

It is a very important report, Mr. Speaker, and there is a great deal of value in it.

CURTAILMENT OF THE BIRMINGHAM NAVAL AIR STATION

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I request the indulgence of the House of Representatives to make a brief statement on behalf of my congressional district, Jefferson County, Ala. As you know, I represent the largest district in Alabama, in population, and the fourth largest in the Nation. Jefferson County includes the city of Birmingham, the cities of Bessemer, Fairfield, Tarrant, Homewood, Mountain Brook, Leeds, and 19 other incorporated communities. It is largely urbanized.

One hundred years ago there was no Birmingham. This dynamic American city was founded in 1871, only 85 years ago. It now is one of the greatest industrial centers of the South, yea, of the entire Nation. The progressive growth of the great cluster of cities which I represent is one of the most inspiring stories in the annals of our Nation. Our amazing progress can be attributed to the energy, the sturdiness, the initiative, and the faith which the people of Jefferson County have in themselves and in their firm belief that they can make a great contribution to the economy and general welfare of the State of Alabama and the United States.

I point with pride to my district, and to the people who have made its greatness possible, for a reason.

In taking the floor at this time, I am motivated by a concern that the Federal Government is apparently unaware of the economic, financial, and industrial importance of my district. We in Jefferson County and Birmingham have been slighted by the Government in Washington for so many years that we are getting a "hangdog" feeling about it. I believe it is time that we quit "taking it" and give back awhile.

Let me give you an example of the failure of the various agencies of the executive branch to give proper consideration to the vast potentialities of the Birmingham district.

Within recent days and weeks, the Navy Department has reached a decision to abolish the Birmingham Naval Air Station, or to institute what amounts to a drastic curtailment of naval activities in my district. They would leave us a shell of our Naval Air Reserve training program in the form of a Naval Air Reserve facility.

At our Naval air station, we now have 208 active-duty support personnel, including officers and enlisted men, who administer and provide training for 784 active Naval Reserve aviators, ground and staff officers, and enlisted men. The Naval air station currently employ 25 civilian personnel. Under the Navy's plan for a Naval Air Reserve facility, we would have only approximately 22 active-duty support personnel, limited facilities, and only about 8 aircraft. All civilian employees would join the ranks of the unemployed.

In addition, the ineffective facility arrangement would be operated under the administrative control of a parent air station, from which it would receive its logistic support. The Navy presently envisons that the impotent Naval Air Reserve facility at Birmingham would receive its support from another Naval air station over 125 air-miles away. It is evident that the bulk of Alabama naval reservists, air and ground personnel, would have to travel this distance for their training.

Training and flying jet aircraft, which we all know represents the real need of our air arm today, would be denied to Brimingham although we are, at long last, about to realize our ambition in extending our main runway to take care of jet aircraft. The old conventional-type aircraft is completely outmoded in this age and it follows that flying planes of World War II vintage is neither attractive nor of value to the Nation's defense effort. Our air arm is properly placing the real emphasis on jets and little glamor is attached to flying obsolete aircraft.

The city of Birmingham will complete its jet runway in about November of this year, and yet the Navy uses as one justification for reducing Birmingham's Naval Air Station to a mere shell the fact that jet operations cannot now be satisfactorily accommodated at Birmingham on the existing runway.

We in Jefferson County and Birmingham do not begrudge others their good fortune but, at the same time, we cannot help noting that apparently the Navy gave little, if any, thought to expanding the training activities and facilities at the Birmingham Naval Air Station before reaching the decision to remove the administrative functions to another city over 125 miles away.

This brings me to my major point. The Navy asserts that its action with respect to Birmingham was dictated by the desire to effect the most efficient utilization of the total manpower resources available. Navy spokesmen have stated that progress made by Birmingham has been disappointing in that it is presently supporting only six Reserve units, and it has a higher than average cost per trainee when compared with similar Reserve installations.

The Navy itself, in my considered opinion, must bear much of the responsibility for what they term disappointing participation in the Reserve program at Birmingham. This allegation is borne out by the extensive improvements being made by the Navy at many other Reserve installations of comparable size and potential. For example, the naval air stations at Birmingham, Lincoln, Nebr., and Niagara Falls, N. Y., were commissioned about the same time, and it is believed that these three stations have roughly the same potential Reserve personnel strength. There have been, to my knowledge, no expenditures at Birmingham other than for maintenance, whereas new facilities have been authorized for Lincoln and Niagara Falls at a total cost of over $10 million. Also, a new $4,500,000 facility is to be constructed at the naval air station in Atlanta so that jet aircraft can be supported. Extensive improvements and new facilities are planned for the naval air stations at Willow Grove, Dallas, Glenview, and Los Alamitos. The Grosse Ile and Akron stations are being moved to Willow Run and Cleveland, with the addition of new facilities.

In short, the Naval Air Reserve stations over the entire United States, with few exceptions, are now suffering from lack of jet runways and the Navy has announced plans for both jet runways and improved facilities at most of the stations, with the exception of Birmingham. We Alabamians fail completely to understand why Birmingham has been made the exception.

The city of Birmingham is constructing its new jet runway without the financial assistance of the Navy.

Further evidence that the Navy has completely overlooked the needs of the Birmingham Naval Air Station, in comparison with similar installations, is shown in that practically every other naval installation in this country has adequate barracks and BOQ facilities for the "weekend warriors." Most of these installations have adequate facilities for conducting physical fitness programs, including tennis courts, swimming pools, and gymnasiums. They also have enlisted men's clubs, CPO clubs, officers' clubs, movies, cafeterias, tailor shops, service stations, libraries, hobby shops, and many other activities which are not only convenient but provide outlets which attract membership in the Reserve program. None of these facilities, I repeat, none, exist at the Birmingham Naval Air Station. The Navy has most generously provided a small ship's service and a very small snack bar where a sandwich may be obtained.

We in Jefferson County and Alabama believe that, had funds been appropriated by the Navy for additional facilities at our naval air station comparable to the appropriations for similar stations in other parts of the country, we would now have 20 Reserve squadrons instead of 6, and our cost per trainee would be much lower than the average for the other Naval Air Reserve installations.

I should like to emphasize that the current annual cost of operating the Birmingham Naval Air Station is only $368,000. This is no more than sufficient to train three Naval Air Cadets at the Naval Air Station in Pensacola, Fla. The reduction of the Naval Air Reserve Training Program at Birmingham as proposed, would be the height of false economy. The cost of operating this station is so small and the results so great when compared with the overall expenditure for national defense that it is unthinkable that the Navy could be so shortsighted as to propose closing it in the interests of economy.

The Rand McNally survey shows that Birmingham ranked third in the Nation in business for 1955 and is one of the country's leaders in wage level increases with an 8-percent rise in the year just passed. The Federal Government, including the Navy, should be aware that it has been estimated that at least 3,000 new major industries will be located in the South within the next few years. I am confident that Birmingham and the State of Alabama will receive its share of these new industries. My district now has a population of 612,000 people. It is continuing to play a major role in the growth of business and its population is increasing at a phenomenal rate.

That the Birmingham area has a tremendous potential of naval and Naval Reserve personnel is obvious.

One other point with respect to the Navy's plan for Birmingham which I should like to bring to the attention of Congress is that Birmingham has been designated by the Civil Defense Administration and the Department of Defense as one of the prime target areat, that is, one of the first cities which will be attacked in the event of an atomic war. This, in itself, without regard to the other arguments which I have presented, should be a sufficient justification for maintaining a strong and expanded Naval Reserve training program in my city.

All we in Birmingham and Alabama ask is that we be given a chance to prove ourselves—a chance comparable to that given to other cities similarly situated. We know that if this is done, we will be able to make a much greater contribution to the Navy's Reserve training program. We have accepted the challenge if the Navy will give us equal treatment and facilities.

A TRIBUTE TO DAVE REED, OF EDWARDSVILLE, ILL.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, a gentleman named Dave Reed—an old man of 90 years—died the other day. He had spent some time of late in a sanitarium in Edwardsville, in the 24th District of Illinois, that I have the honor to represent. He had been a miner, and a man of parts.

In a letter to the editor of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, a friend of Mr. Reed paid tribute to the gallant man. He told of Dave Reed's belief in the right, rather than in power. He told how Dave Reed fought for his rights and the rights of his fellow man in his unions.

There are more Dave Reeds in America than we sometimes know of, but frequently they lack the friend who will write about their deeds and gallantry after they are gone. I was so impressed by the eloquence of the letter paying tribute to this fine American that, under unanimous consent, I ask to have it printed at the conclusion of these remarks, so that it will be a permanent part of our RECORD, and a permanent memorial to him:

WHAT DAVE REED DID

To the EDITOR OF THE POST-DISPATCH:

In January when we saw Dave Reed at the Edwardsville sanitarium, the 90-year-old-miner thought he would be up perhaps in time this spring to work his garden at Maryville, Ill. But in March when we returned he said complications had set in and he doubted if he would last out the month.

There was silence between us and Dave broke the lull with: "It will be all right for one of you fellows to say something over my grave; but don't put it on too thick."

Dave Reed died on April 4, and on April 7 he was buried at the Collinsville Cemetery under the direction of local No. 3 of the Progressive Mine Workers. Jack Battuello, former Wilsonville miner and Reed's coworker, drew the hard task of making the funeral speech and what a fine speech it was.

There is a pattern that is now clear about miners' speeches and that is that they are part of the world in which millions of other human beings reside, and they feel almost instinctively that the lasting solutions of mankind lie in world solutions. We rise or fall with the human race as a whole. That of course, is a high feeling, and this sentiment flows easily among the miners perhaps because they have suffered so much.

The sketch of Dave Reed's life reveals that he was born in Llewellyn, Pa., on December 21, 1866—the year after Lincoln's assassination. His parents were of Scotch ancestry. At the age of 9 he began work as a breaker boy and labored with coal diggers who as Union soldiers had dug the shaft which set off the blast under Confederate fortifications defending Petersburg. Douglas Freeman later defined the "big hole" which the miners blasted as one of the "secret weapons" of the Civil War.

Dave Reed's life then was to span practically the entire history of the various coalminers' unions: He knew the Molly Maguires, belonged successively to the Association of Miners' the National Miners' Association, the Knights of Labor, helped form the United Mine Workers of America, and joined the Western Federation of Miners when he worked in the Western States.

And when the Progressive Miners were formed in Illinois in 1932 he did not hesitate to lead his Collinsville local into the new union and his local was numbered 3 of the 177 locals that were chartered.

In 1937 the Progressive Miners elected Dave Reed to their highest office—the presidency. Throughout his life Dave Reed stood for what he believed was right and just: "Don't worry about power. Power is only temporary. Think about what is right. Help what is right along and the rest will take care of itself."

He was to practice what he preached. The division between the miners found the United Mine Workers on strike while the Progressives remained at work. This did not fit into what Dave thought was right and he summarily placed his job as president on the block of political controversy for he believed that the miners should reunite on the basis of an entirely changed situation from the conditions which had precipitated the schism.

The prejudices ran deep and a blood line separated the miners and they were to turn Dave Reed down on the question of reunification. Dave left the office without regret.

Dave Reed excelled as a pit committeeman and he could hold his own and defend the men's interests on the basis of what was in the contract. He worked overtime as a local union officer, delegate to conventions, funeral committees, sick committees, relief work, and many other tasks.

He was of the stuff that forges movements, the cement that held the union together, the real power that enabled leaders at the top to bargain for better things for working people.

Dave Reed left this world just about the way he came into it, without possessions, except for the four-room house he left to his wife, Catherine. This season while others will be preoccupied with their gardens, Dave Reed's small plot will be idle and unattended. The mine whistle will blow once to signal that his work is done.

GERRY ALLARD.

SPRINGFIELD, ILL.

THE TRANSIT SITUATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the proposal in H. R. 8901 to restore the franchise to the Capital Transit Co. with very substantial and novel concessions is an unfortunate one. It will be remembered that the decision of the Congress to revoke the franchise of the

Capital Transit Co. was made during a strike—a strike which was but one more step in the long history of antipublic attitudes reflected in the Wolfson group's conduct of the business of the Capital Transit Co. That strike, you will recall, was provoked by the company's plain refusal to seek a realistic determination of the issues involved in the then-current labor dispute. In 1954, a Senate subcommittee, composed of Senators PAYNE, BEALL, and MORSE, filed a report on public transportation in the District of Columbia—Senate Report No. 1274, 83d Congress, 2d session. In discussing the proposal of Louis Wolfson in which Wolfson suggested the formation of a Washington Transit Authority, the report of the Senate subcommittee says—page 62:

The general managerial attitude of the Wolfson group toward the problems previously discussed in this section and their public statements clearly indicate that they place their own private financial interests above those of the public in their operation of Capital Transit Co. This attitude has given credibility to the widespread public belief that the Wolfson group is milking the Capital Transit Co. preparatory to dumping the system on the Government. Whether this is the intent of the group the subcommittee cannot, of course, conclusively determine; but there are strong indications that this well may be their ultimate goal.

The subcommittee also stated at page 62:

The Capital Transit Co. follows that course of action which best suits the interests of its controlling group, irrespective of the public interests.

In conclusion, the report states:

Lest this report seem too harsh on Capital Transit Co. and the Wolfson group, the subcommitee state that the facts have been developed and analyzed to the best of their ability with the staff and time available. No illegal actions on the part of Louis E. Wolfson and his asociates were discovered in the operation of the Capital Transit Co. The subcommittee found, however, that the general managerial attitude of the Wolfson group was contrary to the managerial attitude which should be held by the operators of a public transportation company.

When the Wolfson interests obtained control of the Capital Transit Co. in 1949, they obtained a block of 109,458 shares for $2,189,160, or $20 a share. In an article entitled "Profit Taken, Wolfson Ending Transit Venture," which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on July 31, 1955, Edward F. Ryan and S. Oliver Goodman pointed out:

Here's what the Wolfsons have harvested from their original investment of $2.2 million:

Dividends, $3,119,580; $537,600 in Continental Enterprises stock; $1,688,000, market value of CTC shares sold or disbursed. This makes a total of $5,345,180. They still own 28 percent of outstanding CTC stock, with a market value currently of about $2.7 million.

Their original investment of $2.2 million has mushroomed into an estimated $8 million. However, in fairness to the Wolfsons, it must be emphasized that these estimates are gross amounts and that Federal income taxes in their earnings brackets are heavy.

Nor has this been all. For a time the public was burdened with extremely heavy salaries paid to officers of the company. In 1949, B. W.—before Wolfson—Edward D. Merrill served as chairman of the board and president at $36,000 a year; Robert V. Fleming served as chairman of the executive committee at $5,000 and J. B. Heberle served as vice president and comptroller at $19,000, all for a total of $60,000 a year in top salaries. By contrast, in November 1953, Louis Wolfson received $40,000 a year as chairman of the board; J. A. B. Broadwater, $40,000 a year as president and chairman of the executive committee; Doran S. Weinstein as executive vice president, $30,000; and Robert E. Harvey, $21,000 as vice president and comptroller. For that year the top salaries totaled $131,000.

While there have been changes in the top personnel, and Louis Wolfson no longer receives his salary as chairman of the board—although he does receive a substantial expense account—the doubling of the salaries as enumerated above, is indicative of the gains made, salarywise, by the Wolfson interests.

Prior to the coming of the Wolfson management, the company never paid more than $2 a share in dividends in any 1 year. In 1950, the first year after Wolfson came, the dividends were boosted to $3; and in 1951 to $4. In October of 1951, the Wolfson interests declared a 4-to-1 stock split. In 1952, an extra dividend of $10 was paid in addition to a regular dividend of $5.60. In 1953, dividends of $5.80 were paid, and 1954, $5.60—in each case, the dividends are on the basis of the shares before they were split up.

Let us remember also that on July 28, 1955, during the long, hot strike, the company offered to the Congress to surrender its franchise and to operate the property for 1 year until the termination of the franchise would become effective. The offer to give up the franchise undoubtedly gave impetus to the legislation revoking it. The Congress simply took Wolfson at his word. Now it appears that the Capital Transit Co. has changed its mind. Perhaps it senses in the vast concessions obtained in H. R. 8901 an opportunity to squeeze some more juice out of the lemon.

The company has already brought together large sums for distribution to the stockholders. In its most recent annual report, dated Mar. 7, 1956, Messrs. Wolfson and Broadwater stated to the stockholders that the company expected to distribute a substantial first liquidating dividend shortly after August 14, 1956. The report pointed out, page 5:

Estimated cash will amount to $6 million as of August 14, 1956.

The fact is crystal clear that H. R. 8901 does not represent any permanent solution to the transit problem in the District of Columbia. In all probability, the Wolfson management, once it has utilized the concessions made in H. R. 8901 for the primary benefit of the stockholders, will then rediscover their own proposal for a Washington Transit Authority. Let us not create a situation which will further enrich the Capital Transit Co. at the expense of the public and wind up with a public transit authority anyway.

PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON VETERANS' PENSIONS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, in studying the Bradley report on veterans' pensions, I was somewhat concerned as to whether the statements made before the Veterans' Affairs Committee by General Bradley were agreed to by the President. For the purpose of obtaining this information, I addressed the following letter to the President:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 7, 1956.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: May I respectfully invite your attention to the following paragraph of your letter to Gen. Omar N. Bradley, chairman of the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions, which was released by your press secretary, James C. Hagerty, on March 5, 1955.

"The Commission on Veterans' Pensions, of which you are the chairman, has been appointed by me to carry out a comprehensive study of the laws and policies pertaining to pension, compensation, and related remedial benefits for our veterans and their dependents. I would like the Commission, on the basis of its studies, to furnish me with a report, including recommendations regarding fundamental principles, which I can use as the basis for making recommendations to the Congress for modernization of these benefits and clarification of their relationship to broader Government social insurance and family protection programs."

On April 23, 1956, the Commission did submit such a report to you; and on that date General Bradley appeared before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, of which I am a member, and presented the report with a personal explanation to the committee.

To my knowledge, however, your approval or disapproval of the report has not been made known to the Congress nor to any committee thereof. The purpose of this letter, therefore, is to ask if you have approved the report in whole or in part and when your recommendations, if any, will be officially transmitted to the Congress.

As a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I am deeply interested in all veterans' legislation and the administration of the veterans programs as enacted by the Congress and your views with respect to the report will be most helpful, I am sure, in helping me to arrive at decisions when legislation is being considered by our committee.

Inasmuch as my committee is meeting on May 8 and 9, I would appreciate it if it would be possible for one of your secretaries to call and give me the information requested.

With best wishes for your continued physical improvement,

Respectfully yours,
GEORGE S. LONG,
Member of Congress.

In compliance with my request of the President for an immediate telephonic response to my letter, the following reply was telephoned to my office by Mr. Bryce Harlow, the President's administrative assistant:

The report of the Bradley Commission has been put under a tight analysis. It will be some time before any conclusions are reached

in regard to this report. All the background reports of the Commission have not yet been completed, and all this must be taken into consideration before the President makes any recommendations on this report.

AMERICAN CITIZENS DEPRIVED OF PROPERTY UNDER ALIEN PROPERTY LAWS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the following statement I submitted to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on April 30, 1956, in support of my bill, H. R. 5098, to amend section 32 (a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

Immediate favorable action on my bill will rectify a grave injustice in the existing law which discriminates against and deprives American citizens of property to which they are legally and justly entitled.

STATEMENT OF HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN IN SUPPORT OF H. R. 5098, TO AMEND SECTION 32 (A) OF THE TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. Chairman, I deeply appreciate the opportunity you have afforded me of submitting this statement in support of the bill H. R. 5098, to amend section 32 (a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act. The purpose of this bill is to correct an inequity resulting from the wording of the present law.

The Trading With the Enemy Act now provides that property vested in the Alien Property Custodian may not be returned if the owner of the property was a German citizen who was present in Germany during the period of the war unless he was deprived of full rights of German citizenship as a consequence of German laws discriminating against political, racial and religious groups. Section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act precludes turning over the property by the Alien Property Custodian to American citizens who become the rightful owners of such property under the terms of a will. I know of a particular case where fine patriotic American citizens who are the legatees under the will of a German citizen are being deprived of property which is rightfully theirs in the possession of the Alien Property Custodian.

It seems to me that it could not have been the intent of the Congress to deprive American citizens of property to which they are otherwise legally entitled merely because the former owner was present in Germany during World War II. That does not seem to be a valid criterion of the authority of the Alien Property Custodian to withstand the claims of American citizens. There were of course many individuals in Germany during the war who—while they were not actually persecuted because of their race or religion—nevertheless were not Nazis or supporters of the Nazi regime. However, I am not concerned in the present bill with the problem of returning property to those owners. This bill is intended to authorize the Alien Property Custodian to turn over the property to American citizens who are rightfully entitled thereto. If an American citizen would be otherwise entitled to the property it is manifestly unfair to deprive him of the property merely because the former owner of it was present in Germany during the war.

This bill will clarify section 32 (a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act to the extent that the person otherwise entitled to the propery may receive it from the Alien Property Custodian unless he was present in Germany during the war. This, I believe, is in keeping with the original intent of the Congress and is to my mind certainly more equitable and just than the situation brought about by the present language in the Trading With the Enemy Act.

It is a matter of great importance and the amendment will not interfere in the slightest with the philosophy of the present law.

I earnestly urge prompt and favorable action by your committee on the present bill.

AMENDMENTS TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT LOWERING ELIGIBILITY AGE FOR RETIREMENT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions I have spoken on the floor of this House to urge that we must humanize our social-security system by providing benefits for those workers who are so severely disabled that they are forced to leave their jobs, and to lower the eligibility age for retirement. In every session of Congress since I have been in Washington, I have introduced bills which would accomplish these results. My bills would provide disability benefits at any age, and lower the retirement age for men to age 60 and for women to age 55.

During the last session of the Congress, as you know, the House passed a bill which added these improvements which I have so long advocated, but in a limited form. Under that bill, benefits would be payable to workers who were totally and permanently disabled at or after age 50. And the eligibility age for women would have been lowered from age 65 to age 62.

I voted for that bill. It did not go far enough, in my opinion, but it was a step in the right direction.

These amendments to the Social Security Act are now being considered by the Senate Finance Committee. For many weeks, they have been listening to a long series of witnesses. I have watched these hearings carefully. And, if I may say so, practically everyone has been heard except the people who would be directly affected by this legislation. I refer to the men and women throughout the country who, because of a crippling disease or accident, can no longer support their families. Under existing law, they are told that they must wait until they are 65 years old until they are entitled to social-security benefits.

I refer as well to those older women—many of them widows—who, although they are in dire need, are also told that they must wait until they reach age 65 before they are entitled to payments from our social-security system.

Because I am convinced that the plight of these Americans must be our first consideration, I rise today to speak on their behalf.

The Senate committee has been told by most of the opponents of our Social Security System that such improvements would be too costly to the taxpayers. They have opposed the increase in the contribution rate of ½ percent on wages up to $4,200 by which the House bill would have absorbed the cost of these additional benefits. This sudden concern over the welfare of the American taxpayer shocks me.

Mr. Speaker, I want the record to show that I do not agree with the objection that these important new benefits would be too costly to the taxpayers. I am sure that the American people would be willing to pay this additional contribution if they knew the kind of increased protection they would receive as a result. I am sure that the American worker would willingly pay this relatively small additional amount if he knew that his wife would be entitled to benefits at age 62 instead of age 65, and that his family would be entitled to a regular social security payment in the event that he could no longer work because he was disabled.

The truth of the matter is that millions of workers in the country have already demonstrated their concern with this kind of protection. The Federal employees now pay a percentage of their total salary so that they can acquire protection against disability in this form. So do men and women covered by the railroad retirement system, by plans for employees of State and local governments throughout the country; and by workers in many private plans.

They want this kind of protection because they know that a disabling illness or injury may strike at any time, adding its own treatment costs at a time when wages have ceased. I dare say that there is no more haunting fear on the part of most husbands and fathers than that such an eventuality might occur.

And, I am convinced that, when we are discussing costs, we must always bear in mind the costs to the human spirit when wages stop at a time of crippling illness. The need for social-security benefits at this time is certainly demonstrable. Under our present plan, we pay benefits because of loss of wages caused by retirement. And we pay benefits because of loss of wages caused by the death of the family breadwinner. But we have so far refused to allow the American people to increase their protection—through their own contributions, mind you—so that they will be entitled to benefits when wages stop because they are disabled.

A very weak argument has been offered in opposing the lowering of the retirement age for women from 65 to 62. Such a change, the opponents of social security say, would tend to reduce job opportunities for many older workers and would conflict with the fact that more women are living longer and working longer than ever before. I wonder how many older women have been consulted in reaching this conclusion. How many older women are able to obtain jobs in the first place? What does the record show? In a speech before the

House of Representatives on March 17, 1953, I quoted the statement of Dr. John W. McConnell, which appeared in the report of the New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Problems of the Aging, calling attention to the tragic plight of those wives and widows who, after they have raised their families, suddenly find that they must fend for themselves. In Dr. McConnell's words:

> Nearly 4 million elderly women, previously married, and for the most part supported by their husbands, now are forced to find an independent source of income, and to adjust not only to the problems of old age and inadequate income, but to the problem of widowhood as well.

We must ask ourselves then, first of all, how many of these women are able to find jobs? And we must also ask ourselves how many of those women who do find jobs—usually at the lowest pay scales because of their inexperience—are working not because they want to work longer, but because they must, much to their regret, in order to maintain themselves and to earn their benefits.

By lowering the eligibility age for women from age 65 to age 62, as provided in the House bill, we would be relieving the plight of thousands of older women in our country, and creating job opportunities for younger workers at the same time. We would also recognize the special needs of all retired workers. For in paying a wife's benefit at age 62, we would also recognize that most wives are younger than their husbands. Under the present system, no wife's benefits are payable until the wife reaches age 65. In most families, the single retirement benefit to which the husband would be entitled until his wife reaches age 65 is not enough to maintain the family. It was in recognition of this fact that a wife's benefit was added to the social-security system in 1939. By reducing the age requirement for a wife's benefit, we would make it possible for many men to retire at 65 because the amount of social-security benefits they would receive would be adequate to maintain themselves and their wives. And once again, the labor market would thus be opened to younger men.

Mr. Speaker, I am not impressed with the warnings of our opponents of social security that the enactment of this bill would add 1 million women and disabled workers to the rolls of old-age and survivors insurance system. Have they talked to the hundreds and thousands of women in their 60's or to disabled workers? I believe they have the best answer as to the merits of this legislation.

Does such a position recognize the fact that an unemployed man at 45 finds it difficult to get a job? Does it recognize that modern miracles of production are inevitably shortening the work life of most of us if we are to maintain job opportunities for younger workers?

I find it difficult to understand the logic of the position which maintains that we must protect workers against a small increase in their social-security tax, at the cost of refusing to furnish them with the kind of protection which the House bill would provide. This is one tax which would establish a right to direct benefits to the worker himself and to his family. In this sense, it is an investment which will pay off in the future at a time when earnings cease. In making such payments the workers become, in effect, "stockholders" in the social-security system.

I believe the people of this country are in favor of a plan which would reach down below the arbitrary retirement age of 65 to award benefits to those workers who are forced to retire prematurely from the labor force because of a crippling illness or injury which makes them unable to perform any kind of work. As I said last year, when the House amendments were under consideration:

> For the truth of the matter is that a man who is the victim of an injury or illness which cannot be cured has been forcibly retired from the labor force by a tragedy over which he has no control. Such a crippling illness or injury does not wait until a 65th birthday, but can strike any one of us at any time. According to the best estimates, approximately 2 million Americans are away from their jobs each day because of a disability which has lasted 7 months or more. Most of these workers and their families face a bleak future. For the earnings of the family breadwinner have stopped because he is unable to work at a time when the expenses of the family have greatly increased due to the costs of his medical care. But, under the existing social-security law, he is not entitled to receive a social-security benefit until he reaches his 65th birthday.

