

earlier, Merrill Lynch does not take a position in any of these markets. What we are interested in is a fair and equitable contract for buyers and sellers because we know that if they are one-sided in either respect we cannot do business. We are interested in a large volume of business in order to get our percentage of it.

Mr. MCINTIRE. I was getting to the fact that our responsibility under this legislation is much broader than cotton, but that is what we have spent our time on, and I was just wondering about the other commodities.

Mr. HENICAN. Let me ask you this question:

I wish you would clear up some of my ignorance because you originate from that territory. Is there such a thing as an onion processor or manufacturer?

Mr. MCINTIRE. I do not know. I do not come from an onion territory.

Mr. HENICAN. Would he qualify under this?

Mr. MCINTIRE. No; I do not think so.

Mr. HENICAN. I can see a possibility. There are potato processors and manufacturers.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Very definitely.

Mr. HENICAN. I have handled some long contracts for a potato-chip manufacturer where the potato price was such that he could fix his cost and fix his profits. I do not think there is such an organization as an onion manufacturer or processor. So, he would not qualify under this amendment; would he?

Mr. LAIRD. We do have these french-fry potato plants which are processors.

Mr. MCINTIRE. And, of course, there is likely to be more of it as time goes on. That is the direction in which marketing is moving in those commodities.

I am wondering, and I just wanted to get your thought, as to whether or not the discussion we have had here particularly on cotton has equal bearing and an equal relationship with the other commodities which are affected under this act?

Mr. HENICAN. I think so.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Do you think this bill should be amended to include only cotton?

Mr. HENICAN. No, sir; I am very strongly opposed to amending this to include cotton only. It should include all commodities because as you recall yesterday the gentleman from CEA mentioned the fact that the first

time this came up was many years ago. It had to do with a Quaker Oats matter, and later the Corn Products matter, and it has only recently been involved with cotton.

There is another case in which I was personally involved which had to do with the Mexican Government in regard to wheat. I would be very much opposed to limiting this amendment to cotton only.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Thank you.

Mr. GATHINGS. Are there any further questions?

(No response.)

Mr. Kauffman and Mr. Henican, I just wonder if you gentlemen think that the record is complete or if you had any further suggestions?

Mr. KAUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is complete insofar as the Commodity Exchange Authority is concerned.

Mr. GATHINGS. Thank you.

If there are no further questions, the subcommittee will stand adjourned to meet again at the call of the Chair.

(Thereupon, at 12 o'clock, noon, the subcommittee adjourned.)

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 6, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, June 4, 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:

O God, the might of them that put their trust in Thee, amid all the subtle dangers that beset us, save us from the fatal folly of attempting to rely upon our own unaided strength and devices. The world is aghast at the revelation of the ruthless depravity of a dictator who sought to mold a system with Thee excluded, with Thy law and Thy love ignored. Such a baneful career but confirms Thy word that without Thee "The human heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked." In a world so uncertain about many things we are sure of no light but Thine, no refuge but in Thee.

The din of words assails our ears in this agitated world. Grant us an inner calm undisturbed by any outer commotion because our minds are stayed on Thee. Give us the courage to seek the truth honestly and the reverence and obedience to follow humbly the kindly light that leads us on. 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 Tuesday, June 5, 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.

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 following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6024. An act to withdraw and restore to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain land at Kaakaukui, Honolulu, Oahu, T. H.;

H. R. 6218. An act to authorize payment by the Federal Government of the cost of making certain studies necessary to assist the Menominee Tribe of Indians to prepare for the termination of Federal supervision;

H. R. 6332. An act to amend the act of October 11, 1949, to specify the fee which will be paid for services performed by United States commissioners with respect to the commitment of individuals to St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 7552. An act to amend sections 220 and 221 (d) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920;

H. R. 7641. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with Federal and non-Federal agencies in the prevention of waterfowl depredations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7663. An act to provide for settlement in part of certain claims of the Uintah and White River Bands of Ute Indians in Court of Claims case No. 47568, through restoration of subsurface rights in certain lands formerly a part of the Uintah Indian Reservation;

H. R. 7887. An act to authorize the commissioner of public lands to sell public lands under certain circumstances without public auction;

H. R. 8552. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the town of Chincoteague, Va., permanent easements on certain lands for the purpose of taking subterranean water;

H. R. 9280. An act relating to the plan for control of the property of the Menominee Indian Tribe, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9593. An act to simplify accounting, facilitate the payment of obligations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9970. An act to provide for the disposition of the Stockton Air Force Station and the Stockton Annex, Sharpe General Depot, Calif.;

H. R. 10630. An act relating to the District Court of Guam;

H. R. 10766. An act to authorize the payment of compensation for certain losses and damages caused by United States Armed Forces during World War II; and

H. J. Res. 511. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut to confer certain additional powers upon the Interstate Sanitation Commission, established by said States pursuant to Public Resolution 62, 74th Congress, August 27, 1935.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

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

H. R. 6024. An act to withdraw and restore to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain land at Kaakaukui, Honolulu, Oahu, T. H.;

H. R. 6218. An act to authorize payment by the Federal Government of the cost of making certain studies necessary to assist the Menominee Tribe of Indians to prepare for the termination of Federal supervision;

H. R. 7552. An act to amend sections 220 and 221 (d) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920;

H. R. 7663. An act to provide for settlement in part of certain claims of the Uintah and White River Bands of Ute Indians in Court of Claims case No. 47568, through restoration of subsurface rights in certain lands formerly a part of the Uintah Indian Reservation;

H. R. 7887. An act to authorize the commissioner of public lands to sell public lands under certain circumstances without public auction; and

H. R. 9280. An act relating to the plan for control of the property of the Menominee Indian Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6332. An act to amend the act of October 11, 1949, to specify the fee which will be paid for services performed by United States commissioners with respect to the commitment of individuals to St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 10630. An act relating to the District Court of Guam; and

H. J. Res. 511. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut to confer certain additional powers upon the Interstate Sanitation Commission, established by said States pursuant to Public Resolution 62, 74th Congress, August 27,

1935; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7641. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with Federal and non-Federal agencies in the prevention of waterfowl depredations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 8552. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the town of Chincoteague, Va., permanent easements on certain lands for the purpose of taking subterranean water; and

H. R. 9970. An act to provide for the disposition of the Stockton Air Force Station and the Stockton Annex, Sharpe General Depot, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 9593. An act to simplify accounting, facilitate the payment of obligations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 10766. An act to authorize the payment of compensation for certain losses and damages caused by United States Armed Forces during World War II; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas and by unanimous consent, the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, and consider the nomination under the heading "New Report."

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nomination on the Executive Calendar under the heading "New Report" will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Frederick A. Seaton, of Nebraska, to be Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to say I think the President made a very fine nomination when he named our former colleague, Fred Seaton to be Secretary of the Interior. I served in this body with him for a short time. I found him to be a man of sterling integrity and keen intellect, one who was very conscious of the obligations he owed to this country, which had

done so much for him. I am very glad to see him elevated to a high position in the President's Cabinet.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should also like to commend the President for his nomination of Fred Seaton, our former colleague in this body. I have known him for a good many years, and knew him long before he became a Member of the Senate. I served briefly with him in this Chamber. I believe he has the capability to make an outstanding Secretary of the Interior. I am glad that the committee has very promptly recommended the confirmation of his nomination.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I voted in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for the confirmation of the nomination of ex-Senator Seaton to be Secretary of the Interior because he is a man of good character, and because I believe the President of the United States is entitled, except under unusual circumstances, to have an official family of his own choosing and preference.

However, I believe the RECORD should show that many pertinent questions, asked by members of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, were left unanswered by the man who is about to become the chief custodian of the natural resources of the United States.

Mr. Seaton becomes Secretary of the Interior following a regime which, in my opinion, has done more damage to true conservation values than has any other Interior Department administration during the modern era.

I believe that six major challenges face the new Secretary. They are these:

First. To halt—and possibly rescind—the widespread oil and gas drilling which perverts the original and primary purpose of our great system of national wildlife refuges.

Second. To save the Hells Canyon hydroelectric power site, the finest left on the continent of North America, from piecemeal private exploitation.

Third. To cancel the Al Sarena mining claims, which have resulted in no mining of ore, but only in the cutting of over 2 million feet of valuable public fir and pine timber in the Rogue River National Forest, and to support legislation which will in the future preserve national forest timber from going to mining patentees.

Fourth. To deny secretarial sanction to efforts to bring about commercial invasion of our scenic system of national parks and monuments.

Fifth. To reverse administration plans for choking off the migratory fish runs, elk grazing ranges, and wilderness areas of the Clearwater River watershed.

Sixth. To withhold secretarial approval from such anticonservation legislation as the Ellsworth-Cordon timber exchange bill and the Hope-Aiken grazing bill.

How Mr. Seaton measures up to these issues, Mr. President, will decide in history whether he is to be another Douglas McKay or possibly another Gifford Pinchot.

Mr. MALONE subsequently said: Mr. President, on June 5 the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported

unanimously the nomination of Frederick A. Seaton, of Nebraska, to be Secretary of the Interior.

I wish to commend the committee for a unanimous report to the Senate, and the Senate for unanimous confirmation of former Senator Seaton.

It has been traditional for many years that the Secretary of the Interior should come from a Western State.

Nebraska is a Western State. As a member of the National Reclamation Association of the 17 Western States, west of a line through central Dakotas, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas, it is semiarid requiring irrigation. I believe that Senator Seaton understands western problems and will make a fine Secretary of the Interior. He has integrity and the experience necessary for that important position. He has served as a member of the Senate and in many other important posts of public service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified immediately of the nomination today confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, following a brief announcement I desire to make, there may be the usual morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, subject to a 2-minute limitation on statements.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce, for the information of the Senate, that following the disposition of the unfinished business, which is Calendar No. 1896, Senate bill 3108, to encourage the construction of modern Great Lakes bulk cargo vessels, on which there is a debate limitation agreement, the Senate will take up the following bills:

Calendar No. 2065, H. R. 9536, the General Government matters appropriation bill for 1957;

Calendar No. 2064, H. R. 9739, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1957;

Calendar No. 2030, S. 3149, to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, in order to permit certain air carriers to grant free or reduced rate transportation to ministers of religion;

Calendar No. 2039, S. 3449, relating to the reinvestment by air carriers of the

proceeds from the sale or other disposition of certain operating property and equipment;

Calendar No. 2063, S. 3365, to amend section 410 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to change the requirements for obtaining a freight forwarder permit;

Calendar No. 2084, S. 3857, to clarify section 1103 (d) of title XI (Federal Ship Mortgage Insurance) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended;

Calendar No. 2085, H. R. 9824, to establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability or disease incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean conflict;

Calendar No. 2086, S. 1614, to amend the act entitled "An act to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry milk solids," title 21, United States Code, section 321c;

Calendar No. 2089, H. R. 2840, to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas;

Calendar No. 2090, S. 3907, to amend section 345 of the Public Health Service Act;

Calendar No. 2091, S. 3620, to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children;

Calendar No. 2092, S. 3958, to assist in increasing the number of adequately trained professional and practical nurses;

Calendar No. 2093, S. 3430, to promote the progress of medicine and to advance the national health and welfare by creating a National Library of Medicine;

Calendar No. 2110, S. 3307, to amend section 9 (d) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to authorize jurisdiction in Federal courts in certain reemployment cases;

Calendar No. 2111, H. R. 6274, to provide that no fee shall be charged a veteran discharged under honorable conditions for furnishing him or his next of kin or legal representative a copy of a certificate showing his service in the Armed Forces;

Calendar No. 2112, H. R. 5516, to amend title III of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 to provide that service as an Army field clerk, or as a field clerk, Quartermaster Corps, shall be counted for purposes of retirement under title III of that act, and for other purposes;

Calendar No. 2113, H. R. 8102, to provide for the disposition of moneys arising from deductions made from carriers on account of the loss of or damage to military material in transit;

Calendar No. 2114, H. R. 8693, to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, in relation to the refund of reenlistment bonuses;

Calendar No. 2115, H. R. 8922, to provide for the relief of certain members of the uniformed services; and

Calendar No. 2076, H. R. 6376, the Alaska mental health bill.