I believe that the people of this country want to provide for the retirement of women at age 62, instead of holding to the old-fashioned eligibility age of 65 years which was chosen arbitrarily away back in 1935 and has not been changed since that time.

I am convinced that the people of this country are in favor of the social-security amendments as passed by the House last year because they represent a move in the direction of improving and humanizing our social-security system. As I have said, we must never overlook the costs in terms of family welfare and of the human spirit in failing to enact this type of legislation. Nor must we overlook the subsidiary costs arising from the delay and destitution characteristic of the assistance programs concerned with these problems.

It is certainly unrealistic to assume that every worker is able to work until he reaches the arbitrary age of 65. For example, experience has shown that disability rates tend to increase with the severity of the disablement at approximately age 50. But if a worker aged 50 is forced to quit work because he is unable to work, he is now subject to a double penalty: First, he loses his job and the wages it would bring in at a time when medical expense for the family is increased; and, second, he must wait until he is aged 65 before he is entitled to any benefits.

In providing disability benefits for such workers, and in adjusting the eligibility age for older women, we will be facing up to the economic realities of our time, and adding a measure of security to our social-security system which is in line with those realities. At the same time we will be helping to relieve the consequences of tragedy in millions of American homes.

I hope and trust that the Senate Finance Committee will have the courage to favorably report out this bill as passed by this House. In doing so they will be listening to the plea of millions of Americans as against a few who would tear down the benefits of our social-security system.

FACTS AND FIGURES—A CORRECTION OF DISTORTIONS AND OMISSIONS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] gave us a thoughtful and penetrating analysis of the past and present operations of the House Small Business Committee.

The gentleman from Colorado, as we are all aware, was the distinguished chairman of the committee in the 83d Congress and is the present ranking minority member of the Small Business Committee.

The gentleman has served on the committee for 10 years and can speak with authority, not only because of his long service, but as a small-business man in his own right.

For my part, I agree with the conclusions of my friend.

I wish to add some thoughts on the subject and to give you additional facts and figures which are accurate and unadorned.

I also desire to show that the problems of small business did not become "problems" when President Eisenhower took office.

The Eisenhower administration inherited most of these problems and has striven to correct them.

We do not believe our friends of the majority have fairly presented what they claim are comparisons on business failures, Government procurement, or on the activities and work of the Small Business Administration.

I hope Members of this House will recall one pertinent fact, namely, that they have received over the years cooperation on every small business problem from Republican members of the committee.

Particularly, I call to the attention of the members of the Small Business Committee the total absence of sharp shooting such as we have witnessed in the 84th Congress.

I say to my friends on the committee: Play all the politics you like, but do not play politics with small business.

Do not play politics with our system of free competition and free enterprise.

To do either is hazardous to our Nation's welfare.

There is no reason for the establishment of a Select Committee on Small

Business except for the avowed purpose of studying existing and future problems of small business and making a constructive effort to solve such problems.

May I say that for years our committee has had the respect of Members of Congress and businessmen throughout the country for its integrity and impartiality.

Such respect was justly deserved, for regardless of political affiliation the members of this committee, for the most part, have insisted on an objective analysis of whatever subject it had under study.

I seriously question whether our work in the 84th Congress thus far will merit this same respect.

In view of the way the committee has operated this past year, no other conclusion can be drawn.

Rather than enlist the full cooperation of all members to study the many areas in which difficulties confront small business, the majority has, with few exceptions, selected doubtful areas for its investigations and has operated almost wholly without consultation with the minority members.

In all fairness, and from my own personal knowledge, there has been an outstanding exception and that is Subcommittee No. 2, whose chairman is the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

It has been a pleasure for me to serve as a member of this subcommittee, and I have had the fullest cooperation.

There have been no hearings by Subcommittee No. 2, or plans for investigation, without the fullest consultation on the part of the gentleman from New York and the staff of the subcommittee.

However, the majority of the committee investigations have been almost entirely political.

A studied attempt has been made to incite small business to oppose the constructive efforts of the Eisenhower administration.

I want at this time to set the record straight in a few particulars.

First, I want to talk a few moments about the false issue of "big business" versus "small business."

If a fair analysis is made of the small business situation as it has existed over the years; this false concept is certainly no issue in this or any other campaign.

Of course, our friends will not make such an analysis.

The record of the Truman administration does not invite comparison.

I have made another analysis recently of reports of the House Small Business Committee published during the 81st and 82d Congresses when we had an administration and a Congress controlled by the Democrats.

These reports, Mr. Speaker, were unanimous reports, made after very thorough examinations by the committee under the chairmanship of the present chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

In these reports we find in the strongest terms committee criticism on the following points—criticism which clearly demonstrates the objectivity of the committee in those trying years of the committee's life.

Here are some examples:

First. The Small Business Committee was much concerned over the failure of Government procurement agencies to award a fair share of Government contracts to small business.

Writing in the fall of 1952, the committee stated—House Report No. 2513, 82d Congress:

> The only conclusion to this examination of the extent of small-business participation in Government procurement is that, with the exception of purchases of civilian supplies by civilian purchasing agencies, small business is receiving less of the military procurement dollar than ever before. The average small-business potential for all the armed services was determined to be 29.9 percent, but only 59.6 percent of this potential was actually awarded to small businesses. This is only 17.6 percent of the total dollar value awarded to all businesses. The small business share of prime contracts has fallen from 24.5 percent of the total dollar value in fiscal 1950, to 17.6 in 1952, a continuing decline since the attack on Korea (pp. 165–168).

The committee in its report—House Report No. 2513, 82d Congress, 2d session—again stated:

> Since small business now receives a very low percentage of military procurement, it is evident that the primary defect is in the attitudes and judgment of the officials responsible for the administration of the small-business policy in the Department of Defense. The present attitude seems to be that small business is already receiving its fair proportion. Such an attitude indicates bad judgment and failure to soundly appraise economic conditions in the Nation's business structure (p. 168).

Second. The Small Business Committee was similarly concerned about the large percentage of Government contracts awarded through the process of negotiation to the detriment of small concerns.

The final report of the 81st Congress—House Report No. 3237, 81st Congress, 2d session—stated:

> Periodic statistical information from the Department of Defense gave clear evidence of the very small share of defense contracts placed with small business. In the period following the Korean conflict the dollar value of defense orders placed with small business diminished at an alarming rate. At the same time, purchases made through advertised bidding declined in value, while purchases made by negotiation mounted correspondingly. Officials of the Munitions Board and the Department of Commerce were quoted in effect as saying that small business should get in touch with large business in order to participate in the defense program. This advice was tantamount to asking small business to "stay away from my door" (p. 20).

Third. Criticism was made of the failure of these same procurement agencies to adopt a more realistic definition of what constitutes a small-business concern despite the fact that the Selective Service Act of 1947 contained such a definition of small business.

In 1949, the committee said—House Report No. 1576, 81st Congress, 1st session:

> Under the Selective Service Act (Public Law 759, 80th Cong.), a concern is classed as "small business" if "(1) its position in the trade or industry of which it is a part is not dominant, (2) the number of its employees does not exceed 500, and (3) it is independently owned and operated." The committee has been informed by all branches of the armed services that their application of this definition is confined to the number of employees for use in classifying a business as large or small. No attempt is made to determine whether or not a business is dominant in its industry (p. 7).

In 1950, the committee stated—House Report No. 3237, 81st Congress, 2d session:

> The present definition of small business utilized by governmental agencies is the result of tortuous thinking during World War II. * * * At present, we have a definition which literally has little meaning in the executive departments and agencies; nevertheless, it is the law of the land. The committee recommends that the present definition of small business be realistically revised in order that all small business may be included in the meaningful definition (pp. 53 and 54).

Fourth. Much has been said recently concerning the position of big business in our economy. Let us see what the Small Business Committee had to say in 1952 about the awarding of a lion's share of Government contracts to a few very large corporations.

I quote from the final report of the committee to the 82d Congress—House Report No. 2513:

> The general pattern of channeling a high percentage of the dollar value of defense contracts to a relatively few large producers, as established in World War II, is being followed today. Sixty-six and two-thirds percent of the prime war-supply contracts were awarded to the 100 largest corporations from 1940 to 1944. More than 51 percent of the total prime contracts went to the top 33 corporations. The records of 252 of the largest corporations, which received the bulk of World War II prime contracts, show that these companies subcontracted only 34 percent of the dollar value of their prime contracts and that three-fourths of the value of the subcontracts went to firms with over 500 workers. From July 1950 through December 1951, the 100 largest companies and corporate groups received 59.9 percent of the dollar value of prime contracts awarded in the continental United States. * * * More than 46 percent of the dollar value of contracts went to the top 33 companies (pp. 137, 138).

Fifth. An extremely penetrating investigation of antitrust law enforcement caused the committee to comment on the complete failure or the Federal Trade Commission to properly enforce our antitrust laws—House Report. No. 3236, 81st Congress, antitrust law enforcement by the Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the foregoing report the comments of our committee on page 5 of the final report to the 81st Congress—House Report No. 3237—and on pages 249, 308, and 310 of the final report of the 82d Congress—House Report No. 2513—concerning the operation of the Federal Trade Commission, are worthy of particular attention.

I wish to reiterate that the Federal Trade Commission was then under the majority control of the Democrats.

As an example, I quote one section of one of the foregoing reports—House Report No. 2513, 82d Congress.

The committee said in this report:

On the other hand, the committee would not be performing its duty to the Congress if it did not point out the continued existence of grave weaknesses in the operation of the Federal Trade Commission. Most ominous of all is the deep gulf that has appeared within the Commission, in respect both to the theory of the law and to the procedures of its enforcement. It is no secret that on almost every major issue, particularly those involving the Robinson-Patman Act, both the members of the Commission and the staff are sharply and sometimes irreconcilably divided. The unfortunate results of this conflict within the Commission are clearly evident. It is partly responsible for the delay in processing cases as it leads to almost endless debate. It tends to result in compromises on matters of principles where no compromise should be tolerated. * * * It leads to vacillation and erratic decisions. It produces a profound confusion among businessmen and the public generally as to the meaning of the law and the policy of the Commission.

In its earlier report, the Committee called attention to certain other weaknesses in the administration of the Federal Trade Commission and Clayton Acts. Among these are the low level of morale among the Commission's staff, the lack of consistent policy in the selection of cases, the lack of a vigorous program of enforcing cease-and-desist orders, the relative ineffectiveness of the trade practice conference program, and the need for more effective relief in price discrimination cases. Events of the past 2 years have not caused the committee to change its earlier conclusions.

The fact is clear that small business is not today receiving adequate protection against those restrictive and oppressive practices which tend to stifle free competition and foster monopoly. In spite of isolated successes, the Federal Trade Commission is not achieving its major goal of eradicating unfair and discriminatory practices. This committee is convinced that the time has come for the Congress to thoroughly review the role of the Commission in our antitrust program to determine whether the administrative process can be made sufficiently effective and if it cannot, to devise an alternative (p. 31).

Sixth. During these Democratic years we find comments of the committee in its reports on the continued trend toward economic concentration and the high rate of corporate mergers; on, seventh, the profits of small corporations as compared to those of large corporations; on, eighth, the continued need by small firms for long-term credit, aggravated by the tax rates of the time; and on, ninth, the inability of small firms to participate to the fullest extent in the rapid tax write-off of defense facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on pointing out committee comments on the plight of small business during the 81st and 82d Congresses.

But, I am not going to say that things were terrible then and that there are no problem areas today.

I am going to be fair and say that small business still encounters many of these same difficulties and much work still needs to be done.

The Eisenhower administration has recognized this fact and has made considerable progress in correcting many of the inequities which were prevalent when this administration took office.

Small business, in general, has shared in the economic prosperity of the past few years.

The majority has placed particular emphasis on profits and business failures.

They would have us believe that the position of small business as compared with large business has deteriorated since 1952.

They attempt to show that since 1952, small-business profits have plummeted and the number of business failures has risen sharply.

Frankly, I prefer to use more realistic figures to describe what is happening today.

Of course, I have already quoted portions of committee reports for 1950, 1951, and 1952, which showed that small firms were having a real struggle during those days.

But let us see what the real story is today with regard to small business, because only through a fair analysis can constructive suggestions be made which will be of assistance to these concerns.

BUSINESS FAILURES

First, let us look at business failures.

Too much has been said about business failures without adequate consideration being given to the number of failures which have been characteristic of the business economy.

A fair evaluation can only be made after consideration is given to whether or not we are at war or at peace, at what period of time the study is made, the total number of business concerns in operation at a particular time and other factors.

I wish to state right now that comments on weekly business failures are meaningless, only a year-end evaluation gives the true picture.

Several times in the past 2 months my Democratic friends have expressed extreme concern over the business failure figures as reported weekly by Dun & Bradstreet.

They pointed out, for example, that for the week ending March 1, there were 293 failures reported, and that for the week ending March 15, there were 300 failures.

But have we heard anything about the week ending March 22, or the week ending April 5?

No, and why not?

I shall tell you why.

Because the number of failures for these weeks dropped way down to 208 and 217, respectively.

I point this out only to emphasize that weekly figures are of little significance.

In 1954, Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., reported 11,086 failures.

In 1955, some 10,969 failures occurred.

However, the average number of failures during the 20th century from 1900 to 1955 was 13,612.

Actually, it is more meaningful to consider the rate of business failures because of changes in business population.

In 1955, there were, according to Dun & Bradstreet, 41.6 business failures for every 10,000 firms listed.

In 1954, the rate was 42 for every 10,000.

This is considerably less than the rate for the first 55 years of this century, 1900–1955, which was 72.

I have remarked that in order to properly evaluate year-end statistics on business failures one must look at changes in the number of business concerns in operation.

Actually, in view of difficulties encountered by small firms during the period 1948–53, and considering the remarks of those who are engaged in spreading political propaganda, I do not think they have sufficient faith in our economy or in the rugged individualism of our small-business men.

These political merchants do not offer constructive criticism, but merely attempt to weaken the confidence that the people of our country have in its business.

But let me get back to my comments on business population.

BUSINESS POPULATION

The trend of growth of the business population has been similar to that of the increase in the human population.

However, there have been fewer businesses in relation to the human population during periods of depression and war.

For the period 1929–55, there was one business in operation for every 41 persons.

During World War II the business population declined sharply so that by 1944 there was only one business for every 47 persons.

Immediately after the war, there was a phenomenal increase in the number of businesses.

I am not going to recite all of the figures on business population, but I am including them as a part of my remarks and they will follow at this particular point.

In 1948, there was 1 business for every 37 persons.

In 1952, the ratio was 1 to 38 and in 1955, 1 to 39 persons.

Following the rapid rise in the business population immediately following the war, there has been a slow but steady growth since 1949.

During the first 6 months of 1955, there were 210,200 new businesses started and 165,400 discontinued.

Discontinuances include failures, but the majority of businesses were discontinued for other reasons.

The total business population on June 30, 1955, was 4,225,000.

This was a record number of business firms in operation.

The composition of the business population changes partly because of shifts which occur in the kinds of businesses required to meet the economic needs of the human population.

For example, relatively more contract construction firms are in operation when economic activity is greatest.

The number of such firms increased from 417,700 on December 31, 1952, to 457,100 on June 30, 1955.

In manufacturing there has been a trend for more than two decades toward

fewer firms in relation to the total business population.

A total of 257,000 manufacturing firms in 1929 represented 8.5 percent of the total business population.

However, by 1940, they had declined to 226,000, or 6.9 percent.

In 1944, during the war, the number of manufacturers had increased to 250,000, or 8.6 percent of all businesses.

After the war, the number reached a high of 328,000, but this represented a smaller percentage, only 7.9 percent of the total.

On June 30, 1955, there were 312,500 manufacturers, which represented 7.4 percent of the total number of all businesses.

PROFITS OF SMALL FIRMS

Unfortunately, the current financial position of small business cannot be determined except for manufacturing corporations which comprise about 3 percent of the total number of all business enterprises.

It may be that changes in the financial position of small manufacturing enterprises operated by individuals or partnerships may be similar to that of the small corporations.

However, there are no available statistics for nearly three and three-fourths million small nonmanufacturing enterprises.

As far as small manufacturing corporations are concerned, there was a significant loss in their financial position during the period 1947–52.

Mr. Speaker, here again I shall not read all of these figures, but I assure you that they are included as a part of my remarks at this point.

There was, it is true, an increase in sales of the corporations having total assets under $1 million from $33,883 million to $39,211 million, or 15.7 percent.

But, earnings before taxes declined from $1,885 million to $1,347 million, or 28.5 percent.

Similarly, earnings after taxes declined from $1,096 million to $610 million, or 44.3 percent.

During this same period, 1947–52, sales of the large corporations increased from $144,290 million to $219,758 million, or 52.3 percent.

Earnings before taxes of this group increased from $14,589 million to $18,877 million, or 29.4 percent.

Although earnings after taxes did decrease from $9,136 million to $8,266 million, or 9.5 percent, this decrease was not nearly as much as the 44.3 percent decrease of the smaller corporations.

Exhibit 1 below shows the changes in sales and earnings by size of corporation from 1947–52.

Exhibit 2 shows sales and earnings for 1953 and 1955.

These figures were compiled from "Statistics of Income for 1947–52" published by the United States Treasury Department, and from "Quarterly Financial Reports for Manufacturing Corporations," for first quarter 1953, through the fourth quarter 1955, published by the Federal Trade Commission and Securities and Exchange Commission.

EXHIBIT 1

United States manufacturing corporations—Change in sales and profits by size of corporation

Total assets, classes	1947	1952	Change
Sales:	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Percent*
Under $1 million	$33,883	$39,211	+15.7
$1 million or more	144,290	219,758	+52.3
Earnings before taxes:			
Under $1 million	1,885	1,347	−28.5
$1 million or more	14,589	18,877	+29.4
Earnings after taxes:			
Under $1 million	1,096	610	−44.3
$1 million or more	9,136	8,266	−9.5

EXHIBIT 2

United States manufacturing corporations—Change in sales and profits by size of corporations

Total assets, classes	1953	1955	Change
Sales:	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Percent*
Under $1 million	$36,341	$36,230	−0.3
$1 million or more	229,549	242,165	+5.5
Earnings before taxes:			
Under $1 million	1,360	1,335	−1.8
$1 million or more	23,043	27,225	+18.1
Earnings after taxes:			
Under $1 million	656	681	+3.8
$1 million or more	10,686	14,417	+34.9

Now, what has happened during the Republican administration?

For nearly 2 years there has been an improvement in the financial position of small manufacturing corporations as well as the large.

As shown in exhibit 3, below, earnings before taxes of the small corporations increased 31.8 percent compared with 36.7 percent for the large corporations, but the percentage of increase of earnings after taxes of the smaller corporations was greater, 39.8 percent compared with 34.2 percent.

EXHIBIT 3

United States manufacturing corporations—Change in sales and profits by size of corporations

Total assets, classes	1947	1952	Change
Sales:	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Percent*
Under $1 million	$33,701	$36,230	+7.5
$1 million or more	214,808	242,165	+12.7
Earnings before taxes:			
Under $1 million	1,013	1,335	+31.8
$1 million or more	19,918	27,225	+36.7
Earnings after taxes:			
Under $1 million	487	681	+39.8
$1 million or more	10,745	14,417	+34.2

Mr. Speaker, I readily admit that the level of earnings of small corporations is still far below peaks achieved during expanded production of the Korean emergency.

I do insist, however, that the decline in earnings experienced since that time was arrested in mid-1954 and that earnings are now definitely on the upswing.

I, too, am concerned over the relative difference in earnings between small and large corporations and the fact that many small firms have not shared in our current prosperity to the maximum extent that is desirable.

This was as much of a problem before this administration came into office as it is now.

In any evaluation we must give consideration to variances in technology, industry patterns, tax rates, and tax amortization for defense purposes, cyclical fluctuations in small-business earnings and many other factors which help determine this divergence in rate of profits.

We must always do all we can to assure the small concern of its rightful place in our economic society.

GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT FOR SMALL BUSINESS

There have been many complaints over the years concerning the share of military prime contracts awarded to the small-business concerns of this Nation.

I agree that more can be done to assure small business a greater share of the procurement dollar.

However, this is another problem inherited by the Eisenhower administration and one it has worked on incessantly.

Let us see what has happened over these years to small business procurement.

In the fiscal year 1944, the small-business share of military prime contracts in terms of dollar value of contract awards was 17.4 percent; in 1945, it rose to 23.3 percent, and after VE-Day with tremendous cancellations in the large prime contracts, it rose to over 30 percent.

However, in fiscal 1949, the small business share had fallen to 27.2 percent, and in fiscal 1950 to 24.5 percent.

In fiscal 1951, it was 20.9 percent; 1952, 17.1 percent, and in fiscal 1953, it fell even further to 16.2 percent.

Since then the small-business share has risen to 25.1 percent in 1954 and to 21.8 percent in 1955.

Thus, for the three most recent fiscal years under a Democrat administration we find an average of 18 percent of the total procurement dollar going to small business.

For the fiscal years 1954 and 1955, under a Republican administration, small business received an average of almost 24 percent.

Mr. Speaker, despite all the statements to the contrary, no one can say with absolute certainty what constitutes a "fair share," percentagewise for small business.

That depends upon what is being purchased, whether we are at war or engaged in peacetime activities, and other factors.

What we have to do is continually try to increase the dollar value of Government purchases going to small firms and to ease the administrative difficulties which confront these firms in their contracts with the Federal Government.

May I remark here, parenthetically, that attempts have been made to relate what small firms should receive in Government contracts to the amount of goods they contribute to the economy as a whole.

For example, the 1951 Annual Survey of Manufacturers showed that small manufacturers with under 500 employees, on an enterprise basis, accounted for 35 percent of all value added by manufacturing.

It has been assumed, therefore, that 35 percent constitutes a fair share of

Government procurement for small business.

Such an assumption is fallacious, however, since the bulk of manufactured or processed goods is designed for civilian consumption and does not necessarily consist of items or merchandise purchased by the Government.

This is particularly true when we take into consideration the type of items purchased by the military which constitute over 90 percent of all Federal Government procurement.

While I agree that too much of military procurement is achieved through the negotiated procedure, let us share the responsibility for this situation.

The First War Powers Act of December 1941 empowered the President to diverge from the customary system of advertised procurement.

The Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 also contained the authority to permit procurement by negotiation.

Section 2 (c) 1 has been the authority under which most negotiation has taken place since December 18, 1950, following a declaration of a national emergency by President Truman on December 16, 1950.

While the House of Representatives has attempted to amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 by eliminating a portion of section 2 (c) 1, it is agreed that the actual authority for the negotiation process will not be diminished.

Let us look at the dollar volume of negotiated procurement over the past few years and compare what happened under the Truman administration with what has happened under the Eisenhower administration.

In fiscal year 1951, the percentage of contracts awarded by negotiated procurement was 87.9 percent for work done in the United States.

In fiscal year 1952, 89.1 percent; in fiscal 1953, the same.

In 1954, it declined to 84.5 percent, and in fiscal 1955, to 83.8 percent.

Again I state, I am against so much negotiated procurement and would like very much to see it reduced.

The following table, which I will not read at this time, affords a comparison of advertised and negotiated contracts for the period July 1950 through June 1955:

Military prime contracts with business firms for work in the United States by percentage of total dollar value of contract awards, July 1950–1955

	Fiscal year				
	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955
Advertised	12.1	10.9	10.9	15.5	16.2
Negotiated	87.9	89.1	89.1	84.5	83.8

Source: Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics).

There is no question of the need for greater percentages of military procurement to be purchased through the advertised-bid method but we do insist that negotiated contract procurement has been reduced during the past 3 years.

I am speaking of the total dollar value of military procurement and not selected categories which contain figures which would be favorable ones.

We cannot fairly select our figures by categories, we can only be fair when we include all figures in our computations.

In future discussions of this problem, Mr. Speaker, let us all recognize the facts and attack the problem with open minds.

I reiterate that many of the statements made during this Congress by our distinguished chairman concerning Government procurement have not realistically portrayed negotiated contract problems.

Moreover, no adequate answer has been given as to what actually constitutes a fair share of the total dollar value of military procurement which should be awarded to small business.

I do not say there is an answer, at least a precise answer, to the question of what constitutes a fair share.

But, I do say that the Small Business Committee of the House, and all others interested in the problem, should constantly strive to increase the number and value of contracts to small business.

We in the minority are now, and always have been, concerned with improving the position of small businesses in their effort to secure Government contracts.

We Republicans are aware of the difficulties which confront small firms not only in their dealings with the Government, but in maintaining their position in the civilian market.

I make the assertion, and I do not believe it can be successfully contradicted, that President Eisenhower not only is devoted to the interest of our total economy but, in particular, to the interests of small business.

The statement of President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message in January 1956, has formed the basis of this administration's entire approach to the small-business problem.

This statement will bear repeating.

The President said:

An integral part of our efforts to foster a strong and expanding free economy is keeping open the door of opportunity to new and small enterprises, checking monopoly, and preserving a competitive environment. In this past year the steady improvement in the economic health of small business has reinforced the vitality of our competitive economy. We shall continue to help small business concerns to obtain access to adequate financing and to competent counsel on management, product and marketing problems.

Through measures already taken, opportunities for small business participation in Government procurement programs, including military procurement, are greatly improved. The effectiveness of these measures will become increasingly apparent. We shall continue to make certain that small business has a fair opportunity to compete and has an economic environment in which it may prosper.

The economic history of this country has been based on the concept of personal initiative.

Otherwise we could not claim that we are a free enterprise Nation.

It is proper that the Federal Government should supplement and promote our business economy and make certain that the rules of the business game are applied equally to all concerned.

The Small Business Act of 1953 is designed along these lines.

THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Let us look at what has been accomplished by the Small Business Administration under the several programs authorized by this act.

May I preface my discussion of SBA by commenting that during this 84th Congress the activities of the Small Business Administration have been examined by the Subcommittee on the Small Business Administration and Problems Related to Procurement, Loans, and Disposal, of the House Small Business Committee.

This subcommittee held hearings early in the 1st session of this Congress and issued a report containing a fair and impartial analysis of this agency's operations.

However, supplemental views by a majority member of the subcommittee prevented a unanimous report.

Since that time the chairman of the full committee has criticized the SBA on several occasions.

As far as the minority is concerned the views presented by the chairman were his own views.

The minority of the Small Business Committee has completely disagreed with his statements.

I wish, therefore, to show what kind of a job has been done by SBA and to show how distortion of the facts has been used in an attempt to prove that this administration has failed to assist the small-business man or has given preference to big business.

In order to present these facts it would be necessary for me to quote a great many statistics.

However, time does not permit and I shall, therefore, include them as a part of my remarks on the Small Business Administration.

I hope the Members of this House will review the subject matter which I am including at this point on financial assistance and the manner in which loan applications are handled.

This includes, first, processing of applications; second, workload; third, approvals; fourth, withdrawals; fifth, declines; sixth, cancellations; and, seventh, disbursements.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

The Small Business Administration had, as of March 31, 1956, approved 6,814 business and disaster loans for a total of $182,455,000. Of this number there were 2,789 business loans approved for a total of $135,221,000 and 4,025 disaster loans approved for $47,234,000.

This, I sincerely believe, is a good record.

The Small Business Administration's lending program is designed to supplement the lending of private financial institutions and not take their place as some of our friends in the opposite party seem to think should be done.

That is why we insisted in the writing of the act that SBA loans would only be made when a small firm could not secure financial assistance from his local bank or from some other source.

Congress also prescribed that loans would not be made which were not of sound value or where there was not a good chance of repayment.

In other words, the Federal Government is to be of assistance when the local bank is limited in the amount of money it can lend to one company, when certain lines of credit are filled, when the maturity requested is too long, or when a businessman is unable to secure credit for other reasons.