We hope that on the disposition of the bills I have enumerated the Senate may proceed to the consideration of the social security bill. It may be that we can have a general statement on that bill by

the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee on tomorrow or perhaps on Friday, or it might even go over until Monday. Although there will be votes on the pending bill, and a quorum call, and perhaps yea-and-nay votes on some amendments and on the question of final passage, so far as the leadership is aware, there is no great controversy which will require yea-and-nay votes on any of the measures I have announced today.

So Members who desire to make plans for the weekend may know that we do not anticipate that we shall have before us any controversial measures requiring a number of yea-and-nay votes on either Friday or Monday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order entered, routine morning business is now in order.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE BUDGET, 1957, FOR THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL—PROPOSED PROVISION FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, MILITARY FUNCTIONS (S. DOC. NO. 127)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1957, in the amount of \$889,400, for the Architect of the Capitol, and a draft of a proposed provision for the Department of Defense—Military Functions, which with the accompanying papers was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

RESOLUTIONS OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE 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 House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on May 14, 1956, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States against accepting or taking action upon the findings and recommendations of the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States against accepting or taking action upon the findings and recommendations of the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions

Whereas the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions, established on January 14, 1955, under Executive Order 10588, submitted its final report, including findings and recommendations, to the President of the United States on April 23, 1956; and

Whereas the findings and recommendations of said Commission are detrimental to the best interests of all veterans; and

Whereas any action taken favoring the recommendations as submitted by said Commission would be unfair, unjust, inequitable

and contrary to the concept of benefits to veterans: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the President of the United States to take no action upon the report of the Commission on Veterans' Pensions; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States reject any legislation submitted to it based upon the report of the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions; 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.

LUMINOUS MARKING OF RAILROAD CARS TO PREVENT ACCIDENTS—LETTERS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I have received from George W. Dewey, executive secretary of the Oregon Farm Bureau Federation, a copy of a resolution which deserves the most careful consideration. What the Farm Bureau suggests, Mr. President, in their resolution, would undoubtedly reduce the number of deaths that occur annually from people running into freight cars because of the difficulty of seeing them at night.

I referred the question to the Interstate Commerce Commission a few weeks ago. Their position is explained by their Director of the Bureau of Safety and Service in a letter he has written in answer.

I am sure that if the board of directors of one of the Nation's railroads were to take the initiative in marking their cars with some luminous paint, as suggested in the Oregon Farm Bureau Federation resolution, that particular railroad would gain for itself not only the thanks of untold thousands but an immense amount of favorable publicity and good will throughout the country. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this letter from Mr. Dewey embodying the resolution, and the letter from C. W. Taylor, Director of the Bureau of Safety and Service of the Interstate Commerce Commission, be printed in the RECORD.

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

OREGON FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
May 4, 1956.

The Honorable RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: At the last annual meeting of the Oregon Farm Bureau Federation, the voting delegates, representing 8,000 farm and ranch families in Oregon, included in the policy a resolution pertaining to the equipping of railroad cars so that they can be readily seen at night.

The resolution is as follows:

"Highway railroad crossings, at night, pose a danger to motorists due to poor visibility, and there have been a number of fatalities due to accidents at these crossings in Oregon.

"As this condition also exists in other States, we recommend that the Interstate Commerce Commissioner put into effect regulations that would compel the railroads to mark their flat, box, or log cars by means of reflectors, luminous paint, or other means."

This resolution came through the resolution process of this farm organization because of the many rural crossings in Oregon that are unlighted, creating not only a serious traffic hazard but causing fatalities as well.

Two bills have been introduced, H. R. 2399 and H. R. 8899. We would appreciate your comments as to the status of the bills as well as your own personal feeling with reference to this type of regulatory legislation.

With every good wish, I remain,

Very truly yours,

GEORGE W. DEWEY,
Executive Secretary.

MAY 23, 1956.

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: This is in reference to your letter of May 17, relative to the resolution passed by the Oregon Farm Bureau Federation, pertaining to the marking of the sides of railroad cars with reflectors or luminous paint to minimize the possibility of accidents at railroad-highway grade crossings.

This is a matter over which, under existing law, the Commission has no jurisdiction and accordingly I am without authority to take any administrative action placing into effect the terms of the resolution.

With reference to proposed legislation embodied in H. R. 2399 and H. R. 8899, which you mention, it is my opinion that either bill would provide the protection which the Federation seeks, as expressed in its resolution, but that H. R. 8899 more nearly coincides with our thinking for the requirements of such legislation.

I shall be glad to furnish any further information you may desire with respect to this matter.

Very truly yours,

C. W. TAYLOR,
Director.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

S. 3681. A bill to modify certain restrictions with respect to holding more than one office under the United States (Rept. No. 2143).

By Mr. HOLLAND, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment:

S. 3559. A bill to amend the act of August 31, 1954, as amended, so as to extend the availability of emergency credit to farmers and stockmen (Rept. No. 2144).

By Mr. HOLLAND, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments:

H. R. 10285. An act to merge production credit corporations in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for retirement of Government capital in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for supervision of production credit associations; and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2145).

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments:

H. R. 9052. An act to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to continue for an additional period of 2 years the authority provided thereunder for the regulation of exports (Rept. No. 2147).

DOMESTIC TUNGSTEN, ASBESTOS, FLUORSPAR, AND COLUMBIUM-TANTALUM PRODUCTION AND PURCHASE ACT OF 1956

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interior and Insular

Affairs, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 3982) to provide for the maintenance of production of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 2146) thereon. I recommend that the bill, as amended, be passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

EXTENSION OF THE 1953 MALONE-ASPINALL ACT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The committee report on the bill was unanimous?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; and the committee reports the bill favorably, with two amendments.

Mr. MALONE. I understand that the bill is a simple extension of the 1953 Malone-Aspinall Act, with the addition of fluorspar and with the exception of the mineral provisions included in the 1953 act, which Dr. Arthur Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, and also a member of the National Security Council, has testified before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that he can and will continue to purchase during the life of the legislation, or until the President's Cabinet Committee on Minerals presents a permanent acceptable plan.

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 4002. A bill to provide for the establishment of additional animal disease laboratory facilities at or near Montana State College; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 4003. A bill to extend Federal recognition posthumously to Lt. Col. Lee J. Merkel, Air National Guard of the United States, as a colonel, Air National Guard of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. WELKER:

S. 4004. A bill to amend the act of April 6, 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to extend the repayment period on certain disaster loans made under the provisions of such act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 4005. A bill to disclaim any rights of the United States to the Island of Navassa; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 4006. A bill for the relief of Dr. Yong Nak Park; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 4007. A bill for the relief of the Sorensen Fish Co.; and

S. 4008. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marion Huggins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 4009. A bill to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 4010. A bill to provide increases in monthly rates of compensation for service-connected disability and death, and pensions payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration and to liberalize the requirements for awarding additional disability compensation to veterans who have dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. J. Res. 179. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim certain property in Coahoma County, Miss., to the Home Demonstration Club of Rena Lara, Mississippi, Inc.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ANIMAL DISEASE LABORATORY FACILITIES NEAR MONTANA STATE COLLEGE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the establishment of additional animal-disease laboratory facilities at or near Montana State College, located at Bozeman, Mont.

Originally it was proposed by the Department of Agriculture that these facilities be located at the Beltsville, Md., Agricultural Research Center. A budget request of \$18,915,000 was included for this item. However, the Senate Appropriations Committee disallowed the request, asking that the project be reviewed by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and that specific authorization be provided for a site other than Beltsville.

Today, the Secretary of Agriculture, in accordance with the expressed wish of Congress, has taken steps toward selection of a site for the additional animal-disease laboratory facilities. A site committee consisting of representatives of the livestock industry, land-grant colleges, the veterinary medical profession, State departments of agriculture, livestock sanitary officials, and other livestock interests is to hear proposals as to prospective sites at a meeting in St. Louis on June 27. This committee will then choose from 3 to 5 locations for on-the-ground consideration. Members of the site committee will visit these proposed locations and will present their recommendations to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, the press release issued today by the Department of Agriculture, and a telegram I received this morning from Dr. R. R. Renne, president of Montana State College. The criteria to be considered by the site committee, as set forth in the press release, are amply met by Montana State College. I may add that animal-industry leaders of Montana strongly support Senator MANSFIELD's and my proposal to establish these needed facilities, which will

be of great help to the livestock industry not only in Montana and other Western States, but throughout the country. Our colleague from Montana, Representative LEE METCALF, is today introducing a companion bill in the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the release and telegram will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 4002) to provide for the establishment of additional animal-disease laboratory facilities at or near Montana State College, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The release and telegram, presented by Mr. MURRAY, are as follows:

SITE TO BE CHOSEN FOR NEW ANIMAL-DISEASE LABORATORY

Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson today took initial steps toward selection of a site for construction of new facilities for work on animal diseases. The action is in accord with suggestions from leaders in both Houses of the Congress.

Originally, it was proposed by the Department that such facilities be located at the Agricultural Research Center, Beltsville, Md., and \$18,915,000 was included in appropriation requests for construction purposes. Congress, in considering this request generally favored the new facilities, but at a location other than Beltsville.

The suggestion was made that the United States Department of Agriculture—in cooperation with the livestock industry and allied interests—select a site located close to centers of livestock production, near or in conjunction with one of the State land-grant colleges having a strong veterinary medical program, and away from concentrated metropolitan centers. The Secretary, following these suggestions, today invited submission of site proposals and set up procedures to consider them.

Notices of interest and preliminary proposals are to be in the hands of the Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service, Washington 25, D. C., by Thursday, June 21. This deadline does not, however, preclude consideration of other proposals or presentations directly to the site committee. All proposals and oral presentations will be considered by the site committee at a meeting in St. Louis, Mo., beginning on June 27 at the Statler Hotel, at 9 a. m.

The site committee will consist of leaders in the livestock industry representing beef cattle, swine, dairying, sheep, and poultry, and representatives of the land-grant colleges, the veterinary medical profession, State Departments of Agriculture, livestock sanitary officials, and other livestock interests. The site committee is to have full freedom of action in making its recommendations but will be guided by certain factors related to the functions and operating economy of the laboratory, as follows:

1. Scientific center: Near a land-grant college or university having a veterinary school or a strong animal-disease research department, which would provide the advantages of library facilities and opportunity for cooperation and association with other scientific work.

2. Human population: Near a community that could readily absorb 100-200 new families and having adequate personnel to fill 100-200 nonscientific positions; not close to an industrial, metropolitan strategic area.

3. Accessibility: Near major railroad and airline connections on a site adjacent to permanent hard-surfaced roads.

4. Land: From 200 to 400 acres is needed.

5. Construction costs: High-cost areas will be avoided.

6. Utilities:

(a) Water: 250,000 to 300,000 gallons of potable water per day required.

(b) Sewage: Provision for disposition of 150,000 to 200,000 gallons of sterile and treated effluent per day required.

(c) Electricity: 4,000 to 4,500 kilowatts per hour connected load required.

7. Availability per year of 1,000 each locally produced cattle, swine, sheep.

After hearing all proposals presented at St. Louis, the site committee will choose from 3 to 5 locations for further on-the-ground consideration. The members will then visit each of these proposed locations and will review the advantages of each of them. They will present their recommendations to the Secretary of Agriculture.

The new animal disease facility as planned will include laboratories for research simultaneously on 25 different animal diseases so arranged that there will be no possibility of exposure of animals in one section to any of the diseases on which work may be underway in another section. Complete protection for laboratory workers against diseases that may be communicable to humans will be included. Safety measures also will be adopted preventing the escape of disease organisms from the laboratory that might infect livestock herds and flocks or humans. In addition to the research, the facility will have space and equipment for testing and diagnostic work required in the livestock disease control and regulatory activities of the Department.

The livestock industry and agricultural leaders consider the need for the new laboratory to be urgent as a result of the necessary abandonment of 50-year-old inadequate facilities in Washington on July 1, 1955. This action, on the recommendation of an inspection committee of three widely known research experts on communicable diseases, resulted in the closing down of research on tuberculosis, anthrax, and other diseases of animals that also can affect humans. Similar work at Auburn, Ala., and Denver, Colo., also has had to be discontinued because of antiquated and inadequate facilities.

BOZEMAN, MONT., June 5, 1956.