There is a legitimate need for SBA loans to fill the credit gap left by private financial institutions.

Despite all their talk, I seriously doubt if my majority colleagues wish to sponsor a subsidy program.

But, they have belittled the fine work done by the SBA and the genuine effort made to provide financial assistance to small firms.

First they said that SBA loans have amounted to less than one-half of 1 percent of the expansion in business debt during the years 1953 and 1954.

Mr. Speaker, this is true, but just so we will not lose our perspective, let me state that the small loans made by the RFC also amounted to only a fraction of 1 percent of commercial bank loans during any particular year.

As a matter of fact, the loans approved by either agency are relatively insignificant when compared to the loans made by the private financial institutions of our country.

Just remember that preliminary figures for the end of December 1955 showed that commercial banks had over $82 billion in loans outstanding.

Certainly, it would not speak well for our economy if the lending of any Federal Government agency were to assume significant proportions.

And, in this respect, I want to say that the SBA has done a good job.

Any firm which has been unable to get private financing but which can offer collateral and show that there is a good chance of repayment, as is required by law, can get a loan.

Because I know this to be a fact, I have resented the recent attempts of the Democrats to show that thousands of applications have been received by SBA, while only a few manage to get through.

Actually, these statements are absurd.

Let me quote a portion of the remarks made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dated January 18, 1956:

> Let me refer to loan inquiries and applications accepted. According to the last report we have, they were receiving 11,000 inquiries per month. The SBA has been in business since August 1953; therefore, this is the 30th month of their existence. That would be about 310,000 of applications for aid received from small business fellows all over the Nation. * * *
>
> After 2½ years of operation, through December 31, 1955, the SBA has allowed 7,010 formal applications to be filed. A number of these were subsequently withdrawn either on the initiative of the applicant or SBA, leaving a total of 6,013.

I call to the gentleman's attention these facts concerning SBA inquiries.

Initially, when the Agency first began its operations, it was considered advisable to have field offices record every inquiry of any nature, as an indication of interest in the lending program and as a rough measure of the workload in each office.

Many of these inquiries were no more than requests for information as to the nature of the program, filing procedure, individual company eligibility, and to obtain application forms.

These inquiries were predominantly by letter or telephone and usually involved no discussion of the small business concerns' financial problems or the prospects for their meeting credit requirements to obtain a loan from SBA.

Of the personal calls made to the field offices, many were individuals who had just learned of a new Government lending agency and who had no reasonable basis for obtaining a loan.

Some had previously been refused similar credit from other Government lending agencies and some had ideas or inventions of questionable value they wished to promote.

Still others were interested in having the Government finance their venture into a business without private investment or their demonstrated ability to operate a business successfully.

The rate of such inquiries has now declined and with a more realistic definition of the type of inquiries which should be recorded, an average of 3,270 inquiries per month were received during the 6 months period ending December 31, 1955.

This redefinition of inquiries was for the purpose of eliminating the recording of requests for application forms, descriptive literature, and other such contracts not generally associated with a review of an individual business' financial needs.

On this revised basis of recording inquiries, approximately 10 percent of the inquiries received results in the filing of loan applications.

This was approximately the same experience of the RFC.

The fact that only 10 percent of those making inquiry concerning the lending program actually file applications does not mean that the other 90 percent are not given an opportunity to file.

It is the policy of the SBA not to refuse an application from any applicant, if he wishes his application to be considered.

However, it would be a disservice to a small business concern and would increase the operating cost of this agency to encourage a prospective applicant to incur the expense of preparing and filing an application when it is obvious that there exists no basis for approval of a sound loan.

Let me repeat, one-half of the inquiries referred to by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] were by telephone or letter and did not represent a specific, prepared request for financial assistance.

Many of the remaining inquiries resulted in invaluable financial counseling rather than in the actual filing of an application.

PROCESSING OF APPLICATIONS

When an application is received, it is carefully considered, and every effort is made to work out a loan.

During the 6 months of the present fiscal year through December 31, 50 percent of the actions taken have been loan approvals.

The Small Business Administration has been working steadily to reduce its processing time, and now requires processing of applications within 21 calendar days.

A continuing check has been maintained with respect to this requirement and at the present time approximately 90 percent of all applications are being processed within the 21-calendar-day limit.

The delay in practically all cases exceeding the 21 days is due to the failure of the applicant to promptly furnish requested information.

Applications are only returned to an applicant when essential information is lacking or when the application is not signed.

The SBA has no requirement that applicants employ a certified public accountant or other professional assistance.

In fact, the Small Business Administration in each of its regional and branch offices as well as in the Washington office, has financial assistants who readily and willingly assist prospective loan applicants to fill out the necessary forms.

This assistance to applicants for loans is not a gesture on occasion, but it is an integral part of the policy of the Small Business Administration.

An applicant in working with SBA financial personnel often finds that an analysis of his position is such that a private loan could readily be obtained or that certain adjustments might, in fact, disclose factors which demonstrate that no loan is needed at all.

It is a part of the Small Business Administration counseling service to advise prospective borrowers when such advice is acceptable as well as to assist them in other ways.

No attempt is made by SBA personnel to advise and counsel a prospective loan applicant unless the applicant indicates his desire and willingness to have such advice and counsel.

The amount of information needed in each application varies and voluminous information is not required even in the most complicated cases.

At the time an application is being processed, SBA financial specialists review with the applicant the amount of the loan required, maturity, terms and conditions, and so forth.

In very few cases has SBA reduced the amount of the loan or the maturity requested or required additional collateral, and in every instance such changes were made in order that the loan could be approved on a sound basis.

WORKLOAD

The workload of the Financial Assistance Division of the Agency is determined to a great extent by the number of applications received and processed.

May I discuss this for a minute.

We are always hearing about how much the RFC did—let us therefore com-

pare the effort devoted by the two Agencies to business lending programs.

Admittedly, the programs are not entirely similar nor is it possible to precisely determine personnel figures for RFC at this late date.

This comparison was made last year, however, I think it bears repetition.

RFC had approximately 1,800 people working on its loan program.

During the fiscal year of 1955, the SBA had about 385 people connected with its financial-assistance program.

The average SBA loan is processed from filing date to final action in less than 21 days.

This compares to the 30–60 days processing time RFC considered reasonable after 20 years of experience.

Certainly, we can say with emphasis that on this basis the personnel of SBA are doing a good job.

APPROVALS

The SBA has approved 2,789 business loans for a little over $135 million.

Some 1,182 of these are on a deferred participation basis, while another 688 have been made on an immediate participation basis.

There were 919 approvals for direct loans.

This means then, that approximately 65 percent of the loans are made in cooperation with banks or other private financial institutions.

I do not believe it was the intent of Congress that the same firms should come again and again to a Government lending agency for loans with which to finance their operations, as was true with the RFC.

Government loans are designed to fill the credit gap so that small firms may get on a sound operating basis and establish a line of credit with the local bank.

As long as local financial institutions are willing to participate, this method should be utilized.

In fact, the Small Business Act of 1953 states that SBA must attempt to secure bank participation before making a direct loan where all the money would be advanced by the Agency.

Let us look at other things which might happen to a business loan application and which were referred to rather disparagingly by our chairman on January 18, of this year.

WITHDRAWALS

After an application is filed, it may be withdrawn from further consideration before reaching the approval stage.

As of March 31, 1956, there were 1,212 withdrawals.

This step may be taken for many reasons—an applicant may not supply necessary information either because he will not bother or because he has inadequate records—an applicant may find that he can get financing from another source—or he changes his plans—or for other reasons he may withdraw his application.

DECLINES

I wish only to say this about declined applications, of which there were 3,792.

This is not something SBA likes to do.

But, SBA is guided by certain criteria in the act.

We should always keep these criteria in mind: First, credit is not available on reasonable terms from other sources; and, second, all loans must be of such sound value and so secured as reasonably to assure repayment.

Admittedly, credit experts will even differ among themselves as to what kind of a loan would meet these criteria—it is strictly a matter of credit judgment.

I doubt if anyone could find many loans declined by the SBA which should have been made.

We are not credit experts, therefore we should not impose our thinking upon those in the Agency who must pass on these loans.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation got into a lot of trouble because of that very thing.

CANCELLATIONS

Of the 2,789 business loans approved, 511 were canceled subsequent to approval.

Believe me, to cancel a loan is not a devious proceeding to be talked of in hushed tones.

There are some very good reasons why a loan is canceled.

The applicant may cancel a loan because his operations have improved, thereby making an SBA loan unnecessary—he may secure financing from a bank after SBA has shown it to be a desirable loan—sometimes the applicant will choose not to meet the credit conditions considered by the Agency to be necessary—or an adverse change may have set in so that SBA cannot make the loan and still be assured of repayment.

Let me assure you that SBA does not impose terms and conditions which are not considered absolutely necessary to making a loan to meet the criteria established by Congress.

The experience of SBA with regard to withdrawals and cancellations is very similar to that of RFC, with regard to both number of such actions and reasons given for withdrawals or cancellations.

It is not unusual for any lender—public or private—to require a loan applicant to guarantee a loan, to limit his salary or to require collateral.

If we have a proper understanding of business financing, we know that such things are frequently considered necessary for the good of the loan and the good of the business.

I am sure that some of our friends are not serious when they suggest that we have no collateral requirements and no assurance of repayment of the taxpayers' dollar.

DISBURSEMENTS

Much was said on January 18, 1956, concerning disbursement of SBA loans.

It was stated, for example, that disbursement is delayed long after terms and conditions of a loan authorization are met.

This, Mr. Speaker, simply is not correct and gives a completely erroneous picture of what actually happens.

Let us look at the disbursement figures as of March 31, 1956.

Of the 2,278 business loan approvals, after cancellation, totaling $109,726,000—1,743 have been disbursed for a total of $82,015,000.

This is the rate of 76.5 percent, or in round figures, 77 percent.

I am sure that comment will be made by some of our friends of the majority that only 979 loans had been disbursed for a total of $38,275,000, since that is the number of disbursed loans representing direct Agency loans and immediate participation loans.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has always disregarded the deferred participation loans where the local bank disburses the money but where the Agency is committed to purchase a major portion of the loan at some future date.

As of March 31, there were some 764 deferred participation loans totaling $39,245,000 which had also been disbursed.

May I say that without the SBA lending program and its agreement to purchase a share of these loans, they would never have been made.

This money has been disbursed and only as a result of the SBA program.

May I state that in addition to almost $82 million in business loans disbursed, the SBA has disbursed some 2,956 disaster loans for a total of $29,533,000 which is 81 percent of disaster loans approved.

Disbursement will, of course, be held up until an applicant completes the necessary papers such as the clearing of titles, execution of liens or mortgage agreements.

When the applicant has completed such paper work, he may ask for his check and receive it.

However, and this is most important, he does not always ask for his money right away.

Many loans are for the purchase of machinery and equipment at a later date, or a loan may be for construction purposes.

In either case the applicant does not take his money until he actually needs it—why should he pay interest on a loan until that time?

For these reasons SBA has established a limit of 4 months from date of approval by which time an applicant must accept his loan or furnish reasons why it should be further delayed.

On many loans the bank is responsible for disbursement.

Even here the Agency is continually reviewing disbursement procedure in an effort to place loan funds in the hands of applicants at the earliest possible date.

Perhaps the most significant illustration I could give you as to how active the SBA financial assistance program has been, is that almost a month ago the SBA exhausted the loanable funds appropriated to it by Congress.

Since the second week in April the SBA has been unable to approve anything other than disaster loans until such time as additional funds have been approved by Congress.

Their request is included in the second supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal 1956 and is now in conference.

On this point, I include a letter dated May 4 from the Administrator, Mr. Wendell Barnes, of the Small Business

Administration, to the Honorable WILLIAM S. HILL, ranking minority member of the House Small Business Committee.

The letter follows:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., May 4, 1956.

The Honorable WILLIAM S. HILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HILL: I have noted recently that some critics have been making inaccurate statements to the effect that this agency has made only 395 direct business loans. Actually, the correct figure is 919 direct loans. This type of statement also ignores the fact that two-thirds of the 2,789 business loans made to March 31, 1956, have been bank participation loans. These are preferred to direct loans for the following reasons:

1. Because the Congress in the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended, required that the Small Business Administration insist that a borrower try to get a bank participation loan before a direct loan is considered;

2. Because participation loans keep expenditures low and thereby require less money to be appropriated and withdrawn from the Treasury, thus helping to balance the budget;

3. Because paticipation loans require fewer Government employees since much of the processing and servicing work is done by banks; and

4. Because such loans are of more assistance to businessmen since the repayment record helps establish a private line of credit with the bank for future use in a way that a direct Government loan does not.

We have approved over 63 percent of the regular business loan applications filed in March, and about 80 percent of the limited loan participation plan applications have been approved since this latter plan was established January 1, 1956, to assist very small firms such as retail and service businesses.

In addition to the business loan programs mentioned, the agency has made over 4,000 disaster loans during the past 2½ years, most of them direct loans.

The critics are best answered by the House Appropriations Committee report, dated April 27, 1956, page 11, which states as follows:

"The committee was impressed with the testimony presented by officials of this agency this year. It feels that they have done a good job in meeting loan needs during the past year, particularly in disaster areas. Accordingly, it is recommending the full budget estimates for the coming fiscal year."

Cordial regards.

Sincerely yours,

WENDELL B. BARNES,
Administrator.

PROCUREMENT AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to make a few comments on the Small Business Administration's procurement and technical assistance programs.

While Members of Congress pay more attention to the financial programs, much valuable service has been rendered in the fields of military and civilian procurement by the Government and in providing technical assistance to small-business men.

Of particular importance to small firms has been the progress made, as required by the Small Business Act, in the joint set-aside program as established by the Small Business Administration and the Department of Defense.

Under this program all, or stated portions, of particular procurements are set aside for exclusive award to small business.

The SBA proposal to set aside a specific procurement must, of course, be concurred in by the procuring office.

That is required by the act.

This program of set asides has done much to assist small firms in their attempt to secure a fair share of Government purchases. Since the inception of the Agency through March 1956, some $914.7 million in set asides have been agreed to by the military.

These efforts, true enough, are belittled on the floor of this House occasionally.

It has been stated that these contracts are only a small portion of total military purchases.

While this is true, it is for valid reasons.

First, the SBA has been appropriated funds for personnel to cover only 36 of the major procurement installations.

These installations are considered to be ones where small firms need the most assistance.

The SBA has been able to assign only 18 procurement specialists to these offices, which means a division of time and effort in covering the 36 installations.

There are over 190 military procurement offices having a purchasing authority of over $5,000, which should be covered by SBA.

Although the Agency requested appropriations for the year ending June 30, 1956, to provide adequate coverage to the most important purchasing offices, this request was not granted by the Congress.

Secondly, until very recently not all military procurements were subject to set-aside for small business.

In the past, SBA has been excluded from screening emergency and classified procurements as well as certain proprietary items and large complicated machines and weapons.

Thirdly, many purchases in particular areas were not screened since small business normally received the largest percentage of such purchases.

I do not believe that this program was intended by Congress to cover every area in which small business might receive contracts.

It was rather intended to assure small business an opportunity to compete where difficulty had been encountered in the past.

In order to make certain that small business would have every possible opportunity, a new agreement has been made by the SBA and Pentagon officials which will extend the area of joint determination agreements.

Under the revised set-aside agreement with the Department of Defense, there is a mandatory base for screening procurements of $10,000 and over.

In addition, there will be screening of lesser amounts when considered practical.

The new agreement permits screening of all procurements without exception and, therefore, will include emergency, research and development and classified procurements.

The certificate of competency program and many other areas contemplated in the Small Business Act have also been strengthened by the revised agreement.

Such cooperation between the Department of Defense and the Small Business Administration is most important since the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended, provides a method for cooperation rather than positive authority on the part of SBA to institute set-asides on its own motion.

I wish to reiterate that this program of assuring small-business competition on particular procurements was not intended by Congress to replace or to encompass all areas in which contract awards are made to small firms.

Any attempt to relate the awards made to small business under the joint set-aside program to either total dollar value or to the total number of awards made to small-business concerns, indicates a complete lack of understanding as to what this program was intended to accomplish.

The SBA is not, nor should it be, trying to make a good showing on paper by spending time and money in those areas in which small firms consistently receive a high percentage of contract awards.

The Small Business Administration also has recently entered into agreements with the Veterans' Administration, the General Services Administration, and the Department of Agriculture.

These agreements which will permit set-asides of civilian type products are again intended to assure small firms every opportunity to participate in contracts for particular items purchased by these Agencies.

I wish to emphasize most strongly that the majority has, in its criticism of SBA, completely ignored the valuable assistance rendered by this Agency through referral to small-business concerns of prime and subcontracting opportunities.

Too, the Agency has done much to assist small firms to get on bidders' lists, to secure specifications and drawings and in recommending additional small business sources to procurement offices.

Frankly, it is statistically impossible to measure and report actual results in dollars and cents for many of SBA's programs to assist small business.

The SBA has reported that since its establishment procurements amounting to over $914 million have been restricted to small business by its joint set-aside program.

However, this is certainly an inadequate measure of the value to small business of having SBA representatives in procurement centers as the spokesman for small business.

These representatives help offset the tremendous advantage enjoyed by large firms who have representatives devoting their full time to learning of bid opportunities.

Set-aside figures are also no accurate indication of the tremendous aid given to small firms by these SBA representatives who are there to insist that qualified small firms be given the opportunity to participate in negotiated contract procurements.

Most small firms would not even know that such procurements were to be made,

let alone be given the opportunity to negotiate, were it not for SBA's procurement specialists.

SBA can demonstrate that since July 1, 1954, it has had more than 43,000 cases of counseling small firms on selling to the Government, that more than 200,000 notifications of suitable procurement opportunities have been sent to small-business firms, that approximately $425 million was awarded to firms as the result of these notifications—a figure considered to be greatly understated, that 6,700 small firms have been furnished for bidders' lists on which small-business competition was inadequate.

I consider the SBA procurement program to be one of its most valuable aids to the welfare of small business.

PRIME CONTRACTS

Much time was devoted on January 18, 1956, by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] on the failure of SBA to utilize its authority to take prime contracts.

It is quite true that this authority has not been used and the Administrator of SBA has testified to this fact at various committee meetings.

While such authority is written into the act, I believe that for many reasons the prime-contract authority should be used very sparingly and preferably only in the time of great emergency.

SBA's efforts can be concentrated on its other procurement programs with more beneficial results to small business.

On at least two occasions the Small Business Committee of the House has unanimously expressed the same viewpoint.

In each of these instances the committee was controlled by the party now in the majority.

I quote below from two reports which, as I stated, were unanimous reports and with which I still agree.

I was a member of the committee at the time the reports were issued.

May I say also, the minority had full access to all information and facts on which these reports were based.

We were not excluded from committee activities at that time.

The quotation follows:

First. Final report, 81st Congress, House Report No. 3237, 2d session, page 31:

> Actually, the Smaller War Plants Corporation took over very few contracts, but the power was there to do so if necessary, and was in effect, notice to the procuring agencies to award small business a fair proportion of the prime contracts. It is an effective provision by which the end result can be obtained without its being utilized to any appreciable extent.

Discussion of Small Defense Plants bill.

Second. Progress report, 1st session, House Report No. 1228, 82d Congress, page 55:

> If all else fails, the Administration (referring to SDPA) may act as a prime contractor itself * * * It is not expected that this power will be used extensively. It should, in fact, be employed only as a last resort.

The SWPC and SDPA were wartime agencies.

The Smaller War Plants Corporation took only 12 contracts during its existence valued at $35 million.

Over half of these contracts were for furniture, which was a distressed industry because of the wartime limitation orders in effect on their civilian business.

The SDPA never used this authority but instead in several cases took over contracts which had been previously awarded by the military establishment on the basis of an SDPA certificate of competency.

This was not the type of operation contemplated by the drafters of SDPA legislation.

But through its certifying authority, SDPA thereby became responsible for meeting the requirements of the prime contract.

SDPA then executed a subcontract for the production of the materials required under its prime contract with the small concern which had held the original contract.

In utilizing the prime contract authority the SDPA gross loss was about $142,000 of the taxpayers' money as the result of the failure of four subcontractors to perform their agreements with SDPA and the subsequent insolvency of these companies.

The net loss to SDPA, exclusive of the administrative costs of the program, was approximately $109,000.

The actual taking of prime contracts would require an extremely large staff of engineers, accountants, and financial experts.

Finally, may I say to my friends in the majority that there is already in existence provision for diversion of contracts to distressed labor areas.

I am referring to DMP 4 set-asides where contracts may be awarded to firms in distressed areas.

Military supply contracts set aside for surplus labor areas and industries were much higher in fiscal 1955 than a year earlier.

The increase was to $1,466 million from $557 million.

Mr. Speaker, the facts and figures which I have presented here will bear the closest scrutiny.

In fact, it is my earnest hope that every Member of this House, having any interest in small business, will read this brief record of the facts on business failures, Government procurement, and the general operation of the Small Business Administration.

As a matter of fact, there are some aspects of the small-business problem that I would like to deal with more extensively at an opportune time.

In these remarks I have not attempted to berate, belabor, or belittle any of the good work accomplished in the past by our committee.

Finally, I have not intended to be unduly critical of some of the statements which have been made, but what I have endeavored to do is to correct the record by supplying facts and figures.

If setting the record straight may be construed as criticism by some of my friends in the majority, I trust they will consider the criticism objective and in the future will enlighten the Members of this House and not present us with a misleading and distorted picture of the health and welfare of small business under the Eisenhower administration.

THE CONCENTRATION OF 95 PERCENT OF FEDERAL RESEARCH FUNDS IN A FEW BIG FIRMS HINDERS DEFENSE AND UNDERMINES FREE ENTERPRISE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it has become commonplace to say that we are living in an age of transition and in a period of mortal peril. As a matter of fact such sentiments have been echoed throughout history. Nonetheless, in two aspects our civilization is truly unique. In the first place, we are living in an age of unprecedented technological advancement. We have barely entered the age of atomic energy. The significance of the term "automation" is still unfamiliar to most of us, even when we are aware that it foreshadows tremendous changes in production techniques throughout our economy. Everywhere the frontiers of scientific knowledge are being pushed back and new discoveries are being made, not only by individual inventors and scientists, but even more by organized industrial, governmental, and educational research laboratories and institutions. The fruits of this research are being put to commercial use for the benefit of the people.

It is unique in a second way, however. This is an era in which the two most powerful nations of the world are in fundamental opposition in their political and economic philosophy, and as a result are engaged in a competitive struggle in many fields, not the least of which is in technology. This competitive struggle is all the more awesome and crucial in view of the tremendous nuclear forces which each has in its power to unleash.

In this framework, it follows that our Nation has two profound responsibilities.

First, it must advance its scientific and industrial research as rapidly as possible.

Second, we must demonstrate to the world that our economic and political system, with its emphasis on individual liberty and responsibility, can advance not only the prosperity of our people but the security of our Nation to such an extent that we will have nothing to fear from whatever schemes and plans a Communist dictatorship in Russia may devise.

We have already done a great deal to step up the pace of scientific and industrial research—both basic and applied—in this country. During the past 5 years the United States has spent $22 billion on such research, nearly half of the total amount spent in such pursuits since 1860.

We cannot, of course, be complacent about this growth in research. Nor are we. There has within recent months been unprecedented publicity about the present and impending shortage of scientists and engineers. The fact that Russia is now graduating two and a half

times as many engineers as we are has been widely broadcast. Every conference of scientists and educators points to the need for more and better trained young people to perform the highly complex tasks implicit in modern technology.

There is of course criticism not only as to the inadequacies of the amount of research currently being undertaken, but of the nature and quality of that research as well. A recent survey of American research, published in Fortune, indicates that there is a serious deficiency in the amount of basic fundamental research, as compared to applied research. To quote from this article:

> Many administrators of science feel that wherever funds are to be divided between basic and applied research, 10 percent is the minimum share that should be allocated to basic. In the Government program, basic research comes out with only 7 percent; 93 percent goes for research and development devoted to hardware for the armed services.[1]

Particularly significant is the growing role of the Federal Government in research. During World War II there was an unprecedented emphasis on research, climaxed of course by the development of the atomic bomb. But since the war, the responsibilities of the Government for research have not diminished, but instead increased. The following table indicates some of the significant trends in this connection:

Research and development: Selected data for 1946 and 1955

	1946	1955
Total cost	$1,780,000,000	$4,210,000,000
Total research engineers and scientists	122,000	197,000
Funds provided by:		
Federal Government	$910,000,000	$2,420,000,000
Industry	$840,000,000	$1,710,000,000
Nonprofit institutions	$30,000,000	$80,000,000
Dollar volume of performance by:		
Federal Government	$470,000,000	$680,000,000
Industry	$1,190,000,000	$3,110,000,000
Nonprofit institutions	$120,000,000	$420,000,000
Research engineers and scientists employed by:		
Federal Government	28,000	28,000
Industry	80,000	141,000
Nonprofit institutions	14,000	28,000

Source: U. S. Department of Defense, Office of the Secretary of Defense (Research and Development, Resources Division, Neal D. Crane, Director.)

In 1941, 41 percent of the total expenditure on research and development was made by Government and 57 percent by industry. In 1955 the percentages were exactly reversed, 57 percent being spent by Government and only 41 percent by industry. The highest percentage 62 percent—of Government expenditure for research was reached in 1953, in which year industry furnished 36 percent of all research and development funds. Nonprofit institutions have throughout the period been the source of 2 or 3 percent of research and development funds.

[1] Hodgins, Eric. The strange state of American research. Fortune, April 1955, p. 115. According to a 1955 report of the National Science Foundation, basic research accounted for 6.5 percent of all Federal obligations for research and development in fiscal year 1954, 6.7 percent (estimate) for fiscal year 1955, and 7.6 percent (estimate) for fiscal year 1956.

However, this decline in the relative importance of industry as a source of funds for research has been in sharp contrast to the predominance of industry in the performance of research. In 1955 industry performed 74 percent of all research and development—measured in dollar expenditure—almost the same as the 73 percent it did in 1941. In the intervening years this percentage declined to a low of 65 percent in 1945 and has been generally rising since that date. The percentage performed by the Government was 22 percent in 1941, rose to a high of 28 percent in 1944 and 1945, and has been declining ever since, reaching a low of 16 percent in 1955. This decline has been offset by a steady increase in the percentage of research performed by nonprofit institutions, rising from 5 percent in 1941 to 10 percent in 1955.

Thus while the Government has been furnishing an increased share of the funds for research, and the total funds have been growing substantially at the same time, there has been a real decline in the amount of research it has undertaken itself with its own personnel.

With the Government far and away the principal sources of funds for research and development, the way it uses these funds must be examined closely. According to the budget of the United States for the fiscal year 1957, this is the way these Federal expenditures on research and development are classified by purpose:

[In billions of dollars]

National security	1.92
Department of Defense (military functions)	1.52
Atomic Energy Commission	.40
Labor, health and welfare	.11
Commerce and housing	.09
Agriculture and agricultural resources	.08
All other	.06
Total	2.26

Thus it can be seen that 85 percent of all research and development expenditures of the Federal Government are for national security, and it is precisely in this area that Government contracts to industry are of such great importance. As Donald A. Quarles, now Secretary of the Air Force, stated in 1954:

> Since modern war is total war, industry must produce our weapons. For this and other reasons, we turn to industry for the bulk of our applied development work. About 60 percent of the defense research and development funds are expended on industrial contracts. About 10 percent of the total is done at the laboratories of universities and other nonprofit institutions, and the remaining 30 percent within Government establishments. I foresee no substantial changes in this breakdown. Our aim is to achieve a full partnership with science and industry to assure that weapons systems developed do, in fact, benefit by the most advanced technology that the country can produce.[2]

[2] Quarles, Donald A. What military research and development mean to industry. Conference on industrial research, June 1954. Proceedings. New York, King's Crown Press, 1955. P. 266.