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.:

Reurtel Montana Veterinary Research Laboratory at Montana Agricultural Experiment Station, Bozeman, in existence since 1929 is conducting as extensive research program livestock diseases as can be found in any land-grant college in Nation. Additionally, Mr. Wallis Huidekoper recently gave research foundation at Montana State College 110-acre irrigated ranch at Big Timber with all equipment to be used exclusively for livestock disease research. Location of national animal disease research facility adjacent to research center in animal diseases much more important than location adjacent to veterinary medical school where resources heavily diverted to teaching purposes. Many strong reasons to support location national laboratory in Montana. National Institute of Health Laboratory at Hamilton would be near and could importantly supplement animal disease research center.

More important that a disease research facility be located close to strong research facilities in chemistry, biology, bacteriology, physics, or consultation than to be located close to veterinary medical teaching facilities.

Livestock disease regulatory work in Montana under Montana Livestock Sanitary Board is model for State control of infectious animal diseases and is among foremost of this type of agency in Nation and has been

for many years. This also offers strong argument for effective collaboration from State agency if located in Montana.

In January 1956 meeting of some 50 representatives various organizations from 11 Western States met Salt Lake City consider possibility establishing federally financed animal disease research laboratory in western region. Decided such laboratory of great importance and acted to explore all feasible means for its establishment. Group elected Dr. A. P. Schneider, Boise, Idaho, chairman and Dr. K. J. Peterson, Salem, Oreg., secretary. Dr. Schneider appointed committees in each of 11 Western States to work through State organizations to promote such western laboratory in all feasible ways.

Location of animal disease research facility in western range State not only would result in more adequate study of diseases peculiar to range livestock but sparsity of population would be important in disease isolation and as national security measure. Land facilities readily available and at nominal cost. If strong support for such a Federal animal disease research facility somewhere in 11 Western States exists, strong arguments can be advanced for Montana as the location. Sending airmail confirmation this wire to Montana congressional delegation.

R. R. RENNE,
President, Montana State College.

POSTHUMOUS PROMOTION OF LT. COL. LEE J. MERKEL

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend Federal recognition posthumously to Lt. Col. Lee J. Merkel, Air National Guard of the United States, as a colonel, Air National Guard of the United States, and for other purposes.

Lt. Col. Lee J. Merkel, killed on January 31, 1956, was a veteran Kentucky pilot. Born in 1918, Merkel was graduated from Du Pont Manual High School and the University of Louisville. He enlisted in the Air Force in 1941 at age 23. A year later he won his wings as a military pilot. During World War II he served as squadron flight leader in six campaigns in north Africa, Sicily, Italy, and France. Merkel flew a total of 143 missions and on 1 occasion was shot down in Italy behind enemy lines. For his combat performance he received the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Air Medal with 5 Oak Leaf clusters, and 2 Distinguished Unit Citations.

In 1948 Merkel became base commander for the 123d Fighter-Interceptor Group, an Air National Guard unit located at Standiford Field. This unit was called to active duty in October 1950 and served in England as a fighter-bomber wing. It was returned to its Kentucky base in 1952. Lieutenant Colonel Merkel was widely recognized as one of the best pilots in the Air National Guard. As base detachment commander, a full-time job, he worked hard to persuade the State legislature to grant funds for lengthening runways to accommodate jet aircraft at Standiford. Prior to accepting full-time duties as base commander in 1948, Merkel was training officer in the Vocational Rehabilitation Service in the Veterans' Administration regional office. Civil defense and survival were strong interests of Merkel and he aimed to arouse public interest in the formulation of more adequate defense plans and train-

ing. In 1955 he headed the public employees division of the community chest campaign. He was president of the Kentucky Air National Guard Association.

Lieutenant Colonel Merkel's F-51 crashed near Bedford, Ind., on a test flight. Witnesses reported his plane was smoking, and he apparently attempted an emergency landing. He is survived by his wife, Catherine, and four children at 1104 Manning Road, Louisville, Ky.

Prior to his death and on July 12, 1955, Lieutenant Colonel Merkel appeared before a promotion board at Standiford Field and was approved for promotion to the rank of colonel, which grade was authorized for a T/O assignment as fighter group commander. Pursuant to the finding of the promotion board Lieutenant Colonel Merkel was promoted to the rank of colonel on State orders issued by the military department, Commonwealth of Kentucky, on July 4, 1955.

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to grant Federal recognition to the late Lieutenant Colonel Merkel as a full colonel in the Air Force. In view of the unselfish and distinguished service of this officer both in peace and war, and in view of the nature of his command, it is fitting and proper that this promotion be granted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4003) to extend Federal recognition posthumously to Lt. Col. Lee J. Merkel, Air National Guard of the United States, as a colonel, Air National Guard of the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CLEMENTS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

LICENSING OF PAWNBROKERS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared explaining the legislative history and purposes of the bill may be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 4009) to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

STATEMENT PRESENTED BY SENATOR ALLOTT

In essence this bill, which is similar to H. R. 11002, the pawnbroker bill, is a copy of the original pawnbroker act for the District of Columbia, approved March 2, 1889 (25 Stat. 1006) as amended March 3, 1891 (26 Stat. 841). From 1889 to 1913 pawnbrokers were licensed and carried on business in the District. During the same period unlicensed moneylenders carried on a very extensive business in the District, charging exorbitant rates of interest on small loans. The voracity of these unlicensed lenders was so great that the public demanded relief. The act approved February 4, 1913 (37 Stat. 657) was enacted primarily to drive these un-

licensed moneylenders out of the District. It sought to accomplish this purpose by reducing the authorized interest rate on small loans to one percent per month on loans of \$200 or less. In the case of *Newman ex rel Prender v. United States* (41 App. D. C. 37) the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia held that the act of 1913 repealed by implication the Pawnbrokers Act of 1889 and that since the 1913 act authorized the making of loans on collateral security of any kind, tangible or intangible, it covered the pawnbroker business as well as the small-loan business. The net effect of the act of 1913 was to drive legitimate capital out of the District of Columbia so far as small loans and the pawnbroker business was concerned, with the result that persons who would otherwise have patronized licensed lenders were driven to unlicensed, high-rate lenders in the District or to licensed lenders outside of the District.

The background of this legislation is as follows:

Congressman KEARNS of Pennsylvania requested the corporation counsel to assign an assistant to help him draft a small-loan bill for the District of Columbia. Mr. Chester H. Gray, Principal Assistant Corporation Counsel, was designated to assist Mr. KEARNS.

A bill was drafted to authorize loans of \$600 or less in the District of Columbia on which an interest rate of 3 percent per month on the first \$150, 2 percent on the next \$150, and 1 percent per month on the next \$300 of a loan in the total amount of \$600 was provided. That bill was introduced by Congressman KEARNS as H. R. 114, 84th Congress, 1st session.

The bill was referred to the House Committee on the District of Columbia which then asked the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for a report. The Commissioners referred the bill to the Citizens Advisory Council which conducted hearings on the bill and at those hearings Deputy Chief Scott, Metropolitan Police Department, recommended amendment of the bill by adding provisions relating to pawnbrokers. Deputy Chief Scott pointed out that the Police Department had for many years been relying heavily upon evidence secured from so-called pawnbrokers (in fact dealers in secondhand property) for evidence of larceny and other felonies committed in the District of Columbia. He testified that a number of serious crimes, including murder, had been solved with evidence the starting point of which was the tracing of personal property which had been pawned. Mr. Jerome Livingston, the only licensed money lender in the District of Columbia who engages in the pawnbroker business, also testified respecting the need for regulation of the pawnbroker business, pointing out that many secondhand dealers are actually engaged in the pawnbroking business, by the process of entering into agreements with persons selling them secondhand personal property to sell the same property back to the seller at stipulated higher prices, the difference, of course, representing interest at astronomical rates.

On the recommendation of the Citizens Advisory Council, Mr. Gray, accompanied by Deputy Chief Scott reported to Representative KEARNS in substance the testimony of Deputy Chief Scott and as a result Mr. KEARNS requested the drafting of the necessary amendments to include pawnbrokers in the small-loan bill.

A study of small-loan and pawnbrokers laws revealed that these activities are entirely separate and distinct phases of the money-lending business, operating under completely different procedures. The small-loan business is conducted solely on the security of written or printed evidences of indebtedness, whereas the pawnbroker business is conducted on the security of the pledge and possession of tangible personal property.

In view of the different techniques employed it was considered desirable to rewrite

H. R. 114 so as to provide one title for the small-loan business, a separate title for the pawnbroker business, and a third title for regulatory provisions common to both types of business. The bill as so rewritten was introduced as H. R. 6775. After hearings by the Subcommittee of the House District of Columbia Committee, the bill was favorably reported by the committee and was passed by the House on July 25, 1955. Nothing having occurred since the submission of H. R. 6775 to the Senate, it was considered desirable by its sponsors to have that portion of H. R. 6775 which deals with the pawnbroker business introduced as a bill separate and distinct from the small-loan bill. As many of the regulatory features common to both types of loans had been set forth in title I relating to small loans and merely incorporated by reference in title II relating to pawnbrokers it was necessary to extract those features and specifically incorporate them in the pawnbroker bill to provide complete coverage. A bill containing the pawnbroker provisions as passed by the House and as thus completed was introduced in the House on May 3, 1956, by Mr. KLEIN as H. R. 11002.

Section 1 of this bill, which I have previously indicated is similar to H. R. 11002, contains definitions of terms used in the bill.

Section 2 prohibits engaging in business as a pawnbroker without first obtaining a license from the Commissioners. It further prohibits the use of the word "pawnbroker" or the display of any symbol commonly used by pawnbrokers by any unlicensed business.

Section 3 sets forth qualifications for license, including the requirement that applicants have available for use in the business of making loans cash capital of at least \$20,000.

Section 4 requires applicants to file a bond running to the District in the sum of \$5,000 conditioned upon the compliance by the applicant with provisions of the act and all rules and regulations made pursuant thereto. It authorizes any person injured by noncompliance with law or regulation by a licensee to maintain suit in his own name and recover on the bond such damages as shall be adjudged.

Section 5 provides that after investigation and after satisfying the Commissioners of his qualifications the license shall be issued to the applicant and that the annual license fee shall be \$500.

Section 6 provides for the revocation, suspension, and renewal of licenses.

Section 7 imposes upon the Commissioners the duty of enforcing the act; authorizes the Commissioners to investigate the business and records of licensees and authorizes the Commissioners to require by subpoena the production of books, papers, and records and the attendance, and examination under oath, of all persons whose testimony they may require relative to loans or business of licensees.

Section 8 prohibits false or misleading advertising respecting the pawnbroker business.

Section 9 is the interest section. It directs the District Commissioners to investigate from time to time the economic conditions and other factors relating to the business of making pawnbroker loans; to ascertain pertinent facts necessary to determine what maximum rate of interest may be permitted upon the basis of such ascertained facts and to fix by regulation the maximum rate of interest on pawnbroker loans which will induce efficiently managed commercial capital to be invested in such business in sufficient amounts to make available adequate facilities to individuals seeking such loans at reasonable rates of interest and which will afford those engaged in such business a fair and reasonable return upon the assets.

Pending the determination of such rates by the Commissioners, the bill authorizes

pawnbrokers to charge not exceeding 2 percent per month, or fraction thereof, upon any loan not exceeding \$200, or more than 1 percent per month, or fraction thereof, upon any loan exceeding \$200 and not exceeding \$1,000, and 8 percent per annum (the maximum statutory rate now in effect) on any loan in excess of \$1,000.

Section 10 prohibits the charging of interest in excess of the existing statutory rate of 6 percent per annum, or 8 percent per annum upon an instrument in writing, by any person except a licensee under the act and declares invalid any instrument evidencing a loan made in the District in violation of the provisions of the bill.

Section 11 requires every pawnbroker to record in a book at the time of each loan an accurate account and description of the goods pawned, the amount of money loaned thereon, the time of pledging the same, and the rate of interest to be paid on such loan, the name and residence of the person pawning such goods together with a description of such person; requires that the book at all reasonable times be open to inspection by the Commissioners; and prohibits disclosure by any officer of the District of entries in such book to any person other than an official having a right thereto in his official capacity.

Section 12 requires every pawnbroker at the time of each loan to deliver to any person pawning any goods a memorandum signed by him containing the substance of the entry required to be made by him in this book.

Section 13 prohibits any pawnbroker from selling any pawned article until the same has remained 1 year in his possession, unless with the consent of the pawnbroker. It also provides that all sales shall be made at public auction and shall be made or conducted by licensed auctioneers.

Section 14 requires that notice of every such sale be published at least 6 days prior thereto in 1 or more daily newspapers printed in the District, such notice to specify the time and place where such sale is to take place, the name of the auctioneer and a description of the article to be sold. In addition the pawnbroker is required to mail to the pawnbroker a copy of such notice.

Section 15 provides that the surplus money, if any, arising from any such sale, after deducting the interest then due and the expenses of advertising any such sale, shall be paid over by the pawnbroker to the person who would be entitled to redeem the pledge in case no such sale had taken place.

Section 16 provides penalties for violation of the act of fine of not more than \$300 or imprisonment for not more than 90 days; declares that any contract of loan from which any act shall have been done which constitutes a violation of the bill shall be void and that the lender shall have no right to collect or receive any principal or charges whatsoever on account thereof.

Section 17 authorizes the Commissioners to make and enforce such regulations as they deem necessary to carry out the purposes of the act.

Section 18 exempts from application of the act, firms, stock companies, and credit unions doing business in the District of Columbia under the supervision of the Federal Reserve System, Comptroller of the Currency, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, or the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, or to loans made by them.

Section 19 repeals the act of February 4, 1913, as amended, insofar as the same applies to the business of lending money on the security of pledge and possession of tangible personal property.

Section 20 provides if any provision of the act be held invalid the remainder of the act shall not be affected thereby.

Section 21 provides that the act shall take effect at the expiration of 60 days after the date of its approval.

It is my hope and belief that this bill will assist the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to protect the citizens of this area from exorbitant interest rates when it becomes necessary for them to acquire money immediately by pledging personal property, and that it will assist the Police Department of the District to secure necessary information for the prosecution of criminals.

CARE OF MENTALLY ILL OF ALASKA—AMENDMENT

Mr. LANGER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 6376) to provide for the hospitalization and care of the mentally ill of Alaska, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1956—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, on yesterday the Senate Committee on Finance filed its report on H. R. 7225, the social security bill, which will be before the Senate today or tomorrow. In the main, it is a good bill, and contains many excellent provisions. However, I regret that the bill as reported to the Senate fails to contain some of the best provisions of the bill as passed by the House of Representatives. It was the judgment of the Senate committee that all provisions relating to social security insurance for disabled persons should be stricken from the bill. It was also the judgment of the committee that all provisions relating to retirement of working women, wives, and dependent mothers at age 62 should be stricken from the bill. It was also the judgment of the committee that amendments to the public-welfare program, even though one particular amendment was sponsored by 46 Senators, should not be included in the bill as reported.

Mr. President, these amendments will be submitted. The distinguished dean of the Senate and its President pro tempore [Mr. GEORGE], who now is presiding over the Senate, intends to submit, for himself, the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], an amendment restoring to the bill the disability provisions. On behalf of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], I submit the amendment, and ask unanimous consent that it be received, printed, and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators GEORGE, BARRETT, BENDER, BIBLE, BUSH, CHAVEZ, CLEMENTS, DANIEL, DOUGLAS, EASTLAND, ELLENDER, GREEN, HENNINGSON, HILL, HOLLAND, HUMPHREY, JACKSON, JOHNSTON of South Carolina, KEFAUVER, KENNEDY, KERR, KUCHEL, LANGER, LEHMAN, MAGNUSON, MANSFIELD, MCCARTHY, MCCLELLAN, MONROE, MORSE, MURRAY, NEELY, NEUBERGER,

O'MAHONEY, PASTORE, PAYNE, PURTELL, SCHOEPEL, SCOTT, SMATHERS, SPARKMAN, STENNIS, SYMINGTON, WELKER, and YOUNG, I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to House bill 7225, which would increase the Federal matching for State welfare purposes. I ask that the amendment be received, printed, and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. LONG. Also, Mr. President, on behalf of myself, I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by me, to House bill 7225, to restore to the bill the provisions to lower the retirement age for working women, dependent mothers, and also wives of retired workers.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. LONG. I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that, although the committee report is rather lengthy, the minority views appear at the end of it. Beginning at page 127 of the committee report are the minority views of three members of the committee, namely, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], former chairman of the committee, who has had much experience with the social security and public welfare provisions of our law, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the junior Senator from Louisiana. The minority views are signed by all three.

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. WILEY:

Address delivered by him on May 30, 1956, at De Pere, Wis., Memorial Day patriotic observance.

Address delivered by him over radio station WGN, Chicago, Ill., June 3, 1956, discussing his 20-point legislative program.

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF SENATOR CAPEHART

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, today is the birthday anniversary of the distinguished Senator from Indiana, HOMER CAPEHART. [Applause.]

I feel that I speak for all Members of the Senate in wishing for him many happy returns of the day and a continuation of his distinguished career for many years to come.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish to join the distinguished Senator from North Dakota in felicitating the distinguished Senator from Indiana on the anniversary of his birth and in wishing him many happy returns of the day.

Mr. CAPEHART. I thank the able Senators from North Dakota and Texas.

TWELFTH ANNIVERSARY OF D-DAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I think it is fitting to note that this is the 12th anniversary of D-day—the

day that our soldiers and our allies invaded the continent of Europe.

Just 12 years ago, American soldiers landed on the beachheads of Normandy to face the dreaded strength of Hitler's armies. It was the mightiest invasion of history—one that has no parallel in size or in courage.

To the enslaved people of Europe, it represented a glorious day, for which they had been waiting many long years. To the tyrants who had enslaved them, it represented the beginning of the end.

In the years that have passed, D-day and Normandy have become a chapter in history. But they are more than that. The sacrifice of life—American life—represented the stake this country has in freedom, and such a stake is too precious to be lost.

It is a fresh and vivid memory to thousands of Americans who participated in the heroic battle. It is also a fresh and vivid memory to two of our most distinguished correspondents, William S. White and Don Whitehead, whose coverage of the battle gained them worldwide fame.

I am proud to count both of them among my friends.

This is not just a day to recall past glory, however. It is a day in which to draw inspiration from the sacrifices of the past in order to face the problems of the present—problems fully as great as those which were before our Nation on June 6, 1944.

We can hope and pray that never again will American soldiers have to walk into the jaws of death and destruction. But we can also resolve that we will face up to the issues of the present with the same high courage that was the hallmark of the men who fought at Normandy.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR HIRAM BINGHAM

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I have just learned with deep regret of the death of former United States Senator Hiram Bingham, whom I recall as an old friend of the President pro tempore of the Senate.

Hiram Bingham was a man of great distinction in my State. I first knew him when he was a professor at Yale University before World War I. I was one of his pupils. I studied under him in his courses on South American history. I also served under him when I was a private in the Connecticut National Guard and he was a captain, in 1916.

It was interesting to me that Hiram Bingham should have entered the Connecticut National Guard at that time, when our country was in danger of war along the Mexican border. Although he was a somewhat older man, he offered his services, and served with distinction in that organization.

Later he became interested in politics in the State of Connecticut. He became lieutenant governor, then governor, and then United States Senator. He served with distinction in this body for a number of years. Later he served as chairman of our loyalty board at the Federal level. I believe that his work in that

field was of a high order, and commanded the respect of all who came in contact with it.

I say with deep regret that Connecticut has lost one of her great sons. To members of his family, many of whom I know and who are friends of mine, I offer my very deep sympathy, and the assurance that Members of the United States Senate mourn the passing of an eminent American and a distinguished former Member of this body.

DEATH OF FORMER REPRESENTATIVE FOSTER STEARNS

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, on yesterday news was received in Washington of the death of the Honorable Foster Stearns, a former Representative in Congress from the Second District of New Hampshire.

Mr. Stearns had a long and distinguished career of public service. In his earlier years he served in the State Department, and later he filled various assignments in our Foreign Service—military attaché to Belgium, third secretary of our Embassy in Constantinople, and second secretary of the American Embassy in Paris. A lieutenant in the 16th Infantry, 1st Division, during World War I, he was wounded in action and received decorations for valor. A faithful Catholic, he was knighted by Pope Pius XI.

Mr. Stearns entered the New Hampshire Legislature in 1937. In 1939 he was elected to the Congress of the United States, where he served with distinction for 6 years. His background of experience in diplomatic posts made him a most effective and useful member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

It was my privilege to represent the same congressional district after his retirement, and to enjoy the benefit of his friendship and counsel. New Hampshire has lost a devoted citizen, a brave soldier, and an able public servant.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, my colleague from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton] has announced to the Senate the passing of former Representative Foster Stearns, of New Hampshire. I wish to add my word of tribute to the tribute paid him by my colleague.

Foster Stearns had a long and distinguished career. He was the son of the Mr. Stearns who was so closely associated with Calvin Coolidge. He played a part in the affairs of the years preceding and following 1920. He represented this country ably and well for many years in the Foreign Service.

He was chosen to reorganize the library of the Vatican. He served for 6 years, from 1938 to 1944, in the House of Representatives, and since that time played a prominent part in many civic activities. I join my colleague in expressing regret at his passing, and I am happy to pay this tribute to him.

THE ALASKA MENTAL HEALTH BILL

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, House bill 6376, the Alaska mental health bill, has been favorably reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and is scheduled for early action by the Senate, possibly today.

I am certain that every Member of the Senate who has read the committee report—and I hope all Senators have read it—knows that the Senate committee's version of the bill strikes from the House version all of the controversial commitment and care provisions. Among the organizations that voiced strenuous objections to the provisions of the bill as it passed the House was the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, with headquarters in Chicago.

I am happy to be able to report to the Senate that the President of the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons now has written to me, as chairman of the committee, expressing approval of the bill as reported to the Senate. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the association president's letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

COLUMBUS, OHIO, June 2, 1956.
Senator JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and
Insular Affairs, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: Thank you very much for your letter of May 10 and the copy of the hearing for the bill for the Alaskan Mental Hospital. I was very much pleased to see the thoroughgoing manner in which all of the material and the opinions had been worked over by the committee.

It was extremely unfortunate that there was so much intemperate expression on both sides of this matter. I believe that there were some instances in which the bill was faultily worded and I believe that these faults have been corrected. I feel quite certain also that they could have been corrected without much of the heat that has been engendered. I do not honestly feel that either side had a corner on the choice of injudicious and intemperate expressions. I don't believe that there were any points of difference that could not have been settled coolly, rationally, and in open discussion. So far as I can see, the Members of the Congress and the committee conducted themselves in a manner that might have been taken as a good example by the proponents and the opponents on the outside. I believe that the bill as it is now recorded will be satisfactory and I hope that it is passed.

Yours sincerely,
CHARLES W. PAVEY, M. D.,
President, Association of American
Physicians and Surgeons.

SELECTION OF SITE FOR ANIMAL- DISEASE LABORATORY

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, today the Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Ezra Taft Benson, took the initial steps toward the selection of a site for construction of an animal-disease laboratory.

During the debate in the Senate on the agricultural appropriations bill, which was handled by the able junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], there was considerable discussion and a rather extended colloquy on voting additional funds for the construction of additional facilities at Beltsville.

I think it is generally agreed by the Congress that these new facilities should be located in the Middle West. The Department of Agriculture has taken the

same view in its release today. The Department of Agriculture in its release today mentions several items that would be given consideration in the selection of the new location for the animal-disease laboratory. Principally among them was the statement that the facilities should be located at least close or adjacent to one of the land-grant colleges or universities having a strong school of veterinary medicine or a strong animal-research program.

Mr. President, the Kansas State College, at Manhattan, is a land-grant college; it was established in 1863, and it has a veterinary school that is listed as No. 1 in the Nation. This college is already conducting a great animal-research program. It is staffed with competent persons, and has proof of the character of the education at its veterinary school. I submit only the fact that students from all over the Nation make every effort to enter this veterinary school, which at all times has a waiting list.

Every other requirement mentioned by the Department of Agriculture can be met at the Kansas State College, at Manhattan, and the community surrounding it.