All of us, of course, concur in this aim as set forth by Secretary Quarles. However, another objective should never be lost sight of. And that is the objective referred to above, that we keep our system of free competitive enterprise strong. This objective, regrettably, seems to have received little attention to date in the way research contracts have been distributed. Obviously the way in which the Department of Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission let their huge contracts to industry for developmental and other research will have, and is having, a tremendous impact upon the competitive structure of American business.

It is true that a large proportion of the funds committed by the Department of Defense for research and development work goes to produce goods which have, primarily, military uses. But even this kind of industrial research results in important commercial advances, for the simple reason that techniques and production processes for making military items almost always have applications to commercial products and production. A large proportion of the funds being spent by the Department of Defense is for projects of a general industrial nature, as in the fields of electronics, communications, power, aircraft, and many others.

Dr. A. V. Astin, Director of the Bureau of Standards, has stated:

> I could cite scores of examples where wartime developments have been turned to peacetime uses.

Indeed, from my own knowledge, I could cite numerous cases where revolutionary and commercially valuable techniques have grown out of Government contracts.

Eli Whitney is said to have developed the techniques of mass production, which rests on interchangeability of parts, while producing rifles on contracts with the Army.

Automation, the use of revolutionary new techniques as a result of application of electronic devices, was advanced most substantially during World War II. The first fully automated plant grew out of an army ordnance contract during World War II.

The modular technique used in producing electronic equipment—a technique which permits the use of very flexible automatic machine methods—resulted from a wartime project called "Tinkertoy."

The first of the so-called "thinking" machines, ENIAC, was developed and financed on a Government contract.

The harnessing of atomic energy was of course entirely financed by the Government.

This is, of course, only a very partial list, including just those examples which immediately come to my mind. These and scores of other industrial products and processes are a direct outgrowth of research financed with Federal funds.

We should know much more than we do as to how these research contracts are distributed. Obviously those firms that are able to have a substantial part of their experimental research and development activities financed by the Fed-

eral Government will have a great lead, sometimes an unsurmountable lead, in the commercial race. The firms that receive the research and development contracts are in a position to hire, preempt, and control the available supply of trained technicians, scientists, and other industrial research personnel, the supply of which, as we know, is now critically short. These companies will gain the know-how and have the inside track with new products and processes. Furthermore, as I have been told, when the Department of Defense grants a contract for research and development work, it actually allows the private firm receiving the contract to take out the patents on patentable inventions it makes with the use of Government money.

As Tom C. Clark, Attorney General, reported to the President in 1947:

> Throughout this period [1941–44] the general practice in the [War] Department was to leave to the contractor the patent rights in inventions resulting from performance of contracts, reserving for the Government a nonexclusive, royalty-free license, sometimes coupled with a free right to reproduce the article called for by the contract (that is, a free license under "background patents," those acquired by the contractor independently of the contract and used or embodied in the article). So firmly committed was the War Department to the policy of leaving the commercial rights to the contractor that when standard forms of patent clauses were first issued by the Department in September 1941, together with instructions as to their use, no provision was made for an assignment of title to the Government under any circumstances. * * *
>
> On April 5, 1945, a uniform policy was prescribed for the department by regulations reaffirming the traditional policy of leaving patent rights to the contractor subject to a Government license, but for the first time making express provision for an assignment of the patent to the United States in limited circumstances.[3]

This policy has not, to my knowledge, been significantly altered since then.

Considering these advantages accruing to corporations receiving Federal research contracts, the actual record, insofar as we know it, is highly disturbing. Thanks largely to the constant vigilance of the Small Business Committees of the House and Senate, the concentration of Government procurement contracts in the hands of the large major corporations of the Nation has been widely publicized, and efforts have been made to provide for small businesses a greater share of these contracts. However, until a few months ago, there was no definite information available as to the distribution of the research and development contracts, as distinguished from procurement contracts generally. For example, the following statement made in a House Small Business Committee report in July 1955 reflected both its acute awareness of the problem and its inability to get accurate data on the distribution of research contracts:

> The military services have handed out billions of dollars for research and development and are currently awarding between $1 billion and $1.5 billion a year in research and development contracts. Private firms are using these funds for developing new products and production processes, and the usual condition of the contract is that the private firm so engaged may receive patents on the products and processes invented. Such firms obviously may thus forge ahead in the technological race, and the distribution of these funds has, therefore, a vital effect upon competitive relationships. Most of the research and development contracts have gone and are going to the big firms of the Nation.[4]

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. May I commend the gentleman for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. The gentleman is always alert to the needs of his district, his State, and the Nation. The problem he is discussing is a very important one. It has had the attention of the House Committee on Small Business on which I have had the privilege to serve for many years, and I am certain that that committee will continue to give this very vital subject its attention.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank my distinguished friend from New York, and I would comment here that I have found him most helpful in my preparation of this material. I am certainly grateful to him for his guidance.

Largely as a result of this committee's probing into the matter, the Congress in August 1955 amended the Small Business Act—Public Law 163, 83d Congress—to require the Department of Defense to make monthly reports to Congress showing the value of research and development contracts awarded after June 30, 1955, separately from date on other types of contracts, and showing the value of such contracts placed with small business. The resultant reports are highly disturbing. In the 7 months ending January 31, 1956, the Department of Defense awarded research and development contracts amounting to almost $1 billion, to be more precise, $982 million. Of this huge sum only 5 percent went to firms having 500 employees or less. In other words, the concentration of research contracts among the large companies is even greater than procurement contracts generally, and small business concerns are for all practical purposes completely ignored.

It may be admitted, of course, that there are certain research projects which only particular firms with special skills and equipment can handle. And no one is arguing that the Government should deprive itself of the facilities and talent which a particular large corporation may have. Nonetheless there are countless instances in which results as good or better could have been obtained if smaller firms had been awarded particular research contracts. Moreover, if there were a better chance of being considered for Federal research contracts, many small businesses would expand their own research facilities and personnel. And such an expansion would unquestionably be in the Nation's interest as well as in the interest of the small businesses themselves.

Thus far we have few figures on the extent to which Federal funds influence the direction of research in an individual corporation. One instance, however, is quite informative, and shows how much weight government research contracts do carry. The Bell Telephone Laboratories in 1939 were spending more than $20 million a year for research, only 1 percent of which was for Government work. By 1944, through an enormous expansion of research, they were engaged in a program of research more than three times greater than before the war and more than 80 percent of the total was on Government contract. They had cut their own research program in half, and even this work was largely war connected. In 1955, their research budget had gone up to $112 million, of which $50 million was for contract work for the armed services, about as much as was contracted for in terms of dollars at the height of World War II—United States Congress, Senate, Committee on Military Affairs. The Government's wartime research and development, 1940–44, report from the Subcommittee on War Mobilization; part II, Findings and Recommendations, July 23, 1945; reprinted in United States Congress, Senate. Committee on Military Affairs. Legislative proposals for the promotion of science, 79th Congress, 1st session, Senate Document No. 92, August 1945, Washington, United States Government Printing Office, 1945, page 26; and Fortune, April 1955, page 220.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to my friend from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I, too, would like to commend the gentleman for bringing before the House this most important subject and to add that in the limited work which we have been able to do so far in the Committee on Small Business on this subject I think we find ample evidence that it needs much greater investigation and a much more searching look.

As a concrete example of what the gentleman says, our recent investigation has pointed out that the patents which have been developed by the Bell Telephone Laboratory, while they have been ostensibly made available to the public, have been tied down under the consent decree by the fact that a charge may be made for the implementation of those patents in order to make them workable, which is nothing more than another way of saying that they must pay a royalty for the license. It would seem, therefore, that there is a job in this field by the Committee on Small Business and I join my colleague from New Jersey in hoping that this challenge will be met and we will preserve for small business the opportunity to take part in the

[3] U. S. Department of Justice. Investigation of Government patent practices and policies; report and recommendations of the Attorney General to the President. Vol. I, final report proper. Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1947, pp. 80, 81.

[4] Statement by Hon. JOE L. EVINS in: U. S. Congress. House. Select Committee on Small Business. The Small Business Administration and related activities—a preliminary report of the Subcommittee on Government Procurement, Disposal and Loan Activities, July 1, 1955 (84th Cong., 1st sess., H. Rept. No. 1045). Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1955, pp. 19–20.

amounts of money which are being handed out by the Government of the United States so far as possible, with the results therefrom which I think they are capable of producing in contribution to the welfare of the Nation.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I am fully aware of his great interest and of his activity as a member of the Select Committee on Small Business and as chairman of the subcommittee, in this subject. I would thank him in the RECORD, too, for his counsel and guidance and I would apologize to all of the Members of the committee for preempting at least this much of their subject matter.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EVINS. I do not think the gentleman need apologize for the contribution which he is making, but rather I think he should be applauded for that and the assistance which he has given us in bringing this important matter to the attention of the House. It is true the committee has given extensive study to the subject of contract procurement and through extensive investigations and in the calling of many procurement officers of the Department of Defense before our committee we have repeatedly insisted that there be a wider distribution of contracts, a broadening of the base, so to speak, so that small business may participate to a greater degree. We think that the work has in the past been somewhat helpful, but all of the assistance that can be given in this regard is beneficial.

The gentleman certainly need make no apology for his work. He is rather to be commended for it. I think he is making a splendid contribution and I wish to join with others in commending him in this connection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the distinguished gentleman. I might point out to him that I quoted at length a statement by him made as a result of a study of the Subcommittee on Governmental Procurement, Disposal, and Loan Activities in July of 1955, first session, House Report No. 1045.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. I would state that while there have been some advances in the past, this is a subject to which there must be unrelenting attention given.

More recently there was called to my attention an extensive 6- or 7-page mimeographed procurement form for a very small item in a very limited quantity of material, which was supplied to small business. In other words, certain procurement officers make the problem extremely difficult and too difficult for small-business men to participate in by having such procurement forms and much redtape. Also, a great effort should be made in the field of subcontracting. Where large prime contracts are granted, there should be insistence that the prime contractor subcontract as much as possible in a wider area.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I could not agree with anything more than the last statement of the gentleman, in which he advocates the distribution of subcontracts to small businesses. This has been a tremendous problem and has caused great suffering among businesses which are now in fact capable of doing this work.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I join the other Members in commending my friend from New Jersey on a very thoughtful statement, and on bringing to the attention of this body a problem that certainly should have the searching study that he suggests. I notice that he described the growth of the Bell Telephone Laboratories during the period from 1939 to the present. The Bell Laboratories are in the area that I represent. I have watched with a great deal of pride the growth of the laboratories. I know in our area, where we are familiar with the work they are doing, that we feel there is a significant contribution made by the laboratories to the national welfare and the national security. I am sure the gentleman would agree to that as far as the laboratories are concerned.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I do agree as far as the laboratories are concerned. They might well fit into a category which I mentioned earlier of an organization with particular and peculiar qualifications, which certainly should not be deprived of the great research work which they have been doing. I mention them only to point up the amazing statistic of the growth of Government participation in research and development. There is no question that they have done great work up there in northern New Jersey, in Union County, in the gentleman's district, and I hope they continue to do so. I hope also that in the same field or related fields others will be given an opportunity, too, because we are going to need to continue expanding our research facilities.

We know enough to be disturbed about the concentration of research contracts among relatively few large corporations. We do not know enough, however, to take the action which will, at the same time, assure the greatest possible technical advancement and the preservation of our free enterprise system. For this reason, I have introduced a resolution (H. Res. 452) calling upon the Small Business Committee of the House, which has already shown such enlightened awareness of the problem, to make a thorough investigation of the various aspects of the problem of the distribution of Federal research and development contracts among the industrial firms of the Nation. The following are some of the more important aspects of this problem which, I am convinced, the committee would want to investigate: First, the extent to which Federal funds for research and development are being concentrated among particular firms; second, the methods and standards used by Federal agencies in distributing these funds; third, ways in which the interest of small business in research and development work can be safeguarded and the participation of small businesses in research activities fostered; fourth, the relationship between the distribution of Federal research and development contracts and the distribution of Federal contracts for procurement of supplies and services; fifth, the effect of Federal policy on research and development contracts on the distribution of scientific and technically trained personnel; and sixth, the patent policies of the Federal Government as it relates to inventions developed by industrial firms in their research work under Government contract.

Once these facts are brought out into the open, it is safe to assume that appropriate action will be recommended by the Congress to assure achievement of the two goals of rapid technological advancement and preservation of our free enterprise system, both of which are indispensable to the continued strength and prosperity of our people.

THE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE APPRECIATES THAT BIG BUSINESS FAVORITISM WITH FEDERAL RESEARCH FUNDS WILL SQUEEZE OUT SMALL BUSINESS—AN INVESTIGATION WILL BE MADE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] on his speech. It is certainly most educational; he has brought to our attention a most important matter and his presentation here today shows a remarkably thorough and careful piece of research on his own part. Certainly it has made me, for one, appreciate the scope and importance of this problem of the distribution of Federal money for industrial research, more than I had previously.

The gentleman from New Jersey has brought out several facts which I doubt if many of us have known. First of all, the Nation's spending on research—counting both Federal and private money—is currently at a rate which makes the Nation's previous research activities seem puny indeed. Just think of it; there has been as much money spent on research and development in the past 5 years as was spent in this Nation during the previous 90 years.

I doubt furthermore whether many of us had realized that the Federal Government is footing the bill for 57 percent of all of the research and development work done in the Nation, including both basic scientific research and all kinds of industrial and commercial research and development. Furthermore, the Department of Defense is handling the expenditure for substantially all—at least 85 percent—of the Federal funds spent for research; and substantially all of these funds distributed by the Department of Defense go to private business firms.

I assure the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] that the Small Business Committee will certainly do everything it can to investigate these matters stated in his resolution. However, I must point out that the gentleman's resolution contains a large order.

His resolution poses, itself, a job of research which would be very large and very difficult for any committee of Congress, even if we could expect to receive sympathetic cooperation from the Federal agencies who are distributing these vast sums of Federal money. Our past experiences lead me to believe, moreover, that cooperation, and even sympathy for the problem, will not be forthcoming from the Department of Defense. This Department is disinclined to give the public information, or to give Congress information, bearing upon its conduct of the public business as it relates to such matters as to the impact of this business upon competitive industrial relationships. As a matter of fact, on some of the most important matters in this area the Department is inclined to keep even itself uninformed.

The gentleman from New Jersey has already quoted from a report of one of the subcommittees of our committee, issued in July of last year, which pointed out in a general way the magnitude of the sums being distributed by the Department of Defense and the dangers to our competitive enterprise system which are inherent in maldistribution of these funds, as well as the dangers in other administrative procedures which fail to safeguard the competitive enterprise system.

Consequently, when Department of Defense officials came before the Banking and Currency Committee later in July, last year, I inquired about reports on the distribution of the Department's research and development funds as between big business and small business. Specifically I requested such reports of Mr. R. C. Lanphier, Jr., the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Supply and Logistics. It was apparent that Mr. Lanphier was uninformed on this subject; but he promised to see what he could do and supply reports for the record—hearings on H. R. 7071, page 107, and following. In order to have comparisons, I asked Mr. Lanphier to supply such reports covering the previous 2 fiscal years and, if possible, the previous 5 fiscal years.

Subsequently the Department of Defense was able to have prepared a report for the Air Force, covering the calendar year 1954, and in addition, the Department was able to submit a report covering one branch of the Navy. The Department's letter, which was inserted in the record of the hearings, indicated that it was not able to make any report at that time on the amount of research and development funds distributed by the Army, as between big business and small business, nor was it able to make such a report for the other branches of the Navy Department. The Department's letter indicated, however, that it was "investigating the possibilities of setting up a system for regular reporting of this kind of information."

In order to make sure that at least some minimum information on this subject would be reported regularly, the Small Business Committee made recommendations to the Banking and Currency Committee for an amendment to the Small Business Act, the renewal of which was then being considered. The Banking and Currency Committee accepted our recommendation and wrote into its bill a requirement that the Department of Defense report to Congress, each month, the amount of money spent or contracted to be spent with private business firms for research and development work, and the proportion of such money going to small firms. This bill passed, and the law became effective August 1, 1955; the Department of Defense is now required by law to make reports providing this minimum amount of information, although this information is, of course, much too sketchy and incomplete to permit of any real appraisal of the Department's handling of research funds.

When the reports for the first 2 months of the fiscal year came to us, I was greatly amazed to learn that although the Department of Defense committed itself to distribute $187 million of Federal research funds with private firms in those months, less than 5 percent of the total was committed to firms having 500 employees or less. Assuming that substantially all of these commitments went to firms in the manufacturing field, it was apparent that this 5 percent of the money could be compared with about 45 percent of the manufacturing activities carried on by firms with less than 500 employees. As I say, I was greatly astonished and disturbed. Realizing moreover, that the Secretary of Defense himself had previously not had an indication of how the research funds were being divided between big business and small business, and that the news reports on this subject possibly had not come to his attention, I wrote the Secretary on October 26, 1955, calling this matter to his attention. In my letter to Secretary Wilson I said:

> In view of your long industrial experience, I am sure it will be overwhelmingly obvious to you that the way in which research and development funds are distributed will have an incalculable impact on private competitive relationships. The few big firms receiving this money will have immeasurable competitive advantages over their smaller competitors in commercial markets, as they will also have the inside track for defense production work.

Finally, I attempted to make it clear to the Secretary of Defense that I was not asking any subsidy for small business. Furthermore, I tried to make it clear to the Secretary that the Small Business Committee was not trying to put itself in the position of looking over his shoulder to see that the Department distributed its vast research funds in a reasonably fair way, and in a way which would tend to preserve competitive relationships and safeguard a continuation of the free enterprise system. I felt that the Secretary himself would have these considerations very much in his mind, although I did suggest that the reports which had eventuated as a result of the amended law indicated a clear need for somewhat more detailed and revealing statistical summaries on the distribution of research funds. The Members may be interested in the following excerpts from my letter to Secretary Wilson:

> I am not asking you to subsidize small business. But I am asking you to give thoughtful consideration to the consequences which will surely follow if you continue passing out the huge research and development funds which have been placed at your disposal exclusively to big business.
>
> Although my own experience has taught me that public reporting on the activities of the executive departments is the best safeguard against serious mismanagement of the public's business, I think I would be correct in saying that the change in the law to require the Department of Defense to compile statistical summaries of research and development contracts was made, not so much for the purpose of having the summaries public, as for the purpose of making sure that you and your assistants would yourselves be informed. May I now suggest that you direct the military departments to compile somewhat more detailed summaries of research and development contracts, so that both you and Members of Congress may be informed as to the distribution of these funds among firms of several size classes and among several industrial divisions may be compared?

Although that letter was written on October 26, so far there is no indication that any more detailed statistical summaries have been made, or that the Department has any intention of making such summaries. Secretary Wilson did acknowledge my letter, stating that he had asked his assistant, Mr. Pike, to comment on my letter. Subsequently, on January 10, 1956, I had a letter from Mr. R. C. Lanphier, Jr., Mr. Pike's deputy, commenting on the 95–5 percent division of research money as between big firms and small firms. The burden of Mr. Lanphier's letter was that, although when he was before the Banking and Currency Committee in July he had not the slightest idea what the division was; on January 10 he considered the 95 to 5 percent division eminently satisfactory, to his way of thinking. In point of fact, Mr. Lanphier rather overlooked the question of what the Department of Defense might be doing for, or to small business, but rather indicated his satisfaction with what small business was doing for the Department. Mr. Lanphier said:

> Taking together all of the considerations which I have mentioned, the contribution of small firms to this aspect of the defense program appears to be entirely creditable.

So while I am in complete agreement and sympathy with the suggestions made in the resolution of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], at the same time, to be realistic, I must ask for the sympathy and understanding of the author of this resolution, as well as the other Members of the House. The problems of your Small Business Committee are not easy ones to solve when the heads of the executive agencies are not in sympathy with small business and cannot be readily prevailed upon to inform either themselves or the committee on some of the fundamental aspects of their programs.

I assure the gentleman from New Jersey, however, that our committee will do all it can to gather revealing information on this important subject and report this information to the House.

AVIATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLLAND). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week I introduced H. R. 11065 to create a commission designed to study the agencies of the executive branch of the Government having some responsibility with respect to aviation with a view to their reorganization so that aviation problems can be more intelligently, promptly, and effectively resolved.

At this point in my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I set forth the full text of H. R. 11065:

H. R. 11065

A bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950

Be it enacted, etc., That section 104 of the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. sec. 18a) is amended to read as follows:

"IMPROVED ADMINISTRATION OF EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

"SEC. 104. (a) The President, through the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, is authorized and directed to evaluate and develop improved plans for the organization, coordination, and management of the executive branch of the Government with a view to efficient and economical service.

"(b) (1) In order to provide for a study to be made to determine appropriate methods of eliminating the present multiplicity of departments, administrations, commissions, committees, boards, consultants, and other similar agents and agencies created by law or Executive order and having responsibilities or engaging in activities with respect to aviation and related activities; eliminating the present conflicts, duplications, and overlapping of functions and activities, and lack of coordination, between and among such agencies, as well as between such agencies and State and local governmental bodies and foreign governments and international organizations; and eliminating the present impediments to the prompt, efficient, and effective resolution of aviation and related problems arising from such conflicts which hamper and delay necessary progress in and development of aviation, result in waste and inefficiency, and threaten flight safety, there is hereby created a commission to be known as the Commission on Reorganization of Aviation Agencies (hereafter in this subsection referred to as the 'Commission'), which shall consist of 16 members, 8 appointed by the President (4 from the executive branch and 4 from private life), 4 Members of the Senate appointed by the Vice President (of whom not more than 2 shall be of the same party), and 4 Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House (of whom not more than 2 shall be of the same political party). Any vacancy on the Commission shall not affect its powers, and shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

"(2) In order to carry out the purposes for which the Commission is created, the Commission, after a full and complete investigation and study, shall formulate and recommend to the President for transmittal to the Congress, specific programs and policies calculated to eliminate conflicts, duplication, lack of coordination, and overlapping of functions and activities in the field of civilian and military aviation and related activities, and more effectively to discharge the responsibilities of the United States, in conjunction with State and local governments, and foreign governments, and international organizations, in the promotion of aviation for the common welfare and national defense.

"(3) The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members. Nine members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum. The Commission shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949.

"(4) Members of the Commission who are Members of Congress shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; each member of the Commission who is in the executive branch of the Government shall receive the compensation which he would receive if he were not a member of the Commission, plus such additional compensation, if any, as is necessary to make his aggregate annual salary $12,500; members of the Commission from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission. Each member of the Commission shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of his duties as a member of the Commission.

"(5) The service of any person as a member of the Commission, the service of any other person with the Commission, and the employment of any person by the Commission, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such person within the provisions of sections 281, 283, or 284 of title 18 of the United States Code, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States.

"(6) The Commission may create such committees of its members with such powers and duties as may be delegated thereto. The Commission, or any committee thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out this subsection, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the Commission or such committee may deem advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or before any committee thereof. The Commission, or any committee thereof, shall have power to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take testimony; to have printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable within the amount appropriated therefor. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Commission or committee and shall be served by any person designated by them. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes of the United tSates (2 U. S. C., secs. 192–194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this subsection.

"(7) The Commission, or any committee thereof, is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality, information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this subsection; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality shall furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission or any committee thereof, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Commission, or of the committee concerned.

"(8) The Commission established by this subsection shall cease to exist on June 30, 1958."

Mr. Speaker, this Commission, to be known as the Commission on Reorganization of Aviation Agencies, would be composed of 16 members—8 from the Congress appointed by the Vice President and the Speaker of the House on a bipartisan basis, 4 from the executive branch of the Government and 4 from private life.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the introduction of this bill, I issued a statement to the press today which I incorporate at this point in my remarks:

Representative GEORGE MEADER, Republican Michigan, asked Congress today for quick passage of a bill to "clean up the mess in the executive branch of the Government and the numerous and conflicting agencies controlling aviation."

In a speech prepared for delivery on the House floor, MEADER declared:

"I am not at all satisfied with the past record of predominance of the executive branch of the Government, and within the executive branch the predominance of the military departments in determining issues in the field of aviation."

MEADER cited a special Budget Bureau report calling attention to 75 separate agencies, boards, commissions and special consultants "each" he said, "with a hand in aviation policy matters."

He asserted the right of policymaking belongs with Congress.

On Monday, MEADER introduced a bill calling for establishment of a 16-man commission to reorganize aviation agencies. It would be composed of Members of Congress, representatives of the executive branch, and persons from private life.

The Michigan lawmaker said the jet age in air transport has brought with it a "multitude" of problems, including high speeds, lack of suitable air navigation aids and control facilities, conflicting demands on the shrinking air space, as well as lack of airports to handle heavy jet transports.

He added:

"Scores of agencies in the executive branch of the Government are studying those problems without apparent results and without clear-cut responsibilities, and with little or no coordination.

"I hope we will not have to suffer some catastrophe, such as disastrous midair collisions with loss of life, before we awake to the fact that we in Government are way behind technological advances in the field of rapid air transport."

Mr. Speaker, many may remember that I was instrumental in urging the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations to undertake an investigation of the Federal airport-aid program. That committee under the chairmanship of the Honorable ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN, of West Virginia, has undertaken that investigation.

The committee has not commenced public hearings, but I am informed by the staff that their preliminary investigation has progressed to the point that

public hearings may commence in a couple of weeks.

The bill which I have introduced, which would create a commission to study executive agencies across the board, dealing in the field of aviation, in my judgment, is not in conflict with the investigation of the Mollohan committee, of which I have the honor to be the ranking minority member. In fact, it is my hope that since this bill was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, it will be referred to the subcommittee of which Mr. MOLLOHAN is chairman, the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee. Thus, the hearings which the committee proposes to hold in the investigation of the Federal airport-aid program may also be convenient for considering H. R. 11065, at the same time. The bill is not confined to the Federal airport-aid program.

Mr. Speaker, my interest in aviation problems was stimulated a year ago when a controversy arose between two airports in the neighborhood of Detroit. I refer to the Willow Run Airport, which is owned by the University of Michigan in my congressional district, and the Detroit Wayne Major Airport, some 6 air miles away, near Romulus, Mich. That controversy has been a hot one since March of last year and is still far from being resolved.

Just recently the Detroit Economic Club had both sides of this controversy aired in a luncheon meeting of the club in Detroit and recently the Detroit Board of Commerce published in its weekly organ, the Detroiter, on April 16, 1956, a very well-written article by William A. Mara, who is head of the Detroit Board of Commerce Aviation Committee, and an official of the Bendix Corp.

At this point I include Mr. Mara's article in my remarks:

WHICH SHOULD BE DETROIT'S MAJOR AIRPORT?

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Here is the complete text of William A. Mara's speech before the Economic Club recently. He is chairman of your board's aviation committee.)

If Detroit is to avoid becoming a whistle-stop town in a jet age, our public officials will have to do a sudden right-about-face and show much more wisdom in their airport planning. And if the taxpayer is to escape a terrible licking by having 30 million of his tax dollars spent foolishly, these same public officials will have to substitute reason for the confusion which has been their trademark in dealing with our airport problems.

I want to make it clear at the outset that the board of commerce is concerned first with Detroit travelers and shippers, and not necessarily with the airlines. In fact, by design, there have never been any airline people on our aviation committee. Therefore, if we seem to agree with the airlines' viewpoint it is because we believe that that viewpoint will result in better service for the public and will make the most economical use of the taxpayer's dollar.

The subject assigned to today's talk is perhaps the best illustration of the confusion which surrounds the Detroit airport problem. The subject is, "Which Should Be Detroit's Major Airport?" Mr. Richards and some of our other thoughtless officials are guilty of horse-and-buggy thinking when they call Wayne our Major airport and relegate the northeast site to a subordinate role.