Manhattan is in the geographical center of the United States; it is on a major railroad, and has major airline connections. The location of this research laboratory at the Kansas State College would place it in the center of the great livestock-producing areas of the Midwest. On the south we have the great Flint Hills pasture section, which is nationally known; and on the north and west we have the great grazing and range country of the Sand Hills of Nebraska; on the east we have the great cattle- and hog-producing areas of Nebraska, Missouri, and Iowa.

Mr. President, I and others will be giving the site selection committee this and any other additional information they need.

I had intended to ask unanimous consent to have the release issued today by the Secretary of Agriculture printed in the RECORD, but I am informed that it has already been so printed on request of the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] in connection with a bill which he introduced today.

SENATOR WILEY OF WISCONSIN

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, while we all realize it is difficult for any of us here to participate in intrastate politics in any State other than our own, I feel I want to make a few remarks with regard to the situation in Wisconsin.

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I have enjoyed, and value highly, my association with our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]; and with him, I have worked closely in supporting the foreign policies of the Eisenhower administration. We have been together on the Committee under the chairmanships of Senator Connolly, Senator Vandenberg, Senator George, and Sena-

tor Wiley himself. I feel that those of us who have the international viewpoint appreciate the courage and loyalty of our colleague, in representing a State such as his, which has a less international point of view, for standing by his convictions and making the fight for the principles in which he believes, irrespective of the effect on his own political future.

FORMER SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR DOUGLAS MCKAY

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I happened to be present in the Chamber a few moments ago when the nomination of Mr. Frederick A. Seaton to be Secretary of the Interior was considered and confirmed.

I join with other Senators in their fine statements regarding Mr. Seaton. However, in the course of the discussion, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] made some reference to a former Secretary of the Interior. I believe that Bernard Baruch once said that every man has a right to his own opinion, but no man has a right to misstate the facts.

The fact of the matter is that it was my privilege in the other body to serve on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, where it was my good fortune to come in contact with Mr. McKay and his work. I do not know of any more conscientious man who has ever served in the Cabinet. I do not know of any member of the Cabinet who has ever possessed finer qualities than he possesses.

All the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the House regarded him with high esteem. The President has been fortunate in the selection of members of his Cabinet. They are men of unimpeachable integrity and high character.

I am sure that all of us will agree that Mr. McKay was one of the best.

QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE DOMESTIC PARITY PLAN FOR WHEAT

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, my attention has just been called to an interesting survey made by the Uhlmann Grain Co., of Chicago, in regard to the domestic parity plan for wheat, sometimes known as the two-price system.

The Uhlmann Grain Co. is one of the old, established firms in the grain trade, with offices and connections in the principal cities of the Nation, and has extensive contacts in every area of our Nation.

This company mailed a postal card to approximately 4,000 farmers, country elevator operators, terminal elevator operators, and other miscellaneous individuals and firms, such as processors, merchandisers, brokers, and so forth, expressly asking the question whether they were or were not in favor of the domestic parity plans for wheat.

On the basis of the reply cards which were returned to the company, 88.6 percent of the farmers from whom it received replies indicated their approval

of the domestic parity plan; 80.3 percent of the country elevator operators, 91 percent of the terminal elevator operators, and 86.7 percent of all others indicated their approval of the plan. Overall, 86.3 percent of those who returned cards stated they were in favor of the domestic parity plan for wheat.

The survey covered the main wheat-growing areas of the United States, including the Southwest, the Far Northwest and Northwest, the Central States, and some Eastern States. Personally, I was most pleased to get the information contained in this survey, as it confirms previous surveys and studies that I have made on my own account.

During the debate on the farm bill, I stated that I did not believe that either the flexible or rigid price support would solve the wheat problem. It is my contention that wheat is one crop that must be solved on a commodity basis.

The present acreage restrictions, the present costly system of export subsidies, and the continuous building up of our wheat surpluses will completely destroy the wheatgrowers of this Nation. Under the domestic parity plan, the wheat producer would secure full parity for the part of his crop consumed at home. The natural forces of supply and demand would be the basic factors in determining production, and the huge supplies of surpluses that have been such a depressing price factor would not continue to be harvested. Acreage allotments and other Government controls would be discarded, and the American farmer would again be the master of his own production plans and desires.

It is a program that must again have consideration in the next session of Congress.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF SENATOR GORE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the new Federal highway construction bill which the Senate passed last week is a monument to the hard and dedicated efforts of the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] as much as any other person. I am sure that other Senators were as impressed as I was with the tremendous knowledge and the unflinching comprehension of every aspect of the highway bill which the Senator from Tennessee displayed in guiding this bill, hour after hour, through its long debate on the Senate floor.

At the same time, while devoting untold hours to this vast project, the Senator from Tennessee has found time to display valuable leadership in such other important fields as the great necessity for Federal initiative in the development of peaceful use of atomic energy and the reform of our methods of election financing.

These accomplishments of the junior Senator from Tennessee were the subject of a column by the noted reporter of our national scene, Miss Doris Fleeson, in the Washington Star of June 4, 1956, and I ask unanimous consent to have this column reprinted in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

GORE MAY BE ON NATIONAL TICKET—LIBERAL RECORD IN HOUSE AND SENATE COULD EARN HIM VICE PRESIDENTIAL BID

(By Doris Fleeson)

When Senator ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee, assured a Massachusetts rally that the State's junior Senator, JOHN F. KENNEDY, would ornament the Presidential ticket in either spot at any time, GORE was only repaying a compliment.

Senator KENNEDY's own answer to questions about his vice presidential ambitions has long been a suggestion that the post would go to GORE and a good thing too.

The press galleries would agree that from the standpoint of character, ability, and industry, the junior Senator from Tennessee stands very near the top of the heap. He is also very well placed geographically, being from a border State between North and South which is the political bridge Democrats like to build in a national ticket.

The care and diligence with which GORE has constructed a national liberal record in 6 terms in the House and his present first term in the Senate speak for his ambitions. But outside the circle of his associates, his political possibilities have been overshadowed by the unflagging Presidential aspirations of his colleague, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER.

KEFAUVER is 53, GORE 49. In many respects their careers have run parallel; KEFAUVER also served a long apprenticeship in the House. Both represent the new South and are internationalist. Both have an unusual degree of personal independence.

GORE's superior standing with his colleagues rests in large part on his capacity and willingness to work at the hard, dull tasks as well as the things that make headlines. Yet GORE is no pet of the reigning Southern conservative leaders as was proved by their refusal to back his plans for the Senate Lobby Committee of which he was originally chairman. When they refused, GORE, also acting in character, quit.

GORE's most recent achievement is the new highway bill, the biggest the Federal Government has ever undertaken. He began with the financial aspects, a probable reflection of his long and close association with Bernard M. Baruch, the economic elder statesman. GORE substituted a tax plan for the President's proposal to raise the money by floating bonds. After that he worked out the compromises.

A public power advocate, being from the Tennessee Valley, GORE has also been pushing for federally built atomic powerplants. The General Intelligence Agency has backed his contention that this country is lagging in that field behind the Soviets.

GORE and KEFAUVER have both behaved with great circumspection toward each other. GORE will no doubt stand aloof at Chicago until the senior Senator's fate is settled.

The KEFAUVER-style campaign against Adlai Stevenson has made one thing certain. Stevenson would not take the Senator in second place on a Stevenson slate. There or with Gov. Averell Harriman might be GORE's opportunity.

AWARD OF HONORARY DOCTOR OF LAWS DEGREE TO SENATOR KENNEDY BY ROCKHURST COLLEGE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, we in Missouri are proud of our fine universities and colleges. Among our outstanding institutions of higher learning is Rockhurst College, at Kansas City.

Last Saturday, June 2, Rockhurst College honored our colleague the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] by presenting to him the honorary degree of doctor of laws.

Before Senator KENNEDY visited Kansas City, to be honored by this outstanding liberal arts college, the Kansas City Star on May 27 carried a fine article entitled "Likeable Senator KENNEDY To Speak Here Saturday," written by John Cauley, a member of the Star's Washington Bureau. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

LIKABLE SENATOR KENNEDY TO SPEAK HERE SATURDAY

(By John R. Cauley)

WASHINGTON, May 26.—When JOHN FITZGERALD (JACK) KENNEDY, the junior United States Senator from Massachusetts, arrives in Kansas City for a speech next Saturday, midwesterners will have an opportunity to see one of the most attractive personalities in public life today.

KENNEDY is a man with political savvy and intellectual achievements. He is 38 years old, 6 feet tall, lean and erect as a West Point cadet. He has a boyish countenance which could enable him to pass for a man 10 years his junior. His heavy crop of brown and informally combed hair adds to the impression of boyish exuberance.

Indeed, when Jack first came to the Senate in 1953 and attempted to board the subway car which runs between the Senate Office Building and the Capitol, a guard sternly instructed him, "Stand back, son, and let the Senators get on first."

Tourists in the Senate galleries often are astonished when they are told that KENNEDY is a Senator. That lad, they remark, looks as if he just got out of college.

SPEECH ON WDAF-TV

Kansas Citians will have an opportunity for a first-hand appraisal of young KENNEDY when he delivers the principal address at the fourth annual Rockhurst Day dinner at the Hotel Muehlebach June 2. His speech will be televised over WDAF-TV.

Despite his youthful demeanor and appearance, Senator KENNEDY, a Democrat, is a rising political star. He is regarded by veteran observers here as one of the most able men in the Senate. In addition he is the author of a best seller, *Profiles in Courage*, a thoughtful and persuasive book about some Senators of the past who in moments of crisis staked their principles against the tides of bigotry, sectionalism, and conformity.

JACK KENNEDY is one of a family of nine children born to Mr. and Mrs. Joseph P. Kennedy. The elder Kennedy, a spectacularly successful businessman, who among other projects, now operates the Chicago Merchandise Mart, was formerly Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission in the early New Deal days, and from 1937 to 1941 was American Ambassador to the Court of St. James in London. His mother is the daughter of the former mayor of Boston, John F. (Honey-Fitz) Fitzgerald.

The second child in the family, Jack attended public schools in Brookline, Mass., a suburb of Boston. He was graduated with honors from Harvard, and also took courses at the London School of Economics and at Stanford University.

When he attempted to enlist in the Army in 1941, he was rejected because of football injuries suffered at Harvard. After a series of strengthening exercises he was accepted by the Navy and wound up in the South Pacific as a PT boat commander.

HEROISM IN PACIFIC

One dark night KENNEDY's boat was rammed and cut in two by a Japanese destroyer in a dramatic engagement off the Solomon Islands. When the boat sank, KENNEDY towed one of his wounded crewmen to a small island 3 miles away by holding a strap of the man's Mae West with his teeth.

Then, according to the Navy citation: "During the following 6 days he (KENNEDY) succeeded in getting his crew ashore and after swimming many hours attempting to secure food and water, finally effected the rescue of his men."

For this courageous action KENNEDY was awarded the Navy and Marine Corps Medal in addition to the Purple Heart. Jack himself suffered severe injuries to his spine in this engagement and during his ensuing career spent many months in the hospital and in recuperation at home. He is now fully recovered.

Originally it seemed that JACK KENNEDY was not destined for a political career. He was more the quiet, scholarly type, liked to write and some day had a hankering to be a newspaperman. However, when his brother, Joseph Kennedy, Jr., a Navy pilot, was killed in action in Europe, Jack stepped in to carry on the political tradition of the family for which Joe, Jr., had been groomed. Besides, what he had seen in the war and his travels around Europe had given him a new incentive to contribute his energies and talents to public life.

And Jack could afford to be independent. The elder Kennedy had set up million-dollar trust funds for each of his children so that they would not have to be governed by the need of money in seeking a career.

A REPRESENTATIVE IN 1946

In 1946, in his first campaign for public office, KENNEDY was elected a Member of the House from the 11th Massachusetts District by a vote of 69,093 to 26,000 for his opponent. He was reelected in 1948 and 1950.

The Kennedys, who have a fierce competitive spirit besides a shrewd political instinct, had bigger things in mind for Jack. In 1952, with the aid of almost his entire family, Jack took on another distinguished name in Massachusetts, Henry Cabot Lodge, for the United States Senate. Undaunted by the immense backing and political prestige of Lodge, the Kennedy family put on a campaign which is still the wonder of Massachusetts. Mrs. Kennedy and three of her lovely daughters gave tea parties in many communities of the State to which the women voters were invited to meet Jack and the family.