They just aren't facing facts. The facts are that no one airport can properly serve the needs of the Detroit metropolitan area. To do this we need at least two major airports and, most of all, we need to acquire land for the construction of the northeast site before this land is built up and we are forced north to Pontiac. The northeast airport is needed to balance our west side airports.

Everyone will agree that in order to save the travelers time, an airport should be located as centrally as possible. With central location in mind, I call your attention to the chart drawn from information furnished by the Detroit Metropolitan Area Regional Planning Commission. On this chart circles ranging from 5 to 12½ miles have been drawn around both the Northeast and Wayne County sites. They show in simple arithmetic that northeast is closer to almost four times as many people as Wayne—2,200,000 to 600,000.

Shown also is the fact that Willow Run and Wayne can serve the west and southwest sides of our metropolitan area, but by reason of off-center location, can never properly serve the entire area. A series of recent articles by Jean Pearson, of the Detroit Free Press, have dealt thoroughly and intelligently with our airport situation. From these articles you can get the facts in detail on all phases of the problem.

Because Wayne and Willow Run are so close together, and because from a traffic-control standpoint they are actually operated as one airport, the board of commerce does not agree with the city and county position that the airlines should be moved from Willow Run to Wayne. In our opinion, this move would not produce enough additional traffic to pay the staggering cost of $28 million or $30 million to complete Wayne as a major airline airport. Practical considerations demand that these funds be spent for the development of the Northeast airport.

Recently our public officials have put on a performance which is apparently dictated more by hysteria than reason. In spite of the fact that the council approved and ordered condemnation of the Northeast site in 1954, no determined drive has been made to press this suit to successful conclusion. Failing to sell the airlines on moving to Wayne as a good business proposition, they have tried to force them thereby the threat of transferring Navy, National Guard, and Air Force operations to Willow Run in spite of a military investment at present of more than $7 million in Wayne Airport. The airlines are fighting this move and Navy and National Guard officers have expressed their opposition. There are perhaps two reasons for the illogical and apparently senseless position which our city and county officials are taking. One is that so much money has already been spent and is planned to be spent on the Wayne County Airport that they are willing to throw in an additional $30 million to rescue it. The other reason is a compelling one, but is more difficult to understand unless one has lived with this problem. It is that Wayne Airport is the brain child of LeRoy Smith, our county highway engineer, who is considered by many to be the most able politician in these parts.

When he began Wayne Airport years ago, some called it Smith's Folly, because of its off-center location, far southwest of the city at that time. This rankled the old gentleman and made him more and more determined to force the adoption of this location as Detroit's major airport. It has become an obsession with him and I am sure he views this airport as his monument. At any rate, he has been eminently successful in blocking all other attempts to solve our airport problem. He maintains John P. McElroy, a registered lobbyist and his assistant, as a member of the State aviation commission as Lansing. It is McElroy's job to get funds for Wayne Airport and kill funds for any airport which threatens Wayne. Mr. McElroy does not operate for the common good but only for what Mr. Smith considers to be good. Mr. Smith is also the brains who plans all the present airport campaign moves. He thinks up the words which Mr. Richards uses, and Mr. Smith has used Mr. Richards in the past to block airport progress. Mr. Smith works effectively in the background, where he pulls the strings which move the actors about the stage.

I have tried earnestly to work with Mr. Smith on various airport projects. I invited him to be present at meetings of the board of commerce aviation committee. In one of my last conversations with him I asked him, in the presence of the committee, if he would support and work for the northeast airport. He replied definitely that he would not do so until such time as Wayne County Airport had been completed and the airlines had moved there.

Mayor Cobo can straighten out the Detroit airport mess if he decides to do so. He can cope with Mr. LeRoy Smith successfully if he chooses. In my opinion, Mr. Cobo has been our most able mayor. He is a dedicated man and his integrity is unquestioned. He has named a Detroit Aviation Commission with capable men like Packer, Reese, Boyer, Joy, Carroll, and Burnett who understand our aviation problems. They want to see Northeast developed, and have so recommended, but the mayor, instead, seems to listen to LeRoy Smith who wants another $30 million to fully develop his Wayne County monument.

We urge the mayor to listen to his Aviation Commission instead of to Mr. Smith. The mayor has the whip hand because Detroit pays the bulk of Wayne County's taxes. He can force the successful completion of Northeast and save taxpayers $30 million if he will assume the leadership of which he is so capable.

In 1960, 3,100,000 air travelers will arrive and depart in the Detroit metropolitan area. That is 1 million more than we have today. We need two airports to do this job.

A determined mayor and a determined citizenry can take us out of the whistle-stop category and give us the jet-age airports to which our town is entitled.

Mr. Speaker, I only wish to add with reference to the controversy between those two airports in the Detroit area that I am convinced that it does not make sense to spend $30 to $33 million to develop Wayne-Major Airport, which is in the same traffic pattern as an existing airport, Willow Run. As Mr. Mara points out in his speech, there is a need for a second airport in the Detroit area but in a different traffic pattern and serving a different center of population.

Unfortunately the chart which is a part of the article cannot, under the rules for printing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, be incorporated in the RECORD. But suffice it to say that in addition to the narrative material of the article the chart shows that the Northeast Airport, which is advocated by experts in aviation in the Detroit community, would serve a far greater center of population than the Detroit Wayne-Major Airport, and the Detroit Wayne-Major Airport being so close to an existing airport in Detroit, Willow Run, will simply duplicate facilities already existing. This is an inordinate waste of funds.

So much for the airport aid problem which will be considered by the Mollohan Committee.

I wish to return to the broader aviation problems. These include air navigation facilities, the control of airways, competition for air space, the relationship between military and civilian aviation; the relationship between the Federal Government and State and municipal

governments in aviation; and the relationship between the Federal Government and foreign governments and international organizations with respect to aviation.

I assert that the handling of the problems in the field of aviation are in a state of utter confusion. I insert at this point in the RECORD in support of my assertion a circular of the Air Transport Association dated March 27, 1956:

AIR TRANSPORT ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., March 27, 1956.

Operations memorandum No. 56–52.

Subject: Chart of simplified research and development structure and coordinating organizations involved in the common system of air navigation and traffic control.

To: Conference members.

Attached is a copy of an organizational chart showing lines of authority and coordination by the groups of industry and the executive branch of the Government. The heading on the chart states that this is a simplified chart. This is a factual statement and is not intended to be facetious.

This diagram was prepared by a branch of the Government and was used in top level discussions. Note this diagram does not include the legislative branch of the Government nor are all of the agencies of the executive branch shown.

As stated in the recently issued Harding committee report, there are 75 committees, subcommittees and groups of the Government and/or industry directing their attention to aviation facilities within the executive branch of the Government. Industry is represented or participates, to varying degrees, in approximately 40–45 of these committees.

This chart is furnished primarily for information although it has been observed that there are scores of people in the airline industry who think of that portion of the Government having to do with the industry in terms of 1–2 persons. Also there is quite an apparent lack of appreciation that both the executive and legislative branches of our Government have independent responsibilities and that most programs require concerted action on the part of both these branches of the Government.

MILTON W. ARNOLD,
Vice President, Operations and Engineering.

Unfortunately because of the restriction on printing charts in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD it will not be possible for me to insert in the RECORD the chart attached to the circular.

The chart is headed: "Simplified Research and Development Structure and Coordinating Organizations Involved in a Common System of Air Navigation and Traffic Control." I submit that anyone who looks at that chart and the numerous agencies on it and the lines of communication between them will see that probably there is no more mixed up set of agencies dealing with problems in any field of activity in the Federal Government. Here is bureaucracy, redtape, and confusion gone wild. I submit that a look at that chart itself supports the proposition that there is duplication, conflict, and lack of coordination in the agencies of the Federal Government having to do with the field of aviation.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, there is an excellent article dealing with problems of aviation and its future development in the New York Sunday Times of April 29, 1956. I incorporate that article by Mr. Richard Witkin entitled "Jet Age Planning Worries Airlines" at this point in my remarks:

JET AGE PLANNING WORRIES AIRLINES—600-MILES-PER-HOUR-CRAFT CREATING PROBLEMS OF NOISE, TRAFFIC CONTROL, AND FACILITIES

(By Richard Witkin)

Going the rounds of the aviation industry is a Government document that, isolated from other data, might terrify the bank and insurance executives who have arranged financing for $1,100,000,000 worth of jet airliner purchases.

The very title of the document, drawn up by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, is disconcerting. It reads: "CAA Jet Age Planning, the 100 Problems."

The figure 100 is a minimum. The man assigned to compile the list cut it off there for fear he would never be able to stop. The list contains, alongside such obvious items as jet-engine noise and the question of runway length and strength, a multitude of difficulties unsuspected by any but the experts.

For instance, a conventional altimeter—the gage that tells a pilot how high he is—loses its accuracy at altitudes where 600-mile-an-hour airliners will fly. Piston-engine airways are stacked vertically at 1,000-foot intervals. The spread will have to be much greater at the rarefied jet altitudes unless better altimeters can be perfected.

EVEN RADAR AFFECTED

Consider radar. Piston-engine airliners, picked up by radar, bounce back a strong signal that forms a bright blip—a small, luminous streak—on the dark radarscope. The main impetus for the strong return signal comes from the thrashing of the propellers. Propellerless jets will require more powerful radar transmitters.

The difficulties are seemingly endless. Will the harmonics of jet noise shatter the huge picture windows that have become fashionable at modern air terminals? What is the best machine for clearing runways of pebbles and dirt that could chew up a jet engine's insides? How steep a descent from extreme jet altitudes will passengers be able to tolerate?

Britain devised workable solutions for many operational problems when it put its fleet of Comet I's in service. Of course, the tragedies that later suspended the Comet operations testify that British planning left something to be desired. Yet even if the Comet I had been a success—and it missed by only a small though catastrophic margin—this country could not get by with a duplication of British methods. There are several reasons.

The American jets slated to start commercial service by early 1959—the Douglas DC–8 and the Boeing 707—are much larger and faster than the Comet I. They will carry three times as many passengers. The general run of aerial traffic in which the American jets will operate will be congested. The traffic the Comets had to contend with was light by comparison. By the early 1960's there will be dozens of American jets streaming into and out of major terminals. Comet I production was halted while still a trickle.

The almost overwhelming tasks confronting the American aviation industry will strain both its technical ingenuity and its financial resources, which include whatever funds the taxpayer will make available in governmental budgets.

Many of the problems—most glaringly traffic control—are not peculiar to the jet but already are plaguing the industry. Jets will vastly complicate traffic control, however.

Another complication will call for collaboration with other governments. It will be vital to achieve international standardization of many operational jet procedures and much equipment. Otherwise international carriers would be compelled to install several navigational systems in their planes to perform the same function in different countries. The extra equipment would be costly and would slice into passenger or cargo capacity.

THREE CATEGORIES OF TROUBLE

Most of the difficulties the industry faces divide into three categories: Noise, traffic control and airport facilities.

In the public mind, noise has been the prime concern from the moment the industry raised the specter of jet airliners operating near homes and offices. Experimental work on a suitable noise suppressor has not yet been completed. But tests to date have been successful enough to warrant statements from the manufacturers that their planes will be no noisier—perhaps less noisy—than piston-engine planes.

Piping down to piston-engine raucousness is not going to mollify those who feel that even pistons rate banishment to outlying provinces. But there is little doubt that municipal authorities will accept the jet airliner at existing airports if piston-engine noise levels are achieved.

Other things being equal, jet planes have some decided advantages over piston planes when it comes to minimizing the impact on the public nervous system. Once jets are off the ground, their speed and climbing ability carry them out of earshot a good deal more quickly than current planes.

Taming the noise of jet engines during ground run-up is technically much simpler than during takeoff, of course. In designing an in-flight suppressor (the most promising is a corrugated nozzle for the tailpipe), engineers must make sure it does not absorb too much engine power or overburden the plane with its weight and wind resistance.

EARS MUST BE PROTECTED

For ground testing, loss of engine power and size of suppressor are technically not so important. If need be, the boisterous exhaust can be—and sometimes is—piped through a soundproofing chamber bigger than the plane.

Unmuffled jet roar, sometimes necessary in ground tests, can damage the hearing of ground crewmen nearby. Mechanics probably will have to be equipped with protective devices for their ears. On the other hand, an Air Force study shows there is no danger of hearing loss or other physical injury to people living off the airport, whatever their psychological reactions.

The most imposing of all the industry's tasks is undoubtedly the modernization of the already archaic traffic-control system. The task is so imposing that the first jet fleets almost certainly will be controlled by nothing better than the current basic system jogged by heavy infusions of interim gadgetry.

It is widely believed that what is needed in the long run is a fully automatic system in which electronic brains will calculate traffic patterns and transmit instruction signals to dozens of cockpits. Such a system is quite a few years away.

To appreciate the added difficulties that will be encountered in handling jet traffic, it is necessary to understand how the traffic-control system works—or muddles through—today. In good weather, there is a minimum of control from the ground. That is, ground stations do not tell a pilot what altitude to fly or when to let down for a landing. He simply flies in accord with visual flight rules.

EYESIGHT RULES

Visual rules require that planes flying the airways, which are marked out by the CAA, maintain odd-numbered altitudes (7,000 feet, 9,000 feet, etc.) going north or east and even altitudes going south or west. Pilots must rely on their eyesight to keep from colliding with other planes. There are comparable rules for off-airways flights.

When instrument weather moves into an area, ground controllers go to work. Every plane then is required to file a "flight plan" with traffic control authorities. Planes are assigned specific altitudes and told when to take off.

Since pilots plowing through an overcast cannot see other traffic, safety dictates that planes be dispatched at regulated time or distance intervals if they are to share a particular altitude. The rules call for a minimum separation of 10 minutes, unless the area is monitored by radar. Ten minutes in a 360-miles-an-hour DC–7 is 60 miles.

If the 60-mile safety margin is threatened because a DC–7 is overtaking a slower DC–4, ground control finds out from position reports radioed from the planes. In that case, the DC–7 is ordered to circle for a time over a radio beacon or is assigned a new altitude.

In areas where controllers can "see" the planes on radar, the rules permit narrowing the separation of traffic to as little as 5 miles. Controllers can advise the pilots what headings to fly and watch the planes' blips on the radarscope to make sure they comply. With the breathtaking increase in traffic putting more and more of a premium on air space, radar has saved an overloaded system from virtual collapse.

HUMAN LIMITATIONS

But radar is no panacea. Human brains must absorb the radar information and base traffic instructions upon it. There is a limit on how many blips a single brain can safely juggle.

What are the basic defects in the traffic system? Both the scheduled airlines and the military which have jointly led the campaign to overhaul the existing setup start from the premise that visual flight rules need sweeping revision. They insist that for most operations pilot vision no longer is an adequate safeguard against collision, even in a cloudless sky.

It should be emphasized that the airline-military approach to the problem is loudly challenged by the private pilots, represented by the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association. The association fears that the airline-military campaign aims at running the private pilots out of the skies or at least relegating them to the "sticks."

The airlines have buttressed their case with a survey on the mid-air collision hazard conducted by their trade group, the Air Transport Association. The survey produced the statistic that airliners in this country are involved in four near-collisions every day, most of them in clear weather.

The Air Force has reported equally alarming conditions. While some observers sympathetic to the airline-military point of view feel that the survey's definition of a near-miss may be slightly loose, there appears little doubt that the incidence of near-misses is dangerously high.

This will seem less surprising when it is realized that the head-on closure rate of two modern piston airliners is much faster than the speed of a revolver bullet. The closure rate will be far greater with two 600-mile-an-hour jets. The private fliers' association, while conceding there is a collision problem, strongly distrusts the airline survey and bridles at the cures proposed.

RULE CHANGE DISPUTED

The airline-military view is that the logical answer to the near-miss hazard is to compel planes to follow bad-weather rules in good weather, at least in critical areas. To fly under bad-weather, or instrument, rules, a pilot must have an instrument proficiency rating. Also his plane must be equipped with a minimum of radio and navigation equipment—a minimum many private pilots cannot afford.

The private pilots have been assured there is no intention to relegate them to remote areas. They have been assured that adequate air space will be set aside for visual private flying, even in such crowded areas as New York.

The private pilots' association is not buying such assurances. It proposes as the answer to the near-miss hazard:

Speed limits in congested terminal areas.

Better cockpit visibility.

Round-the-clock, all-weather control only at the high altitudes where jets will normally cruise.

The pros and cons of the dispute are complex. In any case, the proposal to curtail visual flight rules flying is somewhat academic at the moment. However urgent the airlines and military officials might consider such curtailment for reasons of safety, economics, or national defense, the change cannot come overnight.

The outmoded traffic-control system lacks the capacity to handle the normal good-weather flow of traffic. It cannot even handle the lighter flow that seeks control when instrument weather moves in.

Today, when bad weather blankets a heavily congested area and makes instrument rules mandatory, one-third or more of scheduled airline flights must be canceled. Other flights are delayed an hour, 2 hours, sometimes more. This slowdown is irritating enough as an occasional phenomenon; it would be ruinous as a permanent condition. The reasons for the incapacity of the system are many.

PRESENT CONTROL CUMBERSOME

Along a 250-mile route at one particular altitude there is room for only 4 DC–7's if 10-minute separation is required. Given complete coverage with present radar, and thereby enabled to narrow separation to 5 miles, controllers still could not handle today's traffic volume. Jet-age traffic would overwhelm them.

There are insufficient communications channels between controllers and pilots. Devices to give constant and positive identification to each radar blip still have to be perfected. The system for relaying data from one controller to another as planes move from zone to zone dates back almost to the time of the mah-jong craze. The reference comes to mind because the system in operation bears some resemblance to that parlor pastime.

Data on each flight—altitude, route, estimated arrival time, etc.—must be scribbled on rectangular strips mounted in aluminum holders. The strips are posted on top of one another on a slanted board. Controllers have a hectic time shuffling holders and relaying information to each other, to pilots, and to airline operations shacks over a mass of wires plugged into walls, ceiling, and floor. The system is crying for automation.

At present the CAA is evaluating an electronic brain that automatically transcribes data onto the strips by use of punched cards.

The extra speed of jet airliners (600 instead of 360 miles an hour) will mean less time to waste in clerical chores and waiting for a chance to get in touch with a pilot over a party-line radio channel.

Because jet airliners will intrude into regions above 30,000 feet, hitherto reserved for the military, the interweaving of military and civilian traffic will become exceedingly involved.

Finally the gluttonous fuel consumption of jets will mean a limit on stacking planes over an airport while they await their turn to land.

On average, jet airliners will carry enough fuel to "hold" for an hour or so over destination before heading for an alternate airport. This is nothing like the holding endurance of piston planes. Figures on fuel consumption show why. A DC–6B requires only 1,420 pounds of fuel to hold for an hour at 10,000 feet. A DC–8 jet will require 9,000 pounds for an hour at 15,000.

The profit margin in jet operations will not tolerate habitual waste of 9,000-pound fuel loads. Nor will it tolerate chronic diversions to alternate airports with the airline then responsible for hotel bills or refunds (or both) for 100 to 140 passengers at a clip. Traffic control will have to weave jets through the skies to prompt landings on a good majority of occasions.

Another point: Traffic control must control right up to the parking gate where passengers board and debark. Quick clearance of runways to enable a second plane to land, avoidance of taxi-strip congestion, smooth access to an adequate number of passenger gates, all must figure in the equation if the system is to cope with predicted traffic volumes.

The Government, at long last, is pulling together and accelerating many rambling efforts to help traffic control catch up with the growth of air traffic. The efforts have rambled not for lack of specialists who knew what was needed but for lack of leadership and congressional funds.

REVOLUTION NOT HERE

It is not expected that a revolution will have been brought about by the time the first jet fleets start operating commercially. But some major reforms should have been accomplished. There will be many more radar installations, more controllers, more navigation aids, more communications channels—quantitative advances.

There should be some qualitative changes, too. But radical transformation of the traffic-control system is a long-range project that will not gather real momentum until sometime after the jet airliners have been introduced. The directions of research and development are well defined, however. They forecast the shape of the eventual traffic-control system, though the exact contours may be affected by how successful the private pilots are in resisting clear-weather control.

Great effort is being expended on improving radar. The newest installations are equipped with moving target indicators that filter out confusing stationary targets, such as buildings and towers. Another improvement prevents rain and other precipitation from cluttering the scope.

A device called a transponder, situated in the plane, holds great promise of increasing return radar signals from jets. It transmits a strong signal in answer to the radar signal sent from the ground. In addition, its reply can be coded—can transmit double blips, colored blips, blips with special symbols. Coded replies could identify the flight or its altitude. Interference between radio frequencies is impeding progress on the device, however.

Parallel research is aimed at producing devices that will enlarge blips and display them so that controllers can easily keep track of them. Another high-priority project is development of a proximity warning device that will alert a pilot if he is on a collision course with another plane.

In the long run, electronic calculators will keep track of the radar blips, calculate the best course for each plane to fly and transmit instructions to the planes.

PILOTS TO BE MONITORS

The instructions will not even have to filter through the pilot. They will go directly to an automatic pilot. The human crewman will merely monitor the operation and be ready to take over in case of a malfunction. Machines will transfer flight data not only from ground to air, but between controllers, and from control center to control center.

A good deal of automatic equipment for traffic control already is in the development and evaluating stage. SAGE (standing for semiautomatic ground environment), the air-defense system that coordinates the radar search for enemy planes and plots courses for

interceptors, probably will play an important role in traffic control. A Government team is studying what features of SAGE can be adapted.

The needs are so complex that it may be a decade or more before automation really takes hold as a traffic controller. It won't be enough for some enterprising automation concern to design an electronic thinker and then go around peddling it.

Each device or facility for navigation, communication, or airport operation in the jet age must be considered in relation to the rest of the system. Scientists these days are always talking about the "systems" approach. In aviation, President Eisenhower has appointed a special assistant—Edward P. Curtis, a former Air Force general—to study the Nation's overall aeronautical requirements for the next 20 years.

Mr. Curtis, operating from an office at the White House, will come up with a comprehensive long-range systems blueprint within the next year or year and a half. This plan will have great bearing on what types of electronic brain will control traffic, what new departures in communications should be used, what the standard airport layout should be.

Airport construction is a subject that generates a good deal of controversy when jet-age problems are discussed. At a jet-age symposium in Washington early this year, a high point in plain-talking came when a slim, earnest individual asked for the floor and identified himself as the mayor of Atlanta, William B. Hartsfield.

The audience of aviation specialists was not too startled to catch a mayor in their midst since mayors are notoriously sensitive to the noise problem. But Mr. Hartsfield had other things on his mind: Airports, and who was to pay for them.

The stimulus for Mr. Hartsfield's comments was the impression that had got about that jet airliners would require lengthening of runways at most of the Nation's major airports. The mayor said somewhat heatedly that he wished the manufacturers would consider the capacity of cities to float new bond issues.

"For 15 years," he said, "we have been madly raising funds, lengthening runways, and enlarging airports to keep up with the growth of aviation." He suggested it was time this stopped. It was time aircraft manufacturers designed their products to fit existing runways. Land for airport extension was becoming harder and more expensive to get. And runways at $1 million a thousand feet had to compete with schools and highways for the taxpayer's dollar.

Since Mayor Hartsfield's oration, the manufacturers and some of the airlines have been making a determined effort to allay the concern of municipal authorities. The nub of their argument is that there will have to be very little lengthening of runways.

The misunderstanding—if such it is—stems from the original announcement of the two manufacturers about runway requirements. They said their jets would need, for top-load takeoffs on a standard-temperature (59° F.) day, about 9,000 feet. Current regulations require minimum runway length to be increased by one-half of 1 percent for each degree the mean temperature of the hottest month exceeds 59°. An 80° hottest-month figure would require a 10-percent, or 900-foot, increase.

Runway length must be increased another 7 percent for every 1,000 feet above sea level, and 20 percent more for each degree of uneven grade. It appeared therefore that the average jet runway would have to be at least 10,000 feet. There are only 3 that long in the entire country, and 1 is at Denver, where the 5,000-foot altitude would add several thousand feet to the minimum requirements. The other two are at Boston and St. Louis.

How do the manufacturers nullify the implications of all this figuring? They reason this way:

The public and its municipal spokesmen have been misled by reference to "top-load" takeoffs. There will be few occasions when jets will have to carry capacity fuel loads, since few routes will extend over the planes' maximum range. Certainly domestic trips will not require capacity loads. And cities such as Atlanta will not be running top-range flights to Paris.

SKEPTICAL VIEWS GIVEN

The manufacturers' arguments are somewhat reassuring. But they have far from dispelled the doubts. The skeptics suggest that the performance of the production planes may deviate, on the minus side, from the paper calculations. It is still not certain how much performance will be sacrificed in the use of noise suppressors. And some insiders who remember how aviation has outpaced all predictions have a hunch that top-load takeoffs will be desired more often than the manufacturers think.

Jets flying against prevailing headwinds from Europe to the United States will have heavy fuel requirements, for instance. And who is to say that Atlanta will not wish to schedule flights to Paris in 10 years? Or that a proliferation of polar routes will not increase the number of occasions when top-load takeoffs will be desired?

Airport operators, and the airlines that will use their facilities, have a lot of other things to think about:

Runway strength requirements.

Flush lighting on the center of the runway to facilitate all-weather operations.

High-speed turnoffs to clear a landing plane off the runway as quickly as possible.

Bypass strips to enable jets, which need no engine runups, to taxi past piston planes, which do.

Facilities to process passenger loads habitually exceeding 100 for each jet airliner.

Improved baggage-handling facilities.

Underground fuel tanks topped by hydrants to refuel planes that would use the contents of several conventional fuel trucks.

AIRLINES AWARE OF TASK

A few months ago an airline president, somewhat shaken by the experience of ordering a fleet of jet planes costing $6 million each, is reported to have said in a tone of strained jocularity:

"We are buying airplanes that haven't yet been fully designed, with millions of dollars we don't have, and we're going to operate them off airports that are too small in an air-traffic control that is too slow, and we must fill them with more passengers than we've ever carried before."

At the time, if the element of hyperbole was discounted, there was a lot to what he said. There still is, though some of the gloomier aspects of the assessment have brightened in the interval.

What must be most heartening to the airline president in question is the gathering evidence that aviation leaders of all stripes realize the size of the workload ahead of them.

The first jet operations are almost 3 years off. The industry already is putting in overtime weeks getting ready.

I might, before I go further, mention the work of the Harding committee. The Harding committee was a group appointed a year ago by the Bureau of the Budget to study agencies dealing with the field of aviation in the executive branch of the Government. Last December that committee submitted a report to the Bureau of the Budget and asserted that there were over 75 committees, subcommittees, and special working groups concerned with aviation facilities matters.

The Harding report did not criticize the number of these agencies; it called attention to the difficulty in the proper coordination of their activities.

The Harding committee concluded that aviation would suffer in the future unless steps were taken promptly to study existing agencies in the executive branch of the Government having responsibilities in the field of aviation.

It concluded also that some top level study and master plan was required to provide a basis upon which "to build a comprehensive legislative and fiscal program for aviation facilities development."

The Harding report recommended that the study be conducted by an individual of national reputation to work with existing departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government backed by Presidential authority. As a result of this recommendation, Mr. Edward T. Curtis of the Eastman Kodak Co. has been appointed special Presidential Assistant on Aviation Facilities Matters.

Mr. Speaker, I concur in the Harding report conclusion that a study of executive agencies and their proper relationship with each other is urgently needed. Where I disagree with the Harding report is that this study should be made by a single individual and completely within the confines of the executive branch of the Government.

Under that program the executive agencies will debate and compromise among themselves and eventually some kind of proposition will probably be submitted to the Congress. It is my belief that a problem of this magnitude deserves the attention of the Congress, that the Congress should participate in the study and in the formulation of the policies which would flow from the study.

Equally important in my view are the interests of the various segments of our national economy in the aviation field. I speak of trade associations for scheduled airlines, like the American Transport Association, trade associations for private flying, manufacturers of aircraft and aircraft equipment, and the owners of public airports, the cities, States, and the general public.

Mr. Speaker, the only way in which all elements of our economy, not only the executive branch of the Government and the Congress but private business and the general public, can jointly participate in this study so urgently needed is through the formation of a commission such as I have suggested.

Mr. Speaker, through my interest in the controversy between the two airports in the Detroit area and because of my experience in being submitted to what I regard as an example of bureaucratic tyranny in the handling of decisions in this field by an executive agency, I have made quite a study of the activities of the Air Coordinating Committee.

That Committee was created by Executive Order 9781 signed by President Truman on September 19, 1946.

The text of that Executive order is as follows:

A. Executive Order 9781 establishing the Air Coordinating Committee:

By virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States, and in order to provide for the fullest development

and coordination of the aviation policies and activities of the Federal agencies, and in the interest of the internal management of the Government, it is hereby ordered as follows:

1. (a) There is hereby established the Air Coordinating Committee (hereinafter referred to as the Committee) which shall have as members one representative from each of the following-named agencies (hereinafter referred to as the participating agencies): the State, War, Post Office, Navy, and Commerce Departments and the Civil Aeronautics Board. The members shall be designated by the respective heads of the participating agencies. The President shall name one of the members as the Chairman of the Committee. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall designate a representative of the Bureau as a nonvoting member of the Committee. (For amendment of this paragraph, see appendix E, p. 21.)

(b) Each officer or body authorized under subparagraph 1 (a) hereof to designate a member of the Committee shall also designate one or more alternate members as may be necessary.

(c) The Committee shall establish procedures to provide for participation in voting, by a representative of any agency not named in subparagraph 1 (a) hereof in connection with such aviation matters as are of substantial interest to that agency.

2. The Committee shall examine aviation problems and developments affecting more than one participating agency; develop and recommend integrated policies to be carried out and actions to be taken by the participating agencies or by any other Government agency charged with responsibility in the aviation field; and, to the extent permitted by law; coordinate the aviation activities of such agencies except activities relating to the exercise of quasi-judicial functions.

3. The Committee shall consult with Federal interagency boards and committees concerned in any manner with aviation activities; and consult with the representatives of the United States to the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or to the permanent successor thereof and recommend to the Department of State general policy directives and instructions for the guidance of the said representatives.

4. The Committee, after obtaining the views of the head of each agency concerned, shall submit to the President, together with the said views, (a) such of the Committee's recommendations on aviation policies as require the attention of the President by reason of their character or importance, (b) those important aviation questions the disposition of which is prevented by the inability of the agencies concerned to agree, (c) an annual report of the Committee's activities during each calendar year, to be submitted not later than January 31 of the next succeeding year, and (d) such interim reports as may be necessary or desirable.

5. The heads of the participating agencies shall cause their respective agencies to use the facilities of the Committee in all appropriate circumstances and, consonant with law, to provide the Committee with such personnel assistance as may be necessary.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 19, 1946.*

The order has been amended from time to time, mainly to add members from additional executive agencies. The most recent amendment is Executive Order 10655, dated January 28, 1956.

The Air Coordinating Committee's decisions, when unanimous, bind the entire executive branch of the Government.

See what that means? Here is an agency not recognized by the Congress, not created by statute, delegated no legislative or administrative authority by the Congress, but created solely by Presidential order, yet, when it makes a decision it binds all of the agencies to whom Congress has delegated authority.

Let me illustrate how that operates. We have the Federal Airport Aid Act. In that act we delegated to the Secretary of Commerce the right to help create a proper airport pattern in the United States, subject to certain definite criteria which are set forth in the statute. But the airport use panel of the Air Coordinating Committee held hearings last June, almost a year ago, in the city of Detroit and came out with a conclusion that Detroit Wayne-Major Airport should be a commercial terminal and that military operations should be concentrated at Willow Run.

You ask, What does that have to do with airport aid? It has this to do with it: Willow Run Airport asked the Civil Aeronautics Administration for a modest $86,500 for certain improvements on that airport out of the current fiscal year's allotment. The management of the rival airport at Detroit Wayne Major asked for $1,300,000. In addition their representatives came to Washington, saw the officials of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and said: Do not give 1 penny to the Willow Run Airport because the airport use panel has made a decision that it should be developed not as a commercial airport but as a military airport, therefore it should have no airport aid funds.

The result was that Willow Run did not get any money while Wayne Major, on the other hand, got almost all it asked for. There you see the Air Coordinating Committee, with no authority from Congress, has usurped the power of the Department of Commerce where Congress specifically vested the authority under definite standards to decide upon the allocation of airport aid funds.

There are levels upon levels of executive agencies conflicting with each other in the field of aviation, and unless we do something about it we are going to find that technology has advanced, and Government has fallen behind. It may take some spectacular catastrophe, like a midair collision, to arouse the American people and the Congress to the fact that there must be a reorganization and a realinement of our agencies making decisions in the field of aviation, so that we may have prompt and intelligent resolution of aviation problems and rapid progress in aviation.

Mr. Speaker, the Air Coordinating Committee, without any statutory recognition, as I have said, has in practice been dominated by the military. On the airport-use panel which considered the problem in the Detroit area there were four representatives of the military and two civilians; a representative from the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Department of Defense, being four, and only two civilian representatives from the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Civil Aeronautics Board, for a six-member panel.

Mr. Speaker, no one wants to deny the military all they need for the proper defense of this country, but under our basic principle of civilian control the military should not be the final arbiters on decisions where there is a conflict between civilian and military needs.

It is my judgment that the Air Coordinating Committee, being dominated as it is by the military, has neglected to give proper attention to the future of civil aviation. In the long run, our defense rests upon the health of our national economy equally as much as upon our excellence in Military Establishments and the weapons of war.

I hope that the Committee on Government Operations will take prompt action on this legislation and that it will receive the enthusiastic support of the leadership of the House on both sides of the aisle, and that before this Congress adjourns this step in the direction of promoting the interests of aviation can be taken. If no action is taken in this session of the Congress, a year will have been lost in commencing this all-important study, or we will have abandoned the study to the executive branch of the Government where policies will be worked out without congressional participation.

DISTRICT TRANSPORTATION LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, since H. R. 8901, the District of Columbia transit bill, may be called up before the end of this week, I want to take this opportunity of making a few points as clear as I can as to it, as to the substitute recommended by the majority of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and as to H. R. 10871. I do so because of the numerous inquiries I have received with reference to these three legislative proposals.

Under the parliamentary situation, I cannot offer H. R. 10871, the interim transit bill, as a substitute for H. R. 8901 unless the committee substitute is rejected. Therefore, it is entirely possible that the important and significant vote will come on the acceptance or rejection of the committee substitute. And it may be the only vote.

I have been asked repeatedly whether I am in favor of public ownership. I have stated, and I repeat for emphasis, "No, unless it becomes absolutely necessary." I have been asked also whether it would not be possible to offer amendments to the committee substitute which, if accepted, would permit Members of the House to support an amended version of the committee substitute without making it necessary for the House to return to the Capital Transit Co. the charter and franchise which Congress repealed last August through Public Law 389. I devoted many hours in an effort

to prepare such proposed amendments, but I came to the considered conclusion that any attempt to offer such amendments, even if successful, would be confusing, impractical, and futile. Therefore, I filed H. R. 10871 as the only practical alternative I could present for the committee substitute. I offered it and I shall offer it if it is possible to do so here on the floor, because I will not reverse my vote to revoke the charter and franchise of the Capital Transit Co., which vote I believe was amply justified upon all of the evidence we have had or now have.

In this connection, when President Eisenhower signed Public Law 389 on August 14, 1955, he stated in part:

. . . both the Congress and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia have concluded that the Capital Transit Co., beginning several years ago and continuing up to the present time, has failed to measure up to its responsibilities in the District.

In connection with our action on Public Law 389, I have been asked whether I have available any tabulation of the earnings and dividends paid by the company, which was in August of last year a matter of serious concern to Members of this House. I have been given a table which I now include under permission granted to me, as follows:

	Net earnings reported to PUC	Dividends paid	Dividends per share ($100 par basis)
1940	$872,082	$240,000	$1.00
1941	1,299,969	300,000	1.25
1942	1,717,188	420,000	1.75
1943	1,508,844	480,000	2.00
1944	1,534,920	480,000	2.00
1945	1,317,958	480,000	2.00
1946	965,854	480,000	2.00
1947	(93,416)	480,000	2.00
1948	396,315	120,000	.50
1949	325,816	480,000	2.00
1950	878,274	720,000	3.00
1951	1,413,250	960,000	4.00
1952	1,046,389	3,744,000	15.60
1953	897,461	1,536,000	6.40
1954	754,898	[1] 1,670,330	4.80 plus 2.16
1955	[2] 1,215,353	576,000	2.40

[1] $1,152,000 cash dividend and $518,330 in stock of Continental Enterprises.
[2] $524,518 net income offset by a $1,739,871 streetcar writeoff.

As I noted in my minority views to accompany H. R. 8901, Louis E. Wolfson and his associates obtained control of the Capital Transit Co. in 1949.

A number of my colleagues have asked me if Members would not be required to vote either to return the charter and franchise to the Capital Transit Co., basically upon its own terms, or for public ownership, in terms of a Washington Metropolitan Transit Authority. The answer to that question is clear beyond any possible dispute. H. R. 10871 specifically authorizes the Interim—and I underline the word "Interim"—Authority to sell the properties it would take under H. R. 10871 to such competent private operators as it could locate prior to August 15, 1959. This means that the proper government authorities of the District would be charged with the responsibility of continuing their efforts, which have been unsuccessful to this time, to search for and sell to any competent private operator who would then own and manage the transit system of the District. Personally I still hope and believe that will be possible in a city where passenger volume is reasonably constant and where a reasonable profit could be expected at fair rates. I cite title III, section 304. Section 304 of that title "terminates the existence of the Authority upon the sale of its property," except to take all necessary action to "close out its affairs as expeditiously as possible."

It is very important to note also that section 305 of that title requires the Board of Directors of the Interim Authority, consisting of the District Commissioners, to report to Congress within 15 days of June 15, 1958, the steps taken to effectuate such a sale and the reasons for failure to make such a sale, if none is made by June 15, 1958. Obviously, upon the receipt of any such report Congress then would have full and complete authority to pass any legislation it feels is necessary and proper under the facts reported to it by the Interim Authority. Only if Congress did not act upon such report would the permanent Authority come into being. In that event the only loss to the people of the District of Columbia would be the very doubtful advantage of having had the Wolfson group operate its transit system for another 3 years upon terms far better, from the point of view of that group, than they had when they brought on the cancellation of their charter and franchise by their own conduct. And the best interests of the people of the District of Columbia is our responsibility, whether we welcome or dislike this role of a city council.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MEADER, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. HESELTON, for 15 minutes, today and tomorrow.

Mr. HOLLAND, for 1 hour on Monday, May 14.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. RODINO and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WICKERSHAM in three instances.

Mr. MCCORMACK.

Mr. COLMER.

Mr. ABBITT (at the request of Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey) and to include extraneous matter and to revise and extend his remarks.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1835. An act for the relief of the Board of Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kans.;

H. R. 1989. An act for the relief of George D. Hopper;

H. R. 2338. An act for the relief of Charles F. Bullette;

H. R. 2717. An act for the relief of Giles P. Fredell and wife;

H. R. 2736. An act for the relief of Roy M. Butcher;

H. R. 2924. An act for the relief of David J. Dasé;

H. R. 3638. An act for the relief of Joseph H. Washburn;

H. R. 3639. An act for the relief of Ralph Bennett and certain other employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

H. R. 3725. An act for the relief of Herman F. Gierke, Jr.;

H. R. 3975. An act for the relief of the Reverend Boniface Lucci, O. S. B.;

H. R. 4902. An act for the relief of Martin F. Kendrigan;

H. R. 5787. An act to authorize settlement of claims for residential structures heretofore erected at the expense of patients on the grounds of the Public Health Service hospital, Carville, La.;

H. R. 6452. An act for the relief of William H. Foley;

H. R. 7583. An act for the relief of Mary Viola Jones;

H. R. 7993. An act to authorize the construction and conversion of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9132. An act to provide for the approval of the report of the Secretary of the Interior on the Ainsworth unit of the Missouri River Basin project.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 419. An act for the relief of Eli E. Hood;

S. 637. An act to provide for the conveyance of Camp Livingston, Beauregard, and Esler Field, Louisiana, to the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes;

S. 885. An act for the relief of Alice Elizabeth Marjoribanks.

S. 2267. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the city of Henderson, Nev.; and

S. 2851. An act to transfer certain lands from the Veterans' Administration to the Department of the Interior for the benefit of the Yavapai Indians of Arizona.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 10, 1956, at 11 o'clock a. m.

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. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9810. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land of the United States to the State of Indiana;

with amendment (Rept. No. 2123). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8110. A bill to incorporate the National Music Council; without amendment (Rept. No. 2141). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9956. A bill to amend subdivision (e) of section 58, Notices of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 10417. A bill to amend the Federal Register Act, as amended, so as to provide for the effectiveness and notice to the public of proclamations, orders, regulations, and other documents in a period following an attack or threatened attack upon the continental United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2143). 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. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 488. Resolution referring the bill H. R. 10826 to the United States Court of Claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 2124). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 490. Resolution providing that the bill, H. R. 6365, and all accompanying papers shall be referred to the United States Court of Claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 2125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4456. A bill for the relief of Cpl. Oscar H. Mash, Jr.; with amendment (Rept No. 2126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6029. A bill for the relief of Robert D. Grier (individually and as executor of the estate of Katie C. Grier) and Jane Grier Hawthorne; without amendment (Rept. No. 2127). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8008. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Warren D. Cooper and her son, Teddy Devere Cooper; with amendment (Rept. No. 2128). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8643. A bill for the relief of the Knox Corp., of Thomson, Ga.; without amendment (Rept No. 2129) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9371. A bill for the relief of John R. Henry; without amendment (Rept. No. 2130). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4031. A bill to consider residence in American Samoa or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands by certain employees of the governments thereof, and their dependents, as residence in the United States for naturalization purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2131). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4137. A bill for the relief of Mitsuko A. Hachita; without amendment (Rept. No. 2132). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5808. A bill for the relief of Judith Kao; without amendment (Rept. No. 2133). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6742. A bill for the relief of Rumiko Fujiki Kirkpatrick; without amendment (Rept. No. 2134). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 456. Joint resolution for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens; with amendment (Rept. No. 2135). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1026. An act for the relief of Nihat Cengiz; with amendment (Rept. No. 2136). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1244. An act for the relief of Eva Gershbein Rubinstein; with amendment (Rept. No. 2137). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2327. An act for the relief of Takako Iba; without amendment (Rept. No. 2138). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 76. Concurrent resolution amending Senate Concurrent Resolution 67, favoring the suspension of deportation in the cases of certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 2139). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 611. Joint resolution for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens; with amendment (Rept. No. 2140). 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. BOGGS:

H. R. 11106. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs and marihuana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 11107. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs and marihuana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 11108. A bill to protect the public health by regulating the manufacture, compounding, processing, distribution, and possession of habit forming barbiturate and amphetamine drugs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 11109. A bill to protect the public health by regulating the manufacture, compounding, processing, distribution, and possession of habit forming barbiturate and amphetamine drugs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 11110. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOLT:

H. R. 11111. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. R. 11112. A bill to extend for an additional 6 years the authority to make, guarantee, and insure loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COON:

H. R. 11113. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to clarify employer liability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 11114. A bill to provide for the control of destructive aphids; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 11115. A bill to extend for an additional 6 years the authority to make, guarantee, and insure loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 11116. A bill to provide additional compensation for employees of the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. R. 11117. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 11118. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the Camp Sherman Rifle Range to the State of Ohio, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 11119. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to clarify employer liability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 11120. A bill to amend the act of May 21, 1930, with respect to certain oil and gas deposits underlying railroad or other rights-of-way; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BELL:

H. R. 11121. A bill to extend for an additional 6 years the authority to make, guarantee, and insure loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BONNER (by request):

H. R. 11122. A bill to promote the development and rehabilitation of the coastwise trade, to encourage the construction of new vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 11123. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain additional property to be included within the Independence National Historical Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 11124. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois (by request):

H. R. 11125. A bill to validate certain payments made to members and former members of the naval service; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 11126. A bill to adjust the application of section 322 of the so-called Economy Act of 1932 to premises leased for Government purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 11127. A bill to clarify the law relating to the grant of certain public lands to the States for school purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 11128. A bill to provide that a commemorative stamp shall be issued depicting the home of Abraham Lincoln at Springfield, Ill.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 11129. A bill 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, as amended, and the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 11130. A bill to extend for an additional 6 years the authority to make, guarantee, and insure loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 11131. A bill to amend the act of June 22, 1936, relative to flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 11132. A bill to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 11133. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing the Lehman Caves-Mount Wheeler area of Nevada as a national park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 11134. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Columbia Basin Project Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing Congress to enact legislation to waive certain charges against an employer relative to unemployment insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 11135. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kenna Moore (nee McCarthy); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H. R. 11136. A bill for the relief of Esther Danon Wright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYWORTH:

H. R. 11137. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Zakiat Barhoum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 11138. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Cuban-American Sugar Co. against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H. R. 11139. A bill for the relief of Homer Cazamias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 11140. A bill for the relief of James Edward Bundgaard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 11141. A bill for the relief of Mary G. Nechaeff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. J. Res. 620. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 621. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1010. By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Petition on fluoridation of public water; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1011. By Mr. JENKINS: Petition of 153 veterans of Athens County, Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1012. Also, petition of 45 veterans of Athens County, Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1013. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of Mrs. Vera E. Sutherland and 14 others to bring H. R. 4627, a bill to limit the advertising of alcoholic beverages, out of committee and onto the floor for open debate; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Statement in Support of Proposed Appropriations for the Soil Conservation Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me in support of proposed appropriations for the Soil Conservation Service before the Senate Appropriations Committee:

The duties and responsibilities of the Soil Conservation Service are among the most essential of all Federal Government activities. In developing and carrying out a national soil and water conservation program through soil conservation districts, it is contributing immeasurably to the welfare of our great farm population and to the Nation.

A mere listing of its activities is sufficient to bring home this fact. Its watershed protection and flood-prevention projects and river-basin investigations are of inestimable benefit to all of the Nation. Reduction of flood damage in 11 major watersheds is one activity which is difficult to measure in monetary value but almost beyond calculation in actual value to those who will thus be protected from loss of property and even loss of life.

Soil, water, and range resources of our country are the foundation blocks of the structure of the national economy. It is the Soil Conservation Service which coordinates, develops, broadcasts information, and carries out many of the most effective measures for the protection of the sources of our food and much of our clothing. How well the resources of soil and water are protected and conserved and even improved will have a direct effect on our standard of living throughout the Nation far into the future.

In the short span of its history the Soil Conservation Service has rendered services of great value to us all. It would be difficult to envisage a farm economy without the vital services which it performs. In the past year, throughout the 2,700 soil conservation districts, over 1,200,000 individual farmers and ranchers were assisted in some measure. Over 4½ million farms totaling over 1½ billion acres are now organized into soil conservation districts. These districts serve as centers for sharing information with all of their members.

Ask almost any farmer and he will tell you that he has benefited mightily from the services offered by the Soil Conservation Service. He may have had his entire farm surveyed and a plan for its most efficient utilization prepared. Such a survey would make use of the most effective conservation measures as well as means of improving the quality of the land and crops. The farmer may have been aided in application of such complex measures as drainage and water-disposal systems, farm ponds (a sight now familiar to even the city dweller), diversions, waterways, contouring, stripping, and many others. He is also constantly advised in maintaining such measures of soil and water conservation after it has been applied to the land.

A broader activity of the Service is the upstream watershed protection and flood-prevention program carried out as an integral part of the total soil and water conservation job. The Service works with local organizations that sponsor watershed projects as well as individual landowners and operators in watershed project areas. It aids in preparation of a plan for the entire watershed and helps the local interests to carry out measures found to be most effective.

We have only to remember reading in the daily press, hearing on radio and TV the constantly recurring accounts of floods throughout our Nation to realize the vital need for flood-prevention measures.

The needs of our rapidly increasing population for food and raiment must be met. All we have whereby they can be met are our soil and water resources. They must be protected in every way possible. The Soil Conservation Service is rendering a vital and valuable service in so doing. It is essential that the work be continued and even expanded in the future.

Economically the farmer is now going through a period of straightened circumstances. He must be helped a little now, and he certainly deserves it. We, as a nation, owe much to our farmers in the past, now, and increasingly will in the future. So I beg of you do not stint in providing funds for one of the most valuable and essential needs of the farmer, the Soil Conservation Service.

Mr. Chairman, I especially urge you to follow the recommendations of Nolan Fuqua, of Duncan, Okla.; L. L. Males, Cheyenne, Okla.; Harral Allen, Ada, Okla., and president of the Oklahoma Association of Soil Conservation Districts, for $5 million for upstream measures on the Washita and other similar projects.

The project on the Sand Stone Creek typifies the great value of such projects and is a monument to such men as Mr. Frank Dunaway, of Jones, Okla., Dick Longmire of Pauls Valley, and Dave Vandever of Chickasha, who work without compensation, and many other civic minded citizens who realize that there is an average of only 3 inches of top soil remaining in this world and if it is not conserved, 200 years hence there will be no top soil left.

I wish to commend and compliment the especially good work done by men like Mr. Ray Walker, in charge of Soil Conservation Service in Oklahoma, his assistant, Harry Chambers, Earl Wade, and Ed McVicker of Chickasha, and many others who are serving beyond duty.

This $5 million is for the Washita Valley Flood Control project which is 1 of 11 pilot watersheds established in 1946 by an act of Congress. I had the privilege of assisting in writing this legislation.

There are 64 substation sheds in the Washita Valley. Six or eight are completed, or nearly so. Forty percent of the Washita project is planned and 15 percent is completed.

Another $5 million is needed now, and $5 million per year for 7 years, making a total of $35 million.

There are many other projects needed in the soil conservation district—one near Waurika where we have had devastating floods recently.

The Federal Civil Defense Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, last October, I attended in Boston the national conference of the United States Civil Defense Council, which is composed of city and county civil defense officials. At that time, I became impressed with the difficult job faced by some 400 State and local civil defense directors at the conference and by the overall responsibility of the Federal Civil Defense Administration.

In order to help civil defense, and particularly its education and training program, which is of interest to all Americans, I introduced H. R. 10432, which will help develop national civil defense training schools. The following facts are of interest by way of background:

The Federal Civil Defense Administration expects to offer a graduate course during the coming months for civil defense command and staff personnel. Completion of this course will prepare a graduate to function effectively in an operational capacity during a civil defense emergency, natural or manmade. The course will be about 3 months in length.

Experience with the 1-week courses which have been conducted since 1951, have shown that many civil defense officials at the State and local levels who should attend such courses are not able to do so because of their budgetary limitations. Passage of this bill will enable more State and local officials to attend, thus assuring a greater uniformity in organization and training in civil defense throughout the Nation. If this bill is not enacted, most civil defense officials who so badly need this training will be unable to attend and the civil defense effort will be seriously handicapped.

The bill recommends payment of travel expenses and per diem allowances in accordance with Government travel regulations. Enactment of the bill would result in no additional increase in the Federal Civil Defense Administration's budget as the cost of the program would be absorbed in FCDA's 1957 appropriation.

Annual Pilgrimage to Old Stone Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, 350 years ago this year, a little band of pioneers set sail from Blackwell, England, in three small sailing ships, the *Susan Constant*, the *Godspeed*, and the *Discovery*. These are the people who, after a harrowing, 5-month-long journey, landed in what was later known as Jamestown in the sovereign State of Virgina—my State.

Across the river there was later established the little town of Smithfield, a pioneer in another notable way, in the production of unique food products which have become famous the wideworld over.

And this month, the month of May, is the time of the annual pilgrimage to Smithfield for the benefit of the Old Stone Church in Smithfield, St. Luke's Church, the oldest known church still in existence. This old church was first built in 1632, a year before the first record of the settlement as a port for tobacco export, 120 years before the formal establishment of Smithfield as a town in 1752.

An important part of this annual pilgrimage in honor of olden times, is the serving of famous, unique Smithfield ham sandwiches. No other spot in the country can produce Smithfield hams. They have been shipped overseas for about 200 years. There is, on record, an invoice for the year 1779 for hams shipped to the West Indies. And one for the 19th century for ham shipped to Her Majesty, Queen Victoria.

But, gentlemen, there is another unique food product which originated in this colonial settlement, that is the now-popular barbecue. Yes, gentlemen, though other parts of this great country claim the barbecue, the Encyclopedia Americana will tell you that the word was in use in Virginia prior to 1700. It further states that the institution of the barbecue is of southern origin. And in a cookbook from Colonial Virginia, printed in 1742, there is a recipe marked "old recipe from Toano, Va.," for "barbecued squirrel."

Now, when we are marking with due respect the establishment of the colony at Jamestown, the building of a church at Smithfield, the development of the famous Smithfield ham, I believe that we should, at the same time, honor the pioneers who first prepared meat in a savory sauce by open-kettle simmering, even as it is still done today in Smithfield, Va. For the barbecue, one of this age's most delicious heritages, is but one more of the wonderful gifts handed down to us by those valiant pioneers of two centuries and more ago.

One Hundredth Anniversary of the Order of the Sisters of Providence in the Pacific Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement I have prepared relative to the 100th anniversary of the Order of the Sisters of Providence in the Pacific Northwest.

Not only has this order of sisters pioneered in religious and charitable work, but it has been outstanding in the field of hospital work in the Pacific Northwest.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

I should like to call to the attention of the Senate a centennial observance in the State of Washington which has more than sectional interest. I refer to the 100th anniversary of the Sisters of Providence Order in the Pacific Northwest and the work carried on, first by a handful, and then by an ever-growing militant army of dedicated Christians intent upon alleviating ignorance and suffering in the northwest corner of our Nation.

Eighteen hundred and fifty-six was the year when five Sisters of Charity of Providence arrived at Fort Vancouver. They had traveled by riverboats, overland wagons, and packtrains before arriving at Fort Vancouver, Wash. At that time, Vancouver was a fur trading post of the Hudson's Bay Co. The northwest will never forget the leader of that group, Mother Mary Joseph. The daughter of a Montreal carriage maker, she was familiar with woodworking tools, a gifted wood carver, and an architectural designer, in addition to being a practical builder. Upon arrival at Fort Vancouver, she transformed a shack into a residence and schoolrooms.

We still point to that school as being the first permanent school to be established in the State of Washington. Today we know it as Providence Academy.

Mother Mary Joseph then converted a log cabin into St. Joseph's Hospital. This was the first permanent hospital in the Pacific Northwest. It is still in operation and last year had 3,368 patients.

Both the school and the hospital had been established by 1858.

Early in the 1860's the Sisters of Providence had set up schools at Walla Walla, Steilacoom, Cowlitz, and Colville. These schools educated the territories' youngsters before public schools were established.

Seattle began to feel that beneficent hand of the Providence nuns in 1877. Pioneer doctors and city fathers of that day had called for establishment of a farm to care for the poor and aged. This was set up at Georgetown. Only a year elapsed before the first Providence hospital was built and placed in operation at Fifth and Madison Streets in downtown Seattle. Now, Providence Hospital is located at 17th and East Jefferson Streets and cares for more than 16,000 patients per year.

In addition, the Northwest now boasts the 600 bed Sacred Heart Hospital in Spokane which annually cares for more than 22,000 patients and St. Elizabeth's in Yakima which cares for more than 8,000 patients.