A younger brother, Robert F. Kennedy, a political comer in his own right and now chief counsel for the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee, spearheaded an organization which reached into every city and hamlet of the State.

On the occasions when the other Kennedys were mingling with voters in other parts of the State, Bob would take the platform at a meeting by himself and put the issue to the audience in this succinct manner:

"My brother Jack couldn't be here. My mother couldn't be here, my sister Eunice couldn't be here, my sister Pat couldn't be here, my sister Jean couldn't be here, but if my brother Jack were here he'd tell you that Lodge has a very bad voting record. Thank you."

When the returns were in, KENNEDY had unseated Lodge by 69,000 votes, a remarkable feat because Eisenhower carried the State by 208,000 against Adlai Stevenson, and another Republican, Christian Herter, defeated the incumbent, Paul A. Dever, a Democrat, for the governorship.

In recent days there has been considerable speculation in Washington and in the East about the possibility of KENNEDY's being

drafted as a running mate for Adlai Stevenson, should the former Illinois governor win the Democratic presidential nomination. KENNEDY is a strong supporter of Stevenson.

Jack would seem to have many qualifications for the job. He is a liberal, but not radical. He is young and handsome, articulate, intelligent, makes a good appearance on television. He's an extremely effective campaigner.

In this connection it is interesting to note that a document is being quietly circulated among Democratic leaders pointing out that a survey shows that 7 percent of President Eisenhower's vote in 1952 was made up of Catholics who had voted Democratic in preceding national elections. This analysis contends that if this vote had remained Democratic, Stevenson would have won.

The purpose of this document is obvious: KENNEDY is a Catholic and as a vice-presidential nominee might be able to bring back that part of the Catholic vote which switched to Eisenhower in 1952, especially the heavy Catholic support in the Northern States where KENNEDY would run strongest.

The analysis furthermore points out that KENNEDY attracts young voters and appeals especially to the women.

"I'M STILL YOUNG"

As he leans back in his office chair, stretches out his long legs and tilts his glasses back into his bumper crop of hair, Jack philosophizes about his political future.

"I'm still young and I like it here in the Senate," he says. "I would take it (the Vice Presidency) if I were asked, but I don't think I will be asked."

Without putting it into so many words, KENNEDY gives the impression that perhaps the times are not yet propitious for a Catholic on the Democratic ticket, and that if he accepted the post and Stevenson, for example, was defeated, the onus might be on him.

KENNEDY's strongest attribute as a Senator is that it is difficult to pin a label on him. He tackles every issue with an open mind and there is no one who can say that he has JACK KENNEDY's vote in his pocket. KENNEDY is reluctant even to suggest in what category he might be placed in the Senate because he votes his conscience and best interests of the country and his State, but he explains, "I suppose you might class me with such men as ALBERT GORE, LISTER HILL, and MIKE MANSFIELD," all of whom are liberals with wide flexibility and on the moderate side.

Jack is a prodigious worker. He keeps his office doors open to all comers, travels extensively and answers his correspondence faithfully—all hallmarks of a good Senator.

For several years he was considered the most eligible bachelor in Washington, but this state of affairs was ended in September 1953, when he married Jacqueline Lee Bouvier, a pretty, dark-haired Vassar alumna and a former member of the staff of the old Washington Times-Herald.

He is a voracious reader, specializing in history and biography. He drinks sparingly and he and his wife entertain occasionally in their colonial-style home in nearby Langley, Va., the former residence of Supreme Court Justice Robert H. Jackson.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, Senator KENNEDY in turn honored Kansas City and Missouri by his presence and acceptance of this degree. At the annual Rockhurst Day banquet on Saturday night, in a statesmanlike address, Senator KENNEDY urged that this Nation speak out boldly for the freedom of all people.

Since that address, I have received from Kansas City and other places in Missouri many telephone calls and letters commenting on the fine impression made by our distinguished colleague.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that his stimulating address be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

REMARKS OF SENATOR JOHN F. KENNEDY, FOURTH ANNUAL ROCKHURST DAY BANQUET OF ROCKHURST COLLEGE, KANSAS CITY, MO., SATURDAY, JUNE 2, 1956

In recent years, key farm States such as Missouri have been visited by an increasing number of politicians from all over the country. But I must confess that this is my first trip to this State—and I am thus deeply gratified for the honor that Rockhurst College has bestowed upon me in presenting me with an honorary degree.

Much is different between Missouri and Massachusetts. We live on a beachhead on the cold Atlantic; you live deep in the heartland of America. We harvest the rolling sea, you harvest the rolling prairie. You send us hogs and corn; we send you carnations and cranberries.

Yes, much is different, but much is the same—the same sense of self-reliance, the common determination to see our country progress, the mutual recognition of the responsibilities as well as the privileges of self-government. Indeed, many citizens of your State and mine are descended from the same hardy forebears who forged the Union in which both States now unite.

I have not been unfamiliar with the history of Missouri and her statesmen—and I think one episode is of considerable relevance to those of us commemorating this fourth annual Rockhurst Day. It was little more than 88 years ago today that Senator John Brooks Henderson, of Missouri, faced a decision more difficult than any he had ever known and more far reaching in its consequences than any he would ever have to make. That issue was the impeachment of President Andrew Johnson by the radical Republican movement dedicated to his destruction and to the exploitation of the defeated Southern States. Senator Henderson, then but 41 years old and the second youngest Member of the Senate, had already achieved national prominence. He was one of the most influential leaders in keeping the State of Missouri in the Union and the sponsor of the 13th amendment to the Constitution abolishing slavery. He was in 1868 no stanch follower of Andrew Johnson—on the contrary, he was a supporter of the Tenure-of-Office Act which had led to the impeachment charges and a severe critic of Johnson's conduct of office. He was, on the other hand, noted for his political independence—he had, for example, defied his party by becoming the only regular Republican to vote against the bill restricting the President's authority as Commander in Chief of the Army.

Thus the radical Republicans knew that John Henderson's vote was not as certain as they might hope, and every effort was exerted to obtain from him an advance commitment to vote guilty. Only Edmund G. Ross, of Kansas, endured more pressure and abuse than John Henderson. Missouri newspapers assailed him, party leaders bullied him, spies hounded him during his every waking hour. Finally the full delegation of Republican Congressmen from Missouri, accompanied by a prominent State legislator, called upon the Senator and demanded that he vote for the President's conviction. To do otherwise, they warned, would be to rebel against the nearly unanimous wishes of his party and State, and insure his own defeat for reelection the following year. Beseated by doubts as to his proper responsibility under a representative form of government, and feeling trapped in his own office by his friends and associates, Henderson wavered. He meekly offered to wire his resignation to the governor, enabling a new appointee to

vote for conviction; and, when it was doubted whether a new Senator would be permitted to vote, he agreed to ascertain whether his own vote would be crucial.

But an insolent and threatening telegram from Missouri restored his sense of honor, and he swiftly wired his reply: "Say to my friends that I am sworn to do impartial justice according to law and conscience, and I will try to do it like an honest man."

John Henderson voted for the President's acquittal, the last important act of his senatorial career. Denounced, threatened, and burned in effigy in Missouri, he did not even bother to seek reelection to the Senate. Years later his party would realize its debt to him, and return him to lesser offices, but for the Senate, whose integrity he had upheld, he was through.

It seems to me that, as the people of Missouri and indeed the Nation look back upon the courageous but tragic career of Senator Henderson, they will better appreciate the special contribution to our society made by Rockhurst and similar institutions. For in 1868, as in 1868, the individual citizen has an urgent but difficult responsibility to determine the facts and the policy decisions to be based upon those facts. And yet he knows that his political leaders, and most of his newspapers, are stating the facts from their own point of view—not dishonestly, not carelessly, and frequently not even knowingly—but simply because their role is the role of the advocate, not the judge. Even Government finds it difficult to present the truth in an age when truth has become a weapon in the struggle for power—truth that is bent, twisted, and subverted to fit the pattern of national policy. Frequently we in the West feel ourselves forced by this drumbeat of lies and propaganda to be discriminating in our selection of what facets of the truth we ourselves will disclose.

Thus the responsibility of a free university to pursue its own objective studies, to carry on the continuing search for the truth—both for its own sake and because only if we possess it can we really be free—is even more important today than ever before. Rockhurst College has succeeded in carrying out this mission, so that today it stands as a bulwark on the North American Continent in the battle for the preservation of Christian civilization.

I would like to discuss with you today in more detail an example of one of those issues where the truth and the right frequently are very difficult to determine—and where the use of catchwords and equivocal terms has made more possible the misunderstanding of this issue by American citizens. The issue to which I refer is the growing and recurrent problems of colonialism, nationalism, and the attitude of the United States and her allies.

Since World War II rudely shook our attitude of isolation, we have, for the sake of our own security, found our destiny to be closely linked with that of the British and the French, the Dutch and the Belgians—nations which still hold under their subjugation large areas of the world upon which they feel their ultimate security depends.

And thus we have been caught up in a dilemma which up to now has been insoluble. We want our allies to be strong; and yet quite obviously a part of their strength comes from their overseas possessions. We want the uncommitted peoples of the Middle East, Asia, and Africa to remain free from the ever-reaching tentacles of Soviet influence and responsive to the leadership of the United States and our allies—and yet those uncommitted peoples look upon those allies with at least as much suspicion in most cases, and more in some, as they do the Soviet Union. We fight to keep the world free from Communist imperialism—but in doing so we hamper our efforts, and bring suspicion upon our motives, by being closely linked with Western imperialism. We want—indeed we

desperately need, if the deterrent power of our Strategic Air Command is to have any meaning—to maintain Western bases in Cyprus, in North Africa, and in all the other areas around the borders of the Soviet Union—and yet we stand to lose those bases if the Communists are able to captivate the nationalistic movements that seek to drive out all vestiges of Western domination. We have permitted the reputation of the United States as a friend of oppressed people, in short, to be hitched to the chariot of the conqueror; because we have believed we could have it both ways.

As a result, our policies and statements on these matters have too frequently been characterized by indecision, confusion, haste, timidity and an excessive fear of giving offense. In the United Nations we have abstained on some key issues, vacillated on others, and prevented others from being even placed on the agenda. Our Secretary of State has spoken of Goa, and our Ambassador to France has spoken of Algeria, in terms which have led our motives and our sympathies to be questioned by those who seek the end of colonial rule. This is not a new pattern—our course in Indochina under the Democratic as well as the Republican administrations antagonized the Vietnamese people, refueled the propaganda machines of the Vietminh Communists and in the long run proved to be a disservice to the free world as a whole and even to France itself.

This policy—if it can be called a policy—of trying to look both ways at once, of trying to bury our heads in the sand when a colonial issue arises, of trying to please everybody and displease nobody—this is the policy which our Department of State likes to call “neutrality” on colonial issues. And when asked about it at a recent news conference, Secretary Dulles had this to say: “We expect to continue to take a position of neutrality because that is our general policy with relation to these highly controversial matters which involve countries both of whom are friends and where we ourselves are not directly involved.”

I must respectfully disagree with the able Secretary, though I stress again the fact that this is no partisan matter. We are directly involved, deeply involved in these issues. They may not involve our possessions—they may not involve our treaties—they may not always even involve our military bases. But we are directly involved—our standing in the eyes of the free world, our leadership in the fight to keep that world free, our geographical and population advantages over the Communist orbit, our prestige, our security, our life, and our way of life—these are all directly involved. How then can we be wedded to this do-nothing policy called “neutrality.” How can we be afraid to touch these “highly controversial” disputes between two friends, when their continuation—and our reluctance—only serve to strengthen the hand of the mutual enemy of us all?

I do not wish to oversimplify an endlessly complex problem. Nor do I wish to deny the success we have had in helping free countries remain free, and the value of the steps we have taken in the right direction on this subject. But the time has come for the United States to take a more forceful stand.

I urge, therefore, that this Nation, acting within appropriate limits of judgment and discretion, inform our Allies and the world at large that—after a reasonable period of transition for self-determination—this Nation will speak out boldly for freedom for all people—whether they are denied that freedom by an iron curtain of tyranny, or by a paper curtain of colonial ties and constitutional manipulations. We shall no longer abstain in the United Nations from voting on colonial issues—we shall no longer trade our vote on such issues for other supposed gains—we shall no longer seek to prevent the subjugated peoples of

the world from being heard. And we shall recognize that the day of the colonial is through.