The motivation of the order and the motto probably accounts greatly for the success with which the order accomplished from its very beginning. Its motto is: "The Charity of Christ impels us."

The founding of the order took place in Montreal when a wealthy widow established an Institute of Servants of the Poor.

The Order of the Sisters of Charity of Providence has left a permanent mark upon the entire North American continent by establishing hospitals, schools, and homes for the aged along the Pacific coast from Anchorage and Fairbanks, Alaska, to Burbank, Calif., and from Seattle to Montreal.

The hospitals of the order are internationally known for representing the highest standards of medical science.

Never in the order's life has the original intent been forgotten. In addition to caring adequately for the sick and needy, they have maintained clinical and outpatient services for the needy and have kept their hospital kitchen doors open to the hungry.

It is fitting that there will be a series of observances starting April 8, and concluding June 15, throughout the Pacific Northwest. One of the highlights of the celebration will be a solemn pontifical mass on May 8, at St. James Church, Vancouver, with His Excellency the Most Reverend Thomas A. Connolly, archbishop of Seattle, as the celebrant. His Excellency the Most Reverend Edward D. Howard, archbishop of Portland, will preach the sermon.

Then, a solemn pontifical mass of thanksgiving will mark the formal ceremonies June 14 in Mount St. Vincent Chapel, Seattle.

Archbishop Connolly will be the celebrant, and the Most Reverend Joseph P. Dougherty, bishop of Yakima, will preach the sermon.

The applied Christianity of this order has known no racial, religious, or monetary bounds.

Widespread public gratitude knows no bounds in this centennial observance.

The Meaning of UNICO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in these times of industrial expansion, increase of scientific interest, and proposed voyages into the stratosphere, we are prone to lose sight of the down-to-earth activities daily carried on by the many benevolent service groups, whose volunteers aid worthy local and national projects ranging from family aid to the endowment of cultural interests.

In 1922 Dr. Anthony Vastola, an American of Italian heritage, gathered together 14 fellow citizens from Waterbury, Conn., and formed what is known today as UNICO National. This organization whose membership is now over 2,500 includes men of business and professional interests in some 50 cities throughout the United States, has had the singular honor of establishing 6 new chapters during the past 5 weeks. The name UNICO, based on the Italian word meaning unique, derives its form from the first letters of unity, neighborliness, integrity, charity, and opportunity. These five meaningful abstractions are the core of the Unican's creed which each member learns and aims to exemplify.

Over 1,000 students have studied or are now studying on UNICO scholarships. The Don Gentile scholarship fund alone has contributed over $25,000 to the assistance of worthy students. UNICO National is currently engaged in a program to raise money for the costly medical care of an Italian youngster stricken with a rare malady. UNICO is also raising money to provide a room in the International College of Surgeons. Of international interest UNICO is currently engaged in its most extensive financial participation. I am referring to UNICO's effort to raise generous donations for the erection of the Pius XII Library on the campus of St. Louis University. There in mid-America will be erected a great center of research which will house the treasured microfilm collection of the entire manuscript section of the Vatican Library in Rome. The completely functional building, the last word in modern library science, will include the name of UNICO among its founders.

While the national fund-raising campaigns are in full force, the many local philanthropies of the UNICO chapters are still continued. Add to these hundreds of local projects, the half-million dollars raised for Italian relief and the generous thousands given to Boys Town of Italy, and we realize how completely philanthropic this society of Americans of Italian extraction has been.

In order to invite the deserved attention of what this growing organization is doing, I respectfully request that this tribute be recorded in the RECORD of this date.

The current president, under whose dynamic leadership the expansion program has made such rapid strides, is Alphonse A. Miele, businessman. President Miele himself represents the ideal Unican and has cast his ideals into action since he was elected to office, August 1955.

Requests for UNICO chapters have come from dozens of cities in all sections of the country. So inspiring has been the story of UNICO National that sincere tributes have been offered by civic leaders and church dignitaries in each city which is privileged to have a UNICO chapter.

National School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me in support of the national school-lunch program before the Senate Appropriations Committee:

STATEMENT OF VICTOR WICKERSHAM IN SUPPORT OF THE NATIONAL SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM BEFORE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

From a small beginning, the school-lunch program has expanded rapidly until today approximately 10.5 million school children in the United States are participating in the program. In Oklahoma about 170,870 children were participating as of December 1955.

The National School Lunch Act, which became effective June 4, 1946, placed the school-lunch program on a permanent basis. It states that the purpose of the program is to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children by encouraging them to eat more nutritious food. In signing the bill, on June 4, 1946, President Truman commented: "In the long view, no nation is any healthier than its children or more prosperous than its farmers; and in the National School Lunch Act, the Congress has contributed immeasurably both to the welfare of our farmers and the health of our children."

Congressional discussions of the school-lunch program have generally credited it with a two-fold purpose—the use of surplus agricultural commodities, and the improvement of the health and nutrition of school children. In its early stages, the program seems to have been chiefly inspired by the surplus of agricultural commodities. School lunches were one method adopted for distributing these surpluses. But as the program has developed, the two purposes have received equal emphasis; and, particularly in educational and health circles, the greater emphasis has tended to be upon the health and nutritional benefits.

To assist the States in carrying on a school-lunch program, Federal funds are allocated on the basis of an equalization formula which takes into account the per capita income of each State and the school population. For the years 1947 to 1950, inclusive, the States were required to match each dollar of Federal funds by $1 from sources within the State. For the years 1951 to 1955, payments were based upon the condition that for each dollar of Federal funds, the State's matching requirement would be $1.50. For any fiscal year after 1955, each Federal dollar must be matched by $3 from sources within the States. However, in the case of any State whose per capita income is less than the per capita income of the United States, the matching required for any fiscal year shall be decreased by the percentage which the State per capita income is below the per capita income of the United States.

The Federal Government appropriation for the national school-lunch program for fiscal year 1955 was $83,236,197. In addition to the cash appropriation, the Federal Government donated about $70 million worth of surplus commodities to the States to be used in the program. Of the cash appropriation for fiscal year 1955 Oklahoma received about $1,228,129, and in addition to that amount

received about $3.7 million worth of surplus commodities.

The cooperation of States and the local communities in the administration of this program and financial contributions in making the national school-lunch program a success is most commendable. It proves to us again that the Federal Government assistance in this program, which provides some incentive for carrying on the program, is highly justifiable. We must, however, keep the program up to date. As participation increases contributions must be increased to maintain comparable nutritional standards from year to year.

The necessity for better nutrition was demonstrated to us during World War II. The national school-lunch program is an important means of spreading knowledge of better nutrition among all people throughout the country. While results of this aspect of the program cannot be measured in quantitative terms, it may well be that future generations will look upon this basic step toward better nutrition for our children as the most important single achievement of the program.

U. S. Department of Agriculture—Agricultural Marketing Service

SELECTED STATISTICS ON NATIONAL SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM IN OKLAHOMA, FISCAL YEARS 1947–55 AND PRELIMINARY 1956

	Fiscal years									
	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956 (preliminary)
Number of schools participating	1,561	1,447	1,393	1,546	1,590	1,669	1,653	1,696	1,771	1,763
Number of children participating	117,634	107,240	115,561	129,763	139,515	145,578	145,873	154,975	163,382	168,865
Federal cash apportionment	[1] $1,400,252	$1,216,167	$1,452,971	$1,523,239	$1,508,514	$1,313,928	$1,320,151	$1,318,060	$1,228,129	$1,181,309
Value of sec. 6 commodities [2]	$123,354	$315,442	$360,736	$364,210	$419,775	$342,654	$343,459	$275,499	$240,633	[3] $149,300
Value of surplus commodities [4]	$61,714	$397,682	$632,295	$839,972	$775,815	$475,394	$1,106,714	$1,818,138	$3,700,471	[3] $843,000
Number of meals served in program	16,249,000	16,706,000	18,538,000	21,183,000	22,868,000	23,177,000	23,690,000	25,482,000	26,864,000	[3] 12,439,000
Value of foods purchased locally by schools	$2,228,350	$2,578,494	$2,691,054	$3,023,175	$3,449,072	$3,793,063	$3,812,323	$3,854,572	$4,287,895	[3] $2,230,283

[1] Does not include $210,443 apportioned for equipment.
[2] Acquired under sec. 6 of the National School Lunch Act.
[3] July–December 1955.
[4] Acquired under price support and surplus removal programs.

Another Mississippian Honored—Mississippi 4-H Girl Represents United States Youth at International Teen-Age Conclave in Paris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I seriously doubt that among all of the 48 States of the Union there is another State that compares favorably with my native State of Mississippi in its contribution to leadership in the various segments of the society and economy and the Nation. Surely, there is no other State in our glorious union of States which furnishes more national leaders on a per capita basis. From time to time I have called the attention of this body to instance after instance where an outstanding Mississippian has been chosen in national competition over other Americans. For instance, there was Sgt. Jake Lindsey, of Lucedale, Miss., who, during the last months of the recent World War, was selected as the outstanding hero to receive the 100th Congressional Medal of Honor for valiant service rendered on the battlefield of France. Sergeant Lindsey enjoys the unique distinction of being the only recipient of that highly coveted honor to receive the Congressional Medal of Honor at the hands of the President of the United States in a joint session of the Congress.

Some 2 years ago when Boys Nation and Girls Nation held their national convention here in the Capital City of Washington, an outstanding Mississippi youth, Eddie Perry, of Bay St. Louis, Miss., was selected as president of Boys Nation, and, believe it or not, at the same time Miss Jerolyn Ross, of Meridian, Miss., was chosen as president of Girls Nation. This was indeed an unusual situation of an outstanding boy and an outstanding girl being selected to head up these two splendid youth organizations both from one State, the great State of Mississippi. I doubt, Mr. Speaker, if a parallel situation has ever existed or for that matter ever will again.

Only last week the Honorable A. Boyd Campbell, of Jackson, Miss., an old schoolmate of mine, retired as president of the United States Chamber of Commerce after an outstanding year's leadership of that great organization.

Other instances of Mississippi's contribution to the leadership of the Nation could be mentioned. But, Mr. Speaker, my purpose this morning is to call the attention of the House to another star that has been added to the galaxy of the crown of Mississippians' achievements.

Mr. Speaker, Miss Marilyn Graves, 19 year-old 4–H girl of Jones County, Mississippi, has just returned from Paris where she represented United States youth at an international teen-age conclave.

The Mississippi girl was one of 40 young women—20 from France and 20 from other countries around the world—who took part in a two weeks' conference to discover how teen-agers in many nations live, think, and feel.

Other countries represented were: Germany, Australia, Belgium, Argentina, Cameroons, Brazil, French Northwest Africa, Egypt, Spain, Denmark, Great Britain, Holland, Greece, Italy, Japan, Portugal, Sweden, and Switzerland.

Host for the meeting was a French magazine, Elle, and each delegate was selected by a leading publication in the country she represented. Miss Graves was chosen to represent the United States by the magazine, Seventeen, which reaches about 2½ million teen-agers, and which last fall featured her in a magazine article as "Miss Young America in 4–H."

Commenting on Miss Graves' selection, Mrs. Enid A. Haupt, publisher of Seventeen, said: "It is a great responsibility to select a girl who will represent America's 8 million teen-age girls at a foreign conference. We are especially pleased that Marilyn is so active in 4–H work—because we feel this is such a typically American activity. Marilyn to us represents the best type of American girl because she has truly kept her 4–H pledge to use the 4–H's—head, heart, hands, and health—for her club, community, and country.

An outstanding member of this organization of farm youth, Miss Graves has traveled through the 4–H Club program to Minnesota, Chicago, New Orleans, and Washington, D. C.; given 230 speeches, and appeared on television and radio as a representative of the organization.

Miss Graves lives on a 260-acre farm with her parents and brother. They raise beef cattle and grow corn and cotton. A graduate of Jones County Agricultural High School and Junior College, she is now working for a degree in home economics at Mississippi State College for Women.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, another Mississippian has been honored and has received national recognition.

Engineering Research and Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, not long ago it was my pleasure to deliver an address in Madison, Wis., before a section of the American Society of Tool Engineers. My subject was the competitive race between the United States and the Soviet Union, in the field of guided missiles, research, and development. Subsequent developments have underlined the significance of this subject.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my remarks on that evening be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

I am indeed honored to address your society. It is one which contributes indispensably to the future of America.

In our industrial society, trained and skilled manpower and tools are the keys to production and to success.

And you highly trained engineers, and your companies, have the responsibility and satisfaction of creating the tools which make America great.

We of the United States, as you know, lead the world in production. We have accomplished the greatest feats of engineering. We are looked to, and increasingly visited, for our advanced industrial know-how.

OUR RACE WITH SOVIETS FOR SUPREMACY

And we are now, of course, engaged in a tremendous struggle to determine whether free men can remain supreme in their production achievements and thereby remain free, or whether they might become the slaves of a Communist industrial state, because of the latter's possible gaining of supremacy in time to come.

I am convinced, as I know you are, that just as we have won in shooting wars against dictators, so in peacetime we can prevail in competition against a dictatorship.

I do not believe in either overestimating or underestimating Soviet engineering capabilities. But I, for one, after years of warning about the Kremlin's determination, was not surprised when Khrushchev announced in Burma last December that "we shall see who has more engineers, the United States or the Soviet Union."

WE MUST BE NO. 1 ON GUIDED MISSILES

I want to talk to you tonight about the implications of this matter of the number of engineers and the quality of engineers.

It is particularly appropriate that you and I weigh the problem on this occasion, because just during this past week, a subcommittee of the United States Senate Armed Services Committee began, as you know, an investigation of the program of our guided missile and long-range and medium-range bomber programs.

I am not on that particular committee. I don't purport to know what its findings will be.

A great deal of its testimony must necessarily be in executive session, because matters of the highest security will be taken up, just as they are taken up in many of our Senate Foreign Relations Committee meetings.

SOME REPORTS ASSERT REDS ARE AHEAD OF US

But I do know this: There has been report after report, apparently based upon information available to United States and allied intelligence, that the Soviets have been making spectacular progress in guided missiles research.

Some reports assert that the Reds are actually ahead of us in the development of a 1,500-mile medium-range guided missile. Some reports assert that we are still ahead in the race for a 5,000-mile intercontinental guided missile, or a ballistic missile (the latter being, as you know, an unguided missile, fired like a bullet or an artillery shell).

It is next to impossible to know how reliable these various reports are. I have confidence in our military authorities, and I know that they have been trying to do their best. I have confidence in the President of the United States, who certainly has the finest military judgment available to this Nation in these hours of stress.

The President's recent request to the Congress for a half-billion dollars more in funds for long-range bombers—B–52's—showed, however, that all is not as well as we would want it to be. It shows that we have got to step up our activity.

The guided missile program, the bomber program, the development of antiguided missiles and antibomber systems—these will determine, in time to come, the very life of this Republic.

We dare not be second best in guided missiles; we cannot be second best in our bomber program.

DANGER OF SOVIET OVERCONFIDENCE IN A BLITZ

If ever the Soviet Union gets the idea that it could blitz us in an all-out attack, that it could rain down a shower of missiles with hydrogen bomb warheads on defenseless cities and defenseless airdromes, that it could smash our strategic air force before it could retaliate—if ever the Soviet Union gets that false idea—then it will be a bad day indeed, and the chance of war will be that much increased.

The recent appointment of a Chief of Guided Missiles in the Pentagon, shows that we recognize that we have got to proceed all-out on the development of that particular weapon.

We cannot, of course, put all our eggs in one basket. We cannot simply rely upon any one weapons system.

But neither can we be second best in the most crucial weapons and the most crucial weapons systems.

The day of mass armies is long since completely over. This is as you and I so well know, an age of science and technology.

But we are losing technicians from the Armed Forces at an alarming rate, and the strongest steps must be taken to replenish that supply.

We cannot have engineers and technicians available to the Armed Forces unless, in the first place, we graduate sufficient numbers of youngsters from the high schools and the institutions of higher learning in America.

OUR BASIC CHALLENGE—MATCHING SOVIET GRADUATES

And that brings me back to the principal point of my comments tonight. It brings me to the one point on which I know you, of this society, will agree with me completely. This Nation must take steps, in a comprehensive program, to expand the number of engineers and technicians available to United States society.

In the dictatorial state of the Soviets, they have power to order as many students as they wish to study engineering. Their government can order that enough money and facilities are made available for training engineers. They don't need to pay too much attention to the standard of living of the Russian people, and they pay no attention at all to their liberty.

Knowing that they need more engineers for defense and for their industrial machine, they merely arrange and order the number of engineers to be turned out.

It is something like our planning a production line to turn out machines. The single mindedness of their program makes it easier. But the concept of dictating to human beings is utterly objectionable to us.

We need more engineers, too, but we will leave the decisions basically to the people.

We do not coerce our people, nor require them to serve what some men may regard as the present fleeting interest of the state. One of our cherished liberties is the freedom of the individual to choose his own vocation.

LOW TECHNICAL STATE FROM WHICH SOVIETS STARTED

Meanwhile, there is no doubt whatsoever that Russia has come a long way in technical achievement since its 1917 revolution.

Czarist Russia was not an industrial state and was very backward in technological matters as compared to the United States.

Consequently, almost any Russian advances in engineering and science appear as great strides compared to the lack of such technical activity before the industrial revolution entered Russia.

About 40 years ago 50 percent of the Soviet population could not read. Since then they have built an elementary school system with a 7-year course and are planning, by 1960, 10 years of basic schooling will be compulsory throughout Russia.

Those schools are open 6 days a week, and more hours per day and more weeks per year than ours are. The students are treated with semimilitary discipline.

We might expect these students to be too machine-like to have the independent initiative and imagination of Americans when they grow up. But we must not discount the fact that they do turn out highly qualified technical engineers.

If we have as many engineers, I am sure that our results will be better than theirs. But there is a limit beyond which imagination and initiative cannot make up for numbers.

We must not let that limit be reached.

RUSSIAN ENGINEERS INCREASE RAPIDLY

In 1954 Russia had more than 540,000 engineers.

This increase to 540,000 engineers may be compared with the figures for 1929 when Russia had only 41,000 engineers.

They may also be compared with the American total of between 500,000 and 525,000 engineers.

In addition, their other scientists numbered about 160,000. We have between 210,000 and 225,000 such scientists.

Their combined total of engineers and scientists is 890,000, according to 1954 figures. Our total is between 700,000 and 740,000.

SOVIET EDUCATION'S VAST ENROLLMENT

Student enrollment in the Russian institutions of higher education rose to 2½ million students in the fall of 1954. And the growth of Soviet college population is continuing.

In 1954 universities and other institutions in the Soviet Union graduated 53,000 engineers.

The Soviet Union is stepping up its rate of graduating engineers. It graduated 63,000 in 1955.

While the Russians have been making this enormous effort in training engineers and scientists, we in the United States of America, speaking generally, have not been concentrating our national efforts upon the problem. We have not focused our attention on the production of engineers and scientists adequate to meet our needs in the modern world.

It is, of course, good that we leave the selection of the individual's career to the individual concerned. I would not have that changed one iota nor would you.

But let us look for a moment at how our achievement in the production of engineers and scientists stacks up against that of the Soviet Union.

AMERICA'S TECHNICAL POPULATION

In the United States, the creation of professional workers (including engineering and scientific people) has increased nearly two times as fast as the Nation's population.

In 1890 the census showed about 30,000 engineers in a total population of 63 million in the United States. In manufacturing, construction, utilities, and transportation, there was only one engineer for every 290 workers.

When the American population had risen to 151 million people in 1950, we had 535,000 engineers. That gave us one engineer for every 65 workers in those same fields of manufacturing, construction, utilities, and transportation.

This was a remarkable increase and is, to a great extent, responsible for the rise in

our industrial efficiency and in our standard of living.

The United States now has between 700,000 and 740,000 engineers and scientists.

Most of these engineers and scientists are employed by private industry. More than 400,000 engineers and more than 100,000 scientists were working in private industry in January 1954.

ENGINEERS IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Not only industry but also Government requires engineers. More than 30 Federal agencies employ about 47,000 professional engineers. And many agencies have numerous high positions to fill. They cover the fields of mechanical, electrical, electronics, chemical and civil engineering, as well as others.

LOW RATE OF GRADUATION IN UNITED STATES

But the graduation of engineers and scientists in America (which moved up between World War II and Korea) has since slumped badly.

This fall not only reflects the decline in births about 20 years before but also the lack of enough discipline requiring study of mathematics and science in high school and college.

To put the sad story to you bluntly, the Soviet institutions of higher education are graduating engineers about 2½ times faster than we are—2½ times.

Now, this is a sorry state of affairs to face a country like ours which has developed a continent through hard work and technical know-how. Our country has always led the world in technical performance and engineering. We are a Nation accustomed to producing surpluses, not shortages.

NO NEED FOR FEAR OR DESPAIR

We must solve our shortage with courage and hard work. I do not believe in an attitude of fear or despair.

"For God hath not given us the spirit of fear; but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind" (II Timothy 1:7). This is what Paul wrote to Timothy, and it is directly applicable to us as we face world problems today. We must banish fear. We must take courage. We will go forward to solve the difficult problems and to overcome the foes we face.

It was not through inattention or through lack of technical skill that we increased our national income from about 70 billions of dollars (which it was in 1939 when Wisconsin first sent me to Washington) to the current figure of about 327 billions of dollars. That is an increase of more than four times, and it was done in the comparatively small period of 17 years.

Now I am not saying that we have plenty of time in which to step up our production of technically skilled people. We don't have. We must work hard and fast.

We had, as you recall, 2 years in which to get ready even after we were attacked at Pearl Harbor, but we would not now have as much as 2 hours if we were attacked by atomic and hydrogen bombs showering our principal cities.

And in this connection may I remind you that, with the speed of modern airplanes, we, here in Wisconsin, are less than 5 hours from Soviet Siberia.

UNITED STATES CHIEFS WARNED AGAINST OVERCONFIDENCE

Adm. Arthur Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said in a speech last January that:

"Perhaps the most insidious weakness a nation can have is complacency. This is the belief that we can do everything better than anyone else."

I continue to quote Admiral Radford:

"It is something like the popular song called 'Anything You Can Do I Can Do Better.'"

He said that the Soviet achievements in developing "modern long-range bombers, submarines, jet engines, and nuclear weapons" rebutted the thought that we can afford to be complacent about Soviet technology. He concluded:

"There are no rational grounds to presuppose that American defense technology is invincible."

A recent statement by the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, after the atoms for peace conference, said that, "What we learned was enough to shatter any complacency we may have enjoyed in regard to our own imagination and ability."

Therefore, we must redirect and reemphasize our engineering program so as to step up the number of highly trained engineers available to support our expanding economy. Meanwhile, we must maintain our defense posture, our readiness to repel attacks, with the most advanced scientific weapons conceivable.

And this must be done within the freedom of our American competitive system of individual enterprise.

We have already made a start. We have already reversed the downward trend of engineering graduations, and we are aiming upward.

Fortunately, the enrollment in the engineering classes of our higher educational institutions in America has been increasing during the last 3 years.

The increase last fall was about 10 percent. And, if this trend continues, the Office of Education in Washington believes that there will be over 40,000 engineering graduates in 1964. This is a substantial increase, but we must remember that in 1950 we graduated over 52,000 engineers. With sound planning and energetic drive, we can again focus the attention of our professional people upon producing engineers who will help protect us from the Communist danger.

And this can be done through the incentive of our system of individual initiative.

THERE ARE ATTRACTIVE FINANCIAL INDUCEMENTS

Salaries and demand for engineering experience have been high. As you know, in city after city, the newspapers carry advertisements seeking engineering personnel for employment at high salaries with glowing futures.

The continuing demand for engineers and qualified scientists will probably serve to maintain the salary incentive. Consequently, boys and girls, who learn of the glowing opportunities in the engineering and scientific fields, will more and more wish to follow those careers.

INCREASE NUMBER OF MATH STUDENTS

But, one of the greatest problems in training engineers and scientists quickly is the lack of mathematicians in high school. Since 1910 there has been a consistent decline in the proportion of high school students who take college preparatory mathematics. This conclusion is the result of a survey by the Educational Testing Service under a grant from the Carnegie Corporation. The youngsters just don't realize how important their math is, to themselves and to the country.

One of the survey's conclusions, after looking at 60 mathematics classes, was stated as follows:

"That genuine and efficient mathematical learning was going on in only eight of them."

And that:

"What we are facing is not a shortage of talent, but of trained talent."

And that:

"It is a problem which merits the attention of all men and women accustomed to concerning themselves about the future of America."

Almost half of the schooltime of high-school children in Russia is spent on science and mathematics.

There has been a distressing tendency in our country to let study of mathematics slide. Under the elective system, most students avoid it. True, it is hard; but it sharpens the mind and it helps toward success in later life.

SIX-POINT PROGRAM TO SPUR ENGINEERING

Now, I earnestly urge that we give serious consideration to an engineering and scientific educational program under which we will do the following things:

1. Emphasize science and mechanics in counseling those boys and girls who show aptitude for that sort of thing.
2. Stimulate them to study hard and to keep up their studies.
3. Direct them to the sources of scholarships, to competitions for tuition grants, and to sources of loan funds which have been made available to foster scientific education.
4. As Government officials and as college or corporation executives, appropriate and allocate adequate funds for scientific study and research and for scholarships.
5. Help our great private and public university system in its wonderful work.
6. Counsel graduates as to scientific and engineering employment and so make the Nation's opportunities available to them.

UNCLE SAM IS FINANCING VAST RESEARCH

Uncle Sam is of course already busy. The Federal Government lets tremendous contracts for research and development. These are awarded on a competitive basis to universities, colleges, research institutions, and industrial corporations which have the skilled manpower and the facilities for their performance.

As a result, many of our colleges are being partially financed by doing Federal Government work in scientific and engineering fields.

And many of our companies are able to finance their engineering research and development by doing defense work for the Pentagon.

This is going on in our truly American way without subjecting the thinking of any of these universities, colleges, institutions, or corporations to the influence of what the Government wants them to think. And that is as it should be. For there must be no censorship of thought in our country.

So I leave with you the message that, although the future may look somber and although we may face a strong enemy, we need not despair. We can be of good cheer because we have the capacity, we have the energy, and we have the incentive to win.

But it will not be easy.

THE VITAL IMPORTANCE OF MACHINE TOOLS

I have been speaking principally about the shortage of United States engineers in relation to the Soviet's mammoth concentration on increasing the number of engineers for weapons development.

I want to emphasize now, however, that I am thinking of the shortage of engineers in terms of our peacetime economy, as well. I am thinking of engineers not simply for the development of guided missiles and B–52 bombers, but for the development of that vast array of tools, which you know, even better than I, is the backbone of America's industrial strength and its military might.

In modern war, toolmakers are as essential as soldiers. But the machine tool industry is an industry of feast or famine. There is either a great demand for its production, or there is little demand at all.

MACHINE TOOL RESERVE POOL

Our unfortunate experience in World War II, when we did not have nearly enough machine tools to turn out quickly the military equipment we needed, has led the Federal Government, as you know, to establish, very wisely, a machine tool reserve pool.

This is administered by the Department of Defense under policies defined by the Office

of Defense Mobilization. Several years ago, an American industrialist, Harold S. Vance (formerly chairman of the executive committee of the Studebaker-Packard Corp. and now a member of the Atomic Energy Commission) headed a committee which described the policy to govern that reserve.

The Vance Committee concluded, after careful study, that a stockpile of end items was not enough. It recommended that machine tools be bought and stored against the time when war would suddenly require American industry to step up military production and go on an all-out basis. This Committee recommended annual appropriations of more than $500 million to establish this pool. Consequently, separate appropriations were made for the establishment of this reserve stockpile of machine tools.