Of course such a stand will displease our allies—but it will displease the Soviets even more. For whether our allies like it or not, and whether they act to impede it or not, sooner or later, one by one, the traditional colonies of the western powers are breaking free. The primary question is whether they will then turn for association and support to the West—which has thus far too often hampered and discouraged their efforts for self-determination—or turn to the Communist East—which has (however hypocritically, in view of its own colonial exploitation) inflamed their nationalistic spirits and assumed the role of freedom's defender. I emphasize again that I do not fail to appreciate the difficulties of our hard pressed Allies—but I feel that their present colonial policies only serve to make easier the way of the Communist transgressor.

The path I suggest for this Nation will not be easy. We will find our policies hailed by extremists, terrorists and saboteurs for whom we could have no sympathy—and condemned by our oldest and most trusted friends who will feel we have deserted them. We will encounter the most difficult problems of government and justice known to man—the fate of the large and justifiably alarmed European minorities in North Africa—the lack of preparation for self-government on the part of many peoples eager to govern themselves now—the likelihood of this Nation being forced to take the place of the present colonial powers in providing the economic assistance which these new nations will need for many years—and the danger to western naval and air bases located in these key areas.

But we have faced difficult problems before—and we have faced them successfully whenever we were resolutely determined to take the hard, bold steps necessary for their solution.

If we are to secure the friendship of the Arab, the African and the Asian, we cannot hope to accomplish it solely by means of military pacts and assistance. Neither can we purchase it through extensive programs of economic grants and subsidies. We cannot win their hearts by making them dependent upon our handouts. We cannot keep them free by selling them free enterprise. Describing the perils of communism or the prosperity of the United States will be to no avail. No; the strength of our appeal to these key populations—and it is rightfully our appeal, and not that of the Communists—lies in our traditional and deeply felt philosophy of freedom and independence for all peoples everywhere. Whatever restraints may have been imposed upon this philosophy in our foreign policy pronouncements during the past decade, there can be no doubt that it still represents the basic attitude of the overwhelming majority of the American people.

Today this issue confronts us in Algeria, Cyprus, West New Guinea, and elsewhere. Tomorrow it may be in Portuguese Goa or Singapore—and the next day it may be in Tagaland or Tanganyika.

There are some who recognize these issues but dismiss them as unimportant. What has all this to do, they say, with the threat of war in the Middle East or the deterioration of our position in the Far East? The answer is, I believe, that these issues are fundamental to practically every crisis now occurring or which will occur in the next generation. For whatever the dispute may be that creates the headlines—we can never escape the fact that we are dependent upon the decisions of people who have hated, as their ancestors before them for centuries hated, the white men who bled them, beat them, exploited them, and ruled them. Perhaps it is already too late for the United States to repudiate these centuries of ill

will, and to firmly but boldly press for a new generation of friendship among equal and independent states. But we dare not fail to make the effort.

NEED FOR MANDATORY POULTRY INSPECTION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, 2 persons died and 62 became extremely ill in a severe psittacosis or parrot fever epidemic in Oregon during February and March. This terrible outbreak, as I reported to the Senate on March 29, was caused by diseased poultry on farms in rendering plants and in processing plants in the Portland area.

Most Americans do not realize that poultry which is served on their family tables is not at the present time subject to careful inspection. This is creating a serious health problem. We find that this practice does not meet with the favor of poultry raisers. Poultry raisers, who are very desirous of protecting their industry, wish to have much more careful supervision, from the health standpoint, of the slaughterhouses which prepare poultry for the family table.

I believe there is involved such a serious threat to the health of the Nation that we in Congress should take the necessary steps to bring to the poultry raisers the assistance for which the economic welfare of the threatened industry is crying out.

Reports from the Salem region indicate that Oregon may suffer still more from this dread poultry-caused illness. For 16 more men and women who processed poultry in the Salem area are now ill with what is suspected to be psittacosis. Health authorities are currently checking further.

Mr. President, these epidemics are not something about which we can shake our heads, say how terrible it all is, and then forget. These outbreaks can happen anytime and anywhere, spreading death and destruction. The International News Service carried a story on April 2 in which scientists of the Department of Agriculture make this point clear. INS said:

Agriculture Department scientists have warned that the Nation's turkey industry is now threatened by an epidemic that has already led to two human deaths and sickness to 62 poultry workers . . . according to one official, “there is no doubt as to the potential danger to other turkey-producing States.” He emphasized that the deadly virus could now erupt in any State anywhere at any time.

A further reason why the Congress cannot forget about this epidemic, and similar ones in other States, is that much of the human suffering can be prevented. The use of the mandatory poultry inspection, as outlined in the bill introduced by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], S. 3176, of which I am a cosponsor, would minimize, if not completely end the human dangers coming from psittacosis-infected poultry.

I believe, Mr. President, we in the Congress must act and act fast on this measure. We must enact it in this session. The experience of Oregon has duplicated the previous experience of Texas, Nebraska, New Jersey, Virginia, and Iowa.

Epidemics in other States may in the future duplicate the experience of Oregon.

An excellent on-the-spot report of the Oregon epidemic has been published in the *Butcher Workman*, the official publication of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen, AFL-CIO. Many of the persons who were made ill in the Oregon psittacosis outbreak are members of that union who work in poultry processing plants.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the *Butcher Workman* entitled "Death Lurked in the Turkey Feathers," 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:

DEATH LURKED IN THE TURKEY FEATHERS

A mysterious outbreak of psittacosis among Oregon poultry flocks during March has dramatically demonstrated why Congress should pass the Amalgamated-backed Murray-Priest-Hayworth bill which provides for Federal poultry inspection.

Before the antibiotic, aureomycin, stopped the pneumonia-like disease, the sudden psittacosis epidemic had created havoc among Oregon's turkey handlers, many of them Amalgamated members, and was threatening to cripple the State's multi-million dollar "gobbler" industry.

In its wake the disease left this casualty list: some 61 human illnesses, including many Amalgamated members, 2 human deaths in which psittacosis was a "factor"; loss of more than 2,500 turkeys, an embargo on Oregon turkeys, and a virtual consumer boycott of the gobblers.

Yet, as this report will point out, the entire epidemic could have been prevented by proper inspection.

Instead, what happened was the worst psittacosis outbreak since the infamous Texas epidemic of 1954. And it happened in a State where poultry standards are high and in a situation in which the turkey industry itself was not to blame.

The "villain" was ignorance, which resulted in failure to recognize the baffling virus before it was too late. It would have been discovered had a proper inspection program been in effect.

This doesn't help the many turkey handlers who were stricken with the vicious virus—and the two men who died after handling the diseased birds. It doesn't help Mrs. Josie Phillips, a member of Local 231, Egg, Candle and Poultry Workers, who is fighting for her life today in a Portland hospital after being stricken with psittacosis in the turkey-picking room at Portland's Fresh Foods Co. Mrs. Phillips' blood count still is low, and she has been responding to treatment with painful slowness.

But this case does offer graphic and conclusive proof that the Nation's health will be further endangered if Congress does not enact the legislation advocated by Senator JAMES MURRAY, of Montana, Representatives J. PERCY PRIEST, of Tennessee, and DON HAYWORTH, of Michigan. Their bill would establish a Poultry Inspection Service under the United States Food and Drug Administration. It would inspect poultry before and after slaughter and guard against outbreaks such as the Oregon epidemic.

"This case clearly demonstrates the desperate need for this legislation," declared Oregon's two United States Senators, WAYNE L. MORSE, and RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, after conferring with Amalgamated leaders and other officials on the psittacosis situation. "While no one actually was at fault, it is evident that proper inspection would have prevented the outbreak."

Senator MORSE, a cosponsor of the Murray Senate bill along with seven other Senators, plans to use the Oregon case to show other senators the need for proper Federal poultry inspection.

To get a clear picture of exactly what happened, the *Butcher Workman* carefully investigated the Oregon case and uncovered these facts:

The two infected turkey flocks which precipitated the outbreak had been losing birds for more than 3 months before the disease was recognized and reported to State authorities.

Had the disease been recognized and the aureomycin treatment given 3 months earlier, the following could have been avoided:

1. Suspected human cases of psittacosis placed at 61 by the Oregon State Board of Health with 2 deaths in which psittacosis is listed as a "factor."

2. Loss of over 2,500 birds, plus heavy loss of income from hatching eggs to both of the sick flocks.

3. An embargo by the State of Washington against all Oregon turkeys, poulters and hatching eggs.

4. A sharp slump in sales of dressed turkeys as a result of public reaction, virtually knocking out a "turkey for Easter" campaign planned by the turkey industry. One grocery chain placed 2,000 gobblers on sale and sold only 6 birds.

The first contact with the diseased birds was made on November 8, 1955, at the State animal disease control diagnostic laboratory at Oregon State College. A group of birds from the Lyons Triple B turkey ranch at Sauvie Island in the lower Columbia River were being given a routine blood test for pullorum disease; it turned up a suspicious reaction on three turkeys.

But an autopsy examination showed no symptoms of any disease. The birds were found normal except for parasitic worms and the flock pronounced pullorum clean.

A week later, on November 15, Loren Johnson, a turkey grower from Scappoose in northwestern Oregon, brought six dead birds to the same laboratory and reported 20 were sick. Examination showed severe hemorrhagic, enteric and air sac conditions. A tentative diagnosis of fowl cholera was made, and sulfa drugs were prescribed.

During January, the Oregon State laboratory ran bacterial cultures for cholera on several batches of turkey legs from birds that had died in the Johnson flock. On January 31 a dead bird from the Lyons flock on Sauvie Island showed peritonitis and enteritis and sulfa was prescribed.

But in these cases, bacterial checks for cholera turned out to be negative—and the turkey losses continued.

By February the losses had increased to a rate of 30 to 40 birds daily, and truckloads of them were being hauled to a Portland rendering plant to be boiled down for tallow, feed, and fertilizer. Laboratory veterinarians at the Oregon State Laboratory continued to double check for cholera with negative results.

At this stage the situation started to erupt. On February 24 Dr. Samuel Osgood, epidemiologist for the Oregon Board of Health, received a call from a physician at the Portland Veterans' Administration hospital to report "a patient under treatment for pneumonia of an unusual character." The doctor suspected psittacosis, since the patient had been handling sick turkeys on Sauvie Island.

Dr. Osgood called Dr. Kermit Peterson, Oregon state veterinarian, who then called the State laboratory which had been investigating the mysterious malady. Tissue from the dead birds was put into mice. The diagnosis was psittacosis. This later was confirmed by United States Public Health Service laboratories in San Francisco and Montgomery, Ala.

Oregon health officers immediately swung into action, checking turkey handlers for signs of psittacosis infection. They found a remarkably high rate of human illness, particularly in the rendering plants. At 1 plant out of 32 employees, 24 became ill, a dozen were hospitalized. At other plants there were 29 cases. Two died, and Dr. Osgood credits psittacosis as a factor in their deaths. Confirmation of other suspected cases is awaiting the outcome of blood tests being made by the United States Communicable Diseases Center.

Amalgamated members, of local 231, Egg, Candle, and Poultry Workers, who were stricken by the disease included Ida Jackson, Gladys Bradley, Ida Miller, Josie Phillips, Johnnie Mae Hastings, Mary Murphy, Heber Holtorf, Ruth Beck, Mina Farris, Ruth Curtis, Fred Di Filippo, and Syble Enquist.

The diagnosis of psittacosis and the epidemic were announced to the press on March 9, and the Oregon Department of Agriculture promptly quarantined the diseased flock. Both flocks were placed on a heavy diet of aureomycin—which can cure both men and birds of psittacosis. (Before aureomycin, 20 percent of human cases ended in death.)

Within a week the psittacosis outbreak was cured by putting almost a pound of aureomycin in every ton of turkey feed. Most of the human victims (with a few exceptions, such as the Amalgamated's Josie Phillips) were cured with aureomycin treatments.

But, in the wake of the mysterious malady, one big question remained: Why weren't the Oregon State College veterinarians able to spot the disease which they first came in contact with on November 8, 1955?