It has been decided by the Pentagon to procure machine tools, both for stockpile and for current use, out of their general appropriations. The effect of this decision is to place the responsibility for stockpiling machine tools on each military service. This places the burden for justifying appropriations for this reserve where the burden lies for all military appropriations.

TRIGGER PROGRAM FOR M-DAY

One of your past presidents, Joe Crosby, is giving his time until July to the Department of Commerce to help solve the machine-tool problem. As you no doubt know, the Department of Commerce and the General Services Administration have cooperated to develop a trigger program to be shot into action, if and when we have an M-Day again.

The Government is now offering to enter into contracts with your companies effective immediately to produce specified machine tools which will be needed for wartime production. Manufacture of the tools would begin upon notice from the Government on or about M-Day. Later, these contracts may be made effective automatically on M-Day without further notice. The requirements of the contracts would be reviewed twice a year, and proper adjustment made. Just the other day, the Commerce Department and the General Services Administration completed their cooperative preparations for this machine tool trigger program.

THE CHALLENGE OF AUTOMATION

One cannot, I believe, discuss our machine tool industry without bringing up the challenging issue of automation.

There has been, as you know, concern expressed in some quarters, particularly labor circles, about the trend toward automation. There has been a fear that it would result in displacement of jobs.

There is no question but that in specific instances, some unemployment may result as manual jobs are replaced by machine-run machines. But the whole inspiring history of the expansion of the American free enterprise system has shown this fact—industrial progress in America, while invariably making obsolete some particular type of job, tremendously increases the number of new jobs in totally new fields.

The horseshoemaker, the harnessmaker, and the other jobs, which were dependent upon horses in the America of the 19th century, have been replaced. But there were literally millions of new jobs created, thanks to the "horseless carriage," the great American automobile industry.

The development of nuclear science, the continued progress in electronics, the miracles of American chemistry, particularly in developing new plastics—the miracles in physics research—these are symbols of the new frontiers of American industry.

So, contrary to the fear talk, we should welcome the trend to automation, because it means a higher, not a lower standard of living, more jobs, not fewer.

AUTOMATION NOT REALLY NEW

I should like to point out that automation is really only a further development of an old concept in America. It involves the increasing use of laborsaving machinery. This machinery is almost continuous in its operation and sometimes is self-regulated. It is, as you know, increasingly used in offices, as well as in factories.

MANY KINDS OF AUTOMATION

Some automatic machinery performs a cycle of operations according to an established pattern without further human intervention.

Other machines save human labor in the automatic movement and handling of materials.

Still other machines automatically control the work of machinery, substituting machine calculation in place of graders and inspectors.

And in offices, electric computers and data-processing machines perform miraculous calculations in split seconds.

PURPOSE OF AUTOMATION IS GOOD

All these are the brain-children of mankind. And they are calculated to lift toil from the backs of mankind, men and women.

As we exercise statesmanship, in government, in business and in labor, we can foresee a shining future when there will be more leisure, more happiness and less physical and mental exhaustion in the lives of all our people.

But we must exercise patience and forbearance, and labor long to foresee the problems which this transition to more automatic processes will entail.

If greater automation increases production, we must be sure that the engineers and the small entrepreneurs receive an adequate return for their imagination, foresight, and risk taking.

On the tax phase, let me mention this: Whether or not the rapid tax amortization program is continued in connection with defense expenditures, the Government now permits a more realistic write down of investments in plant and facilities. This should stimulate the business of the machine-tool industry.

And of course, we must protect the rights of labor in this changing world. If workers have been faithfully doing one job for years, have acquired seniority rights and limited skills, we must try to help them to secure fair compensation for these rights or transfer them to the other jobs for which their study and increasing skill will fit them.

And here I must reemphasize that hard work and study throughout our lives will fit us for increasing responsibility.

FURTHER TRAINING OF WORKERS NECESSARY

If any workers are displaced by automation, they should be able, with proper help, to improve their skills to the point where they will earn more in more responsible jobs.

In this connection, I commend to your attention a pamphlet issued under the name of our Secretary of Labor. It is called, "The Skilled Work Force of the United States," and it deals, among other things, with the relation of skill to unemployment. It points out that automation will increase the proportion of skilled workers in American life, and stresses the importance of continued self-education.

There are many ways in which our people can improve their skills. They can do it at home, in school, or while serving with the Armed Forces. Through initial apprenticeship, through technical institutions or junior colleges, by participating in training programs within industry and by accumulative job experience at their daily work. But no one becomes skilled by chance. You didn't, and no one else can. Special effort is necessary.

And so, while the Federal Government foresees the great gains coming from automation, it is not overlooking the considerations necessary to help gradual adjustments to the new jobs which automation will bring about.

WISCONSIN WILL PROSPER IN AUTOMATION ERA

It seems to me that a great State like Wisconsin, with a marvelous university system, a State which has rightly prided itself upon the skills and crafts of its laboring people and its managerial people, a State where quality of product has always been a matter of deepest pride, stands to benefit far more so than the average State—in the scientific, industrial, and atomic era of our times.

I look, therefore, for greater prosperity of our State than we have ever known before. But I emphasize that it must be a well-rounded prosperity in which the progress of industry and labor is accompanied by prosperity in agriculture. Unfortunately, the latter situation—prosperity in farming—has not sufficiently prevailed, but it must prevail if our whole society is to remain healthy.

And I want to mention still another essential unit for well-rounded prosperity—our great teaching profession.

INCREASES TEACHING FACILITIES

In the process of greater automation, and the training of the greater number of scientists and engineers which automation will require, the Federal Government, as well as private industry, should make increasing use of our great universities.

They should make increasing use of our splendid laboratories and our fine private inventive and engineering talent in the laboratories of our many corporations.

In this way, America can move ahead by improving our civilian economy while maintaining superiority in weapon systems for our own national survival.

In order to continue our technological progress, we need, as I have said, more engineers and scientists; and to train these, we need more teachers. Teachers are woefully underpaid. We must bring every effort to increase their compensation, so that they will regain the position of real leadership and the place of respected importance in our lives which we all remember our own teachers had 30 or 40 years ago.

CONCLUSION—THE BRIGHT HOPE OF OUR PIONEERING AGE

If we think ahead, if we continue to act with pioneering spirit, if we follow in the footsteps of the settlers of America, we will have nothing to fear from increasing automation.

We can rely on it, as Daniel Boone relied on his long rifle, for defense, for food, and for a better life.

If we avoid fear and if we follow hope, if we buckle down with hard work, we will succeed beyond the imagination of any of us here present.

Remarks by Hon. W. Kerr Scott, of North Carolina, Before the Senators' Breakfast Group, on May 9, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, this morning it was my privilege to hear a short talk made by the distinguished

Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT]. The Senator from North Carolina has a fine appreciation for the enduring values, including things of the spirit. He has a great understanding of human nature, as well as things of nature. His remarks are always helpful to others. I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TALK BY SENATOR W. KERR SCOTT BEFORE THE SENATORS' BREAKFAST GROUP, UNITED STATES CAPITOL, MAY 9, 1956

Friends:

"One is nearer God's heart in a garden
Than anywhere else on earth."

So wrote the poet enthralled by the newfound discovery that flowers, even if not possessing a soul, are a part of the spiritual values with which the Creator has surrounded us and our lives.

Edward William Bok, a great American editor and public benefactor, recognized the spiritual value of flowers and man's need for their comfort and relaxing power when he built and endowed that famous beauty spot known as Mountain Lake Sanctuary, or Bok Tower, near Lake Wales, Fla.

He turned a barren, sandy wasteland into a garden of 53 acres of flowers and trees—and trees are only massive flowers—that has relieved the tensions and refreshed the souls of the hundreds of thousands of visitors who have passed through it.

And Luther Burbank, the great naturalist who spent his life skillfully blending the colors and other characteristics of flowers into even more splendid beauty, also found inspiration in the words of the poet, words inscribed on a plaque at Bok Tower:

"The kiss of the sun for a pardon,
The song of a bird for mirth,
One is nearer God's heart in a garden
Than anywhere else on earth."

Flowers, and the love and devotion they symbolize, are an integral part of the joys and sorrows of the most moving moments of life—of courtship, marriage, birthdays, illness, and even death.

They walk with us, and we among them, finding in them pleasure and solace all the days of our lives.

A wedding without a bridal bouquet would be like food without salt.

Death of a loved one calls for banks of flowers, a tribute to the goodness of his life and to ease the sorrow we feel at his or her passing.

Flowers even have a language of their own. Lovers and sweethearts know it and speak it to each other throughout courtship and marriage.

On Mother's Day we wear a red rose if the one who gave us life is still living, a white rose if she has passed on into the great beyond prepared for us by the Creator and from which no traveler returns.

In ancient days the warrior going forth to battle carried close to his heart a pressed flower, a talisman of love and devotion from his beloved designed to bring him home safely. And when the hero returned from the wars, a garland of flowers was placed around his neck by an acclaiming populace.

After a loved one dies we return, time and time again, to lay an offering of flowers on his grave—a silent tribute that speaks its own message.

And who, I ask, can look upon the splendors of a rose or the delicate face of a pansy and say with certainty that flowers themselves do not possess a soul.

Joyce Kilmer, after a solitary walk in the forest—surrounded on every hand by wild flowers shyly peeping toward the sun while protected from the raging winds by their big brothers, the trees—became pensive and wrote:

"I think that I shall never see
A poem as lovely as a tree.
A tree that may in summer wear
A nest of robins in her hair.
Poems are made by fools like me
But only God can make a tree."

"Consider the lilies of the field," we are told by the Master in Luke 12: 27, "how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin: And, yet I say unto you, that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these."

Yes; it is true, flowers neither toil nor spin, but Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one tiny flower created by God to sustain man in his deeper emotional and spiritual moments.

The conclusion is inescapable that Divine approval, if not guidance, has been given for our entwining the beauty, innocence, and purity as symbolized by flowers—and the inspiration, comfort, and pleasure they give us—into the fabric of our daily lives and our acceptance of the darkness of the grave.

In the song of Solomon, which depicts the love of Christ for the church, we read: "I am the rose of Sharon, and the lily of the valley," and, "For, lo, the winter is past, the rain is over and gone; the flowers appear on the earth; the time of the singing of birds is come."

As I reflect upon the words, "the flowers appear on the earth," I am aware of the fact that the flowers appear in this worship garden spot each time we meet here through the devotion and thoughtfulness of Mr. Bellamy, the only non-Senator member of our group who regularly attends. He has captured and faithfully nurtures the consciousness that flowers symbolize the love of man for man, the love of man for God, and the love of God for man.

Flowers truly are the currency of love, honor, and adoration. What boy raised in the country has not sought out in the early spring on sunny hillsides delicate, pale, dancing forget-me-nots to shyly lay a tight little bouquet in his mother's lap? What boy raised in the country has not searched the shady forest nooks for violets—those "purple teardrops that live betwixt Heaven and earth, but closest to earth"—to honor that sel'same mother?

Our Father in Heaven, in casting the important scenes of His Divine Plan, has chosen flower bedecked gardens as the stage for most of them.

"And the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden," we read in the second chapter of Genesis.

Centuries later it was in the Garden of Gethsemane that our Saviour fell upon His face, and the man-side of His nature cried out in anguish, "Oh, My Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from Me."

But, even then, winding along the garden paths, came the traitor Judas to betray Him to the multitude armed with swords and staves who demanded His crucifixion.

And when the shameful trial had ended, and He had died on the Cross, it was to a nearby garden that His sword-pierced body was taken for entombment.

It was from that spot, a garden where tiny early spring flowers were bravely lifting their heads toward the warmth of the sun, that the Saviour who died for the sins of all men arose on that first Easter Morn to take the place prepared for Him on the throne of the Lord God of Creation.

Yes, one is nearer God's heart in a garden than anywhere else on earth.

It is only after the shouting and tumult has died, and our friends and loved ones left behind have bedecked our grave with flowers of remembrance, that we can get closer to the heart of God than we can in a garden where flowers grow.

In closing I would leave you with the Song of the Roadside Flowers:

"We are the roadside flowers,
Straying from garden grounds;—
Lovers of idle hours,
Breakers of ordered bounds.

"If only the earth will feed us,
If only the wind will be kind,
We blossom for those who need us,
The stragglers left behind.

"And, lo, the Lord of the Garden,
He makes His sun to rise,
And His rain to fall like pardon
On our dusty paradise.

"On us He has laid the duty—
The task of the wandering breed—
To better the world with beauty,
Wherever the way may lead.

"Who shall inquire of the season,
Or question the wind where it blows?
We blossom and ask no reason,
The Lord of the Garden knows."

Statement in Support of Appropriations for the Rural Electrification Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by me in support of appropriations for the Rural Electrification Administration before the Senate Appropriations Committee:

The city dweller first knew the blessings of electricity as early as 1882 when Thomas A. Edison built his famous Pearl Street plant in New York. The rural dweller had to wait many years to realize these benefits. During the three succeeding decades the farmer waited, more or less patiently. Electric utilities, public and private, for a long time ignored him. Farmhouses were thought to be too far away from generating plants and were too far apart. There could be no profit in serving them.

Eventually the transmission lines crept out into the country from the cities, slowly and painfully. By 1935 only 10 percent of the Nation's farms were electrified and prospects of this percentage increasing rapidly were exceedingly dim in the midst of a period of depression. It was then that the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 was passed. The Federal Government then assumed the responsibility of bringing the blessings of electricity to the long-suffering farmer. Today over 94 percent of farms throughout this broad land are electrified. There are now over 1,000 REA financed systems, owned by the farmers themselves, which maintain 1,300,000 miles of line serving over 4½ million rural consumers. This is a truly remarkable achievement.

By means of electricity it is certain that many lives have been lengthened and made more complete. Productivity of the farm has attained heights unknown elsewhere in the world, due largely to the coming of electricity to the farm.

Over $3 billion has been authorized for loans. It is significant to me that repayment of loans and of interest is almost 100 percent perfect. At the first of the year only 15 of the borrowers were delinquent more than 30 days and the amount overdue was less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the amount billed. Few businesses of any kind can boast of such a record.

The strength of the Nation is its people. Americans have become strong by accepting responsibility, demonstrating initiative and perseverance. Nowhere has this been better proven than in the Rural Electrification program. Once given the opportunity our rural dwellers have shown that they are mature and self-reliant. Today the financial position of the program is sound.

Every 7 years the farmer has been doubling his use of electricity. He has come to consider electricity as an absolute necessity, and it is resulting in a need for increasing the capacity of many REA systems. For that reason, and for the development of new sources of energy it is essential that more funds be made available to maintain efficiency and expand capacities of many REA cooperatives.

It is essential that the program be carried on, both for the purpose of improving and expanding existing systems and to reach the few remaining farms not yet served with electricity.

In 1949 Congress belatedly recognized an anachronism. Many farms, even in this modern age of electronics, had no telephones. It then authorized the REA to extend its lending services to interests, public as well as private, who would extend telephone service to those needing it, or to improve existing but poor service.

The first telephone loan was made in February 1950, at a time when the United States census showed only 38.2 percent of all farms had telephones. Variation was extremely wide in separate areas. By December 31, 1955, 415 borrowers had sought $273 million and already over 15,000 miles of lines had been constructed to reach 286,000 subscribers. This is a remarkable record for so short a time and deserves to be encouraged by all means. Authorized totals would include, at the end of 1955, 86,543 miles of line on 246 systems.

The activity of the REA rural telephone program has stimulated activity by all operating in the field. The job of getting modern telephone service on every farm in the United States is not REA's alone. All units of the industry are working toward that end.

In my own State I have witnessed the remarkable growth of these two programs. In 1935 only 2.6 percent of Oklahoma's farms were electrified when the first loan was approved. On January 1 of this year, 90.8 percent were electrified. Farms so served had increased from 5,648 to 108,079. Loans have been made totaling over $120 million, which will eventually result in nearly 62,000 miles of lines to serve over 151,000 rural consumers. I am proud to say not one of the 28 borrowers in my State are delinquent in repayment of their obligations.

In 1940 only 18.1 percent of Oklahoma's farms had telephones, and when the REA telephone program began only 1 out of 3 farms had phones. By the end of 1954 this had been increased to 44.8 percent, or 53,299 farms, served by 2,368 miles of line. REA rural lines have brought new service to 3,107 and 3,521 are benefiting from improved services. The nearly $3 million in loans to 9 borrowers is being well used.

The American farmer has little to cheer him in these days of surplus crops and depressed prices for farm products. But we must not forget that he has been a stalwart pillar of strength throughout our history, and he will be needed more and more in the future. Our increasing population will demand an ever-increasing amount of farm products. The health, happiness, and productivity of our farm population must be preserved. The REA programs of electrification and telephone service are essential to the farmer's efficiency and must be continued until there is no penalty to the rural dweller from the fact of living in the country. The farmer is entitled to the full use of electricity and of communication with his fellow no less than the city dweller. For these reasons, I appeal to you to grant the full amount sought by the REA for continuing unabated its useful and valuable program.

Address by Hon. William Langer, of North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 9, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech I made in New York City on September 29, 1955.

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

SPEECH BY SENATOR LANGER AT CARNEGIE HALL, NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER 29, 1955

Mr. Chairman, Mrs. Sobell, and my friends, I am delighted that Mrs. Sobell told you that I was the Senator from North Dakota. North Dakota, believe it or not, is the greatest State in the Union. Every once in a while this evening when one of these distinguished guests came to me and said they were glad I was here and commenced to pay compliments to me for being here, I said to them that we have scores of folks out there in North Dakota who would do it if they were in my place.

I believe one of the greatest jobs in the United States is that of being United States Senator. That is especially true if you represent a great State, if you don't owe any obligations to anybody but to the people, where you can say anything you want to and do anything you want to and be entirely happy while you are doing it. I want the press to know that, and they are here, I understand, tonight, to report my speech. I want them to tell the press in North Dakota that WILLIAM LANGER spoke here tonight and he is very, very happy to be here.

Upon these other occasions on which I have appeared here in Carnegie Hall, I promised to put certain articles and legal instruments into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I placed, and maybe Mrs. Sobell will feel better, I think, when I tell her, I placed the William Peters case into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and he won. And I put the Schneider case into the RECORD, and he won. Of course, you all know that great champion of human rights here in New York City, Corliss Lamont. I can't tell you the great pleasure it gave me to rise on the Senate floor at the time when he was cited for contempt by the McCarthy committee, to appear there and help Senator LEHMAN, of your State, in that great fight we made to keep Corliss Lamont from being cited. And what particularly pleased me was that a few weeks later, we, Senator LEHMAN and I, had the great pleasure of reading the decision of the court upon the floor of the Senate, saying that Corliss Lamont was not guilty of contempt.

When I became attorney general of my State, as Mrs. Sobell told you, I was only a young fellow. I found 441 men (they weren't all men; there were 7 women) 441 altogether, confined in the penitentiary. It gave me a great deal of pleasure to have a thorough investigation made of every case. You would be interested to know that in there we found 2 Negroes, and you know in North Dakota we only have a population of 208 Negroes altogether, and so when I found 2 of them in the penitentiary sentenced to life, Mr. Williams and Mr. McGee, we spent $400 and got out the record and got it before the pardon board. Then we found out that both those men were absolutely innocent and both of them were discharged. It is our belief out there in North Dakota it is better to have 99 guilty go free than have 1 innocent man sent to the penitentiary.

When I came to the Senate, I had had varied experiences. One was as county attorney of a county, and as attorney general of the State, and as governor. When I became a United States Senator, I promptly proceeded to organize a committee on national penitentiaries. Nobody else wanted the job so they gave it to me. I was the chairman of that committee for a great number of years, and when the Democrats got in—due to WAYNE MORSE—I lost my chairmanship and the result was I am only 1 of 3.

In these penitentiaries we have 21,500 inmates and most of these people haven't got a friend on earth. A lot of them aren't as lucky as Morton Sobell to have a beautiful, fine wife who is loyal to him and anxious to help him. You find quite the opposite in some of these cases. As chairman of that committee and as a member of that committee, I have investigated many penitentiaries in the United States of America, every Federal prison, all 18 of them, and also the work farms. It is a very simple procedure. You get up about 3 o'clock in the morning and you go over to the penitentiary and investigate the food. You have a card of admittance and they can't keep you out, because you are either the chairman or a member of this committee. We investigate to see whether there's been any discrimination—any racial discrimination. We investigate to find out whether there has been an excess of solitary confinement. We make a thorough investigation to ascertain just exactly how that penitentiary is run. And you know, my friends, upon my tombstone, if I have nothing else, I hope there will be something on there that will say that since the organization of that committee there has not been a single riot in all the 11 years in any Federal penitentiary, not one. Certainly we people here in America can run those prisons in a humane manner and not run them the way Atlanta prison was run shortly before this committee was created. All the riots that they have had in various States (men have been killed, guards have been killed, guards have been held as hostages, and millions of dollars worth of property has been burned), have been due to the fact that the prisoners were not treated in a humane manner, with sufficient food and with all that goes with being confined in a penitentiary.

Yet I can tell you this—of all the prisons in the United States, the worst hellhole of all is Alcatraz. I have been there time and again. I have made report after report asking that that prison be closed up. It was established by Spain during the period of the Spanish Inquisition over 400 years ago. There it is today, 12 acres, not enough land out there to give exercise to the prisoners. Former Attorney General Frank Murphy made an investigation of Alcatraz and he recommended that it be closed. I've taken this matter up as a United States Senator time and time again, and I'm happy to in-

form you tonight that at last Jim Bennett, Director of Prisons of the United States Government, is also recommending that Alcatraz be closed, closed forever in the United States of America.

Being attorney general of a State is a replica of being Attorney General of the United States. The United States Attorney General only operates on a larger scale than does the attorney general of the State. I have always maintained that it's the duty of the attorney general of the State to be just as much interested in seeing that no innocent man is sent to a penitentiary, as it is to see a guilty man sent there. As chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate that was my object. It's hard to describe to you here tonight the terrific power, the almost unbelievable power, that is in the hands of the Attorney General of the United States of America. The entire Department of Justice is in his hands, the FBI, J. Edgar Hoover's department, 10,000 young men and some women who are working for them. You can readily understand that when a prosecutor goes in convinced that a man is guilty, what small chance that man has. I think it is just as much the duty of the FBI and the Attorney General to dig up the other side of the question.

So it was when Mrs. Sobell came to me in Washington in 1954 I said to Mrs. Sobell, "I am satisfied that the Attorney General of the United States, when the Judiciary Committee asks him to intercede, will see that you get a fair deal." Now the Sobell case is going to be up in the Court of Appeals. I want you to know that just as soon as that is disposed of, and also in the meantime, we will do what we can down there in that Senate. Believe me, that body of Senators is an honest group of men who want to do what's right. When you know those men, when you know them as I know them, you're proud of them. Now some of the men may not agree with some of your views on some matters. A Senator may be in favor of the railroads, but he's elected by the people and if the people weren't interested enough to elect somebody who had opposite views, certainly that Senator has a right to make his views known to the country. We have down there the conservatives, and the so-called liberals, and I want to tell you tonight there's no distinction either side of the aisle between Democrats and Republicans, because we have liberals and conservatives on the Democratic side and liberals and conservatives on the Republican side. Happy to say that down there some of my most liberal friends and some of the best men on that Judiciary Committee, some of the men who are just as much interested in Morton Sobell as I am myself, would gladly put their hands to the plow, to help out to see that he gets the justice to which he is entitled.

May I say, however, that there's one thing that I've discovered down there in Washington that I don't like—and it isn't only down there but I found that in State after State after State. You find a prosecutor who wants to make a record, a prosecutor who will get hold of the press and get them to write up stories, just like they did in the Sobell case, month after month after month after month, and poison the feelings of the people in that community before the man ever comes to trial at all, stories that aren't true, stories that mention people who never are called to testify when the trial itself takes place. They create a prejudiced atmosphere—my friend Waldo Frank referred to the atmosphere in the courtroom. In spite of the fact that a juror may be honest and say that he isn't prejudiced in that particular lawsuit, nevertheless, subconsciously, there in the back of his head he's read these stories and he's heard this stuff over the radio. You can't tell me that it hasn't made an impression. I believe if we're going to have the kind of justice we're so proud of in the United States of America, the kind of justice we should have, and the kind of justice that I believe every member of the Senate Judiciary Committee wants, somehow or other we've got to do something when a poor man, or a rich man either for that matter, when any man is charged with a crime, so that the newspapers don't blazen a lot of stuff that isn't true about that man or about that woman, and prejudice the community.

I want you folks to know that the Judiciary Committee has this very much at heart—this matter of convicting an innocent person before he's proven guilty, in the minds of the public, so that when you finally get a jury, they're unconsciously prejudiced, with the result that instead of having a fair trial like our Constitution says every man or woman should have, that man or woman doesn't get it. And I think that down there in Washington too we need legislation—I don't mean a new law, but I mean an interpretation which will say to the Attorney General of the United States: We believe it is just as much your duty to see to it that an innocent man is not sent to the penitentiary as it is to send a guilty man there—just as much your duty to use all the services of the F. B. I., all the services of all these other men that you've got, to see that all the evidence is brought out, to see that no evidence is suppressed and that the jury may have all the facts. And so tonight, ladies and gentlemen, I can't tell you how delighted I've been to have been invited here. I want you to come forward, Mrs. Sobell. [Motions to Mrs. Sobell to stand at his side.]

My friends, I want you to know that I've got four daughters just about the same age as this young lady standing here beside me tonight, and I pledge you that everything I can do as a member of the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate will be done to see that her husband gets justice.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 10, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, May 7, 1956)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Fr. Eugene Lazar, pastor of the Rumanian Orthodox Church, the Descent of the Holy Ghost, 1133 Madison Street, Gary, Ind., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

O Heavenly King, Spirit of Truth, who art present everywhere, treasure of blessings, and bountiful Giver of Life: Come Thou and abide among us, as we pray that unto our God-fearing President, and the Members of this House, and all civil authorities, and our Armed Forces, Thou wilt grant a peaceful life, health, salvation, and conquest over the enemies of these United States of America.

O Almighty God, our help and refuge, fountain of wisdom and tower of strength, who knowest that we can do nothing without Thy guidance, direct us to divine wisdom and power, that we may accomplish whatever task we may undertake, faithfully and diligently, as we beseech Thee, O Master, to remember those who live in oppression and fear, in countries behind the Iron Curtain, as they seek the same freedoms Thou hast bestowed upon us so generously, who are judged and condemned to prison and exile and bitter slavery, and who have need of Thy mercy.

And as Thou desirest, O Lord, that all people be free, we ask that Thou especially remember the God-fearing people of the Kingdom of Rumania, on this memorable day, and as in the past they found and enjoyed the gift of freedom, assist them to find the same road to recovery, to liberation, and to freedom from injustice and the yoke of tyranny, and that Thy blessings be upon them as upon us in this hour.

This we ask in the name of the Risen Christ our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 9, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, May 10, 1956, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1212) for the relief of Dr. Lincoln Roy Manson-Hing, Mrs. Joyce Louise Manson-Hing, Collin James Manson-Hing, and Jennifer Lynn Manson-Hing.

IMPLEMENTATION OF HOOVER COMMISSION REPORT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

(For President's message, see House proceedings of today.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 1488. An act for the relief of Mrs. Esther Reed Marcantel;

H. R. 2423. An act for the relief of the city of Sandpoint, Idaho;

H. R. 3526. An act for the relief of the estate of Neil McLeod Smith;

H. R. 3738. An act for the relief of Roy M. Hofheinz and wife Irene;

H. R. 4051. An act to provide for the relief of certain Army and Air Force nurses, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4536. An act for the relief of John J. Cowin;

H. R. 4633. An act for the relief of Crosse & Blackwell Co.;

H. R. 4634. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. George H. Cronin, United States Air Force;

H. R. 5495. An act for the relief of Arthur H. Homeyer;