The answer to that question is one main reason why Federal poultry-inspection legislation is needed now. The fact is poultry diseases are difficult to diagnose, as this case clearly proves. Although Oregon State College boasts one of the West's finest veterinary laboratories, it was unable to discover the disease in 3 months of diagnosis of the dead birds.

What does this reveal? For one thing, it clearly demonstrates that poultry diseases are so obscure that highly trained specialists—such as would be provided by the proposed United States Poultry Inspection Service—are needed to diagnose them. You wouldn't ask a general-practice doctor to diagnose a rare human disease. Yet this is what the Oregon State technicians were attempting to do with the diseased turkeys.

The Oregon veterinarians offer these theories as to why the disease was not discovered earlier:

1. It was camouflaged by other diseases. Erysipelas was present in one flock, and there also was a question of cholera.

2. Many facets of psittacosis still are unknown. This was the first known case in turkeys in Oregon (California, incidentally, had a similar outbreak at the same time).

3. The psittacosis virus may be fairly common in turkeys and other fowl, but in a mild form. It became virulent as it was able to attack birds weakened by other diseases or by exposure to severe winter weather. This virulence increased—became "hotter"—as it spread through the flock until finally healthy birds were succumbing. Tests are under way in California to find out if the mild virus from other birds can be "made hot" by passing it through turkeys.

Just how the disease happened to hit the Sauvie Island and Scappoose flock still is a mystery. Dr. Sam Osgood, Oregon State epidemiologist, believes that psittacosis may have been present in the area as long as 1946 and existed in latent form.

But the most prevalent theory is that the psittacosis microbe was transmitted to the turkeys by wild birds—principally ducks and seagulls—which swarm along the lower Co-

lumbia. These birds frequently mooch food from the turkey runs.

Recently United States Public Health Service specialists ran tests of wild game at Sauvies Island. They took out the internal organs of 20 wild ducks and from another 30 birds—ducks and seagulls—they took blood samples. These tests were repeated on seagulls in Portland garbage dumps.

"The problem," said Dr. Donald Mason, United States psittacosis specialist, "is to determine how this virus is being introduced into a flock of domestic birds." He suspects water birds because the 1954 Texas outbreak, which he investigated, indicated the infection came from gulls and willets in that area.

But, on the basis of his Texas experience, Mason admits that it may be hard to actually pinpoint the culprit. "We may never know," he told the Butcher Workman, "whether ducks or gulls gave it to turkeys, or vice versa."

Mason and other United States specialists point out that psittacosis is more than just a passing problem. Turkey psittacosis has been recorded in 6 States and outbreaks have occurred among other poultry species.

Human cases—in which the microbe is passed from bird to man—also appear to be on the increase. So far this year the State of Washington has recorded seven psittacosis cases—more than in several previous years.

The one encouraging development in the Oregon case was the prompt way that United States and State health and agricultural officials, the Amalgamated, and the industry moved to set up safeguards against future ravages from psittacosis.

Prevention of a repetition of the situation, with its hazards to human health, now seems assured, thanks to the effective leadership taken by amalgamated representatives, headed by W. R. (Bill) Davison, secretary of Portland local 231, and Shirley Barker, international poultry director, who flew in from Chicago to investigate the epidemic.

Davison and Barker demanded an antemortem inspection of all turkeys by the State department of agriculture. Dr. Kermit Peterson, State veterinarian, agreed that this was a just request. He has promised to provide licensed veterinarians for antemortem inspection of all turkeys grown in Oregon.

Other points of the control program adopted by the State, the Amalgamated, and the turkey industry:

1. Wide dissemination of information about the disease among all interested groups, including turkey handlers, so an outbreak may be recognized and reported immediately.

2. An immediate hold order on suspected flocks, with a strict quarantine following laboratory confirmation.

3. Prescription for aureomycin treatment, with safeguards to prevent spread of the disease through hatching eggs and poults. (The use of 50 to 100 grams of an aureomycin compound per ton of turkey feed will prevent the microbe from taking hold in flocks.)

The two recovered flocks will be handled in accordance with the procedures set up in this new control program. Eggs can be hatched in any Oregon hatchery that handles only eggs from those two flocks. The poults can be sold for raising as market birds by any Oregon grower. Neither eggs nor poults can be shipped outside the State.

At the end of the hatching season, turkeys from the two flocks must be slaughtered in an approved processing plant, having veterinary inspection approved by public health officials. Any sign of infection means that processing will be halted and the birds returned to the farm until lesions disappear.

In conclusion, the Oregon outbreak proves two points:

1. It demonstrates that psittacosis, or other baffling poultry diseases, can happen anywhere—not merely in a State where poultry conditions are substandard, such as Texas.

Conditions in Oregon are excellent, yet psittacosis occurred anyway.

2. It shows that there is a definite nationwide need for a United States Poultry Inspection Service, as advocated by the Amalgamated. This situation would have never happened had such an agency existed.

The next move is up to Congress.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the factual coverage of this article leaves no doubt about the serious nature of the epidemic in the poultry industry and it emphasizes the urgency of immediate action on the part of the Government to deal with the dangers incident to diseased poultry. The article supplies strong supporting evidence in favor of the immediate enactment of the bill S. 3176.

Mr. President, I close with this plea to the committee which has jurisdiction of S. 3176: "The health of your fellow Americans calls for an immediate report of the bill by your committee, so that the Senate may take action very quickly on this health-protecting measure."

CONSTRUCTION OF MODERN GREAT LAKES BULK CARGO VESSELS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further morning business to be transacted, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is S. 3108.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3108) to encourage the construction of modern Great Lakes bulk cargo vessels.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief 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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, so that the Senate may take action on the nomination previously passed over.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

ADMINISTRATOR OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the nomination passed over.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Charles J. Lowen, Jr., to be Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination? [Putting the question.]

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allott	Gore	Monroney
Barrett	Green	Morse
Beall	Hayden	Mundt
Bender	Hennings	Murray
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bible	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pastore
Bridges	Hruska	Payne
Bush	Humphrey	Potter
Byrd	Jackson	Purtell
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kerr	Scott
Clements	Knowland	Smathers
Cotton	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Laird	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Langer	Sparkman
Douglas	Lehman	Stennis
Duff	Long	Symington
Dworschak	Magnuson	Thye
Eastland	Malone	Watkins
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Welker
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Wiley
Frear	McCarthy	Williams
Fulbright	McClellan	Wofford
George	McNamara	Young
Goldwater	Millikin	

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPLE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. Ives] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

POLITICAL SITUATION IN WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, at his press conference this morning President Eisenhower, in reply to a question asked by a member of the press, said that he does not believe the Chief Executive should intervene in primary elections. I fully agree with the President. I adhered to the substance of that statement

when I was interviewed in Wisconsin during the week following the convention. The people of any State would resent being told how to vote. This was clearly demonstrated in past administrations when attempted dictation boom-eranged in a number of instances.

On the other hand, the people of a State are interested in a President's factual evaluation of a public servant's services. Such evaluation—very kind and favorable—has been made by the President of my services, including three of his past letters which I reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. And on other occasions, the President has been kind enough to express his warm, personal regard for my loyal efforts. Perhaps he may choose to do so again in the future without, of course, attempting to interfere.

I do not believe that a candidate such as myself should put the Chief Executive of our country in a corner, and I would never do so.

I reiterate that it is the function of the people of my own State of Wisconsin to make the choice. I am campaigning as a loyal supporter of the President who believes in him as a great statesman. And I shall continue to fight for his policies, come what may.

I repeat the plain fact that the people of Wisconsin overwhelmingly support the President. They know, however, that the minority in our State, which consists of Eisenhower haters, is behind my opponent.

In any event, I am confident that I will be overwhelmingly renominated in September.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9720) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. FOGARTY, Mr. FERNANDEZ, Mr. LANHAM, Mr. DENTON, Mr. CANNON, Mr. TABER, Mr. HAND, and Mr. JENSEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 1866. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas V. Compton;

H. R. 8123. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.; and

H. R. 9390. An act asking appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

CONSTRUCTION OF MODERN GREAT LAKES BULK CARGO VESSELS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3108) to encourage the construction of modern Great Lakes bulk cargo vessels.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Has the morning hour been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The morning hour has been concluded, and the unfinished business has been laid before the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Do I understand correctly that the Senate is now operating under a time limitation in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, the time limitation is 30 minutes on each amendment and 1 hour on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield the floor.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 4, after the word "in", it is proposed to strike out "the lowest cost foreign yard" and insert in lieu thereof "a foreign shipbuilding center which is deemed by the Secretary to furnish a fair and representative example for the determination of the estimated foreign cost of construction of vessels of the type proposed to be constructed, and".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER].

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I have discussed the perfecting amendment with the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. It is an amendment which brings the determination of the cost of construction of vessels built in foreign shipyards into conformity with the formula for determining the cost of constructing salt water vessels. I shall use the time allocated for the amendment to discuss the bill briefly.

Senate bill 3108 was introduced jointly by myself, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER]. Hearings were held before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the bill was reported unanimously by that committee.

With the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway, a new element will be brought into the Great Lakes shipping area. At present, shipping in the Great Lakes consists of movements between American port and American port, or be-

tween Canadian port and American port. The Welland Canal makes it impossible for foreign shipping to enter the Great Lakes in an attempt to take over that trade.

It is well known that there has been a shift in the use of ore deposits in North America. There are great ore deposits in the Labrador area, and there has been a shift from the use of ore from the Mesabi Range to the use of Canadian ore. That shift will become more intensive as the years go by.

As I stated previously, after the St. Lawrence Seaway is completed, it will open up the Great Lakes to foreign ore carriers, which will be able to move in and engage in the freight traffic between Canada and the United States. During peacetime that is of little consequence, other than as it affects the domestic industry. But we know that today, on the drafting boards of many foreign shipyards there are plans for construction of ships for that particular trade.

We are all conscious, I am sure, of the great part the Great Lakes ore-carrying fleet played in the successful prosecution of World War I, World War II, and the Korean war. We know that foreign-flag ships would, in time of emergency, seek to stay within their own national waters, and would not be available for the very necessary shipments of ore in time of emergency.

If it were not for its national-defense features, I would say the bill should not be before the Senate of the United States; but it is necessary that the bill be enacted into law because of our defense needs. In the event of a national emergency, we would have to call upon the Great Lakes ore-carrying fleet to maintain the lifeline in bringing ore from the mines to the mills.

What does the bill do? The bill simply does for the Great Lakes that which we now do for salt water operators. The domestic ship operators know that the future is not bright, and that it is not feasible for them to compete, on an economic basis, with foreign-built and foreign-operated ships in this particular trade. The bill allows American ship operators who are forced to construct ships in American yards to receive a cost differential as between the actual cost of constructing ships in American yards and the cost of construction in foreign yards. That determination is to be made by the Maritime Commission, and the differential will vary, but, normally, it will be between 40 and 45 percent of the cost of construction.

Mr. President, that arrangement is nothing new. It is the same type of formula which is now used for offshore shipping. It will afford shipping operators on the Great Lakes and yards which will build ships for the Great Lakes trade the same protection afforded salt water operators who have the same competition with foreign operators and foreign ship manufacturers. That is the national maritime policy.

Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong the debate for any length of time. Therefore, I shall conclude my remarks on the amendment. If the Senator from Delaware wishes to speak on the amendment or on the bill, he may do so.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield a few moments to me on the amendment?

Mr. POTTER. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have discussed this amendment with the Senator from Michigan. We are in complete agreement. I think the amendment should be adopted, and I certainly support it. Without the adoption of the amendment, the bill would provide that one of the determining factors, in arriving at the cost of ships constructed abroad, would be based not on a bona fide bid submitted by a responsible yard, but on a bid from any yard which used to build ships and which may not be in the shipbuilding business now. The amendment does nail the formula down to a more realistic basis. It is the same formula provided in the shipping act. Therefore, I think the amendment certainly improves the bill.

I may have other objections to other features of the bill which I shall state later; but I am in complete agreement with the Senator from Michigan on this amendment, and I hope the Senate will adopt it.

Mr. POTTER. Is it agreeable to the Senator from Delaware that the amendment be disposed of at this time?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I yield back the time remaining to me on the amendment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, if no other Senator wishes to speak on the amendment, I yield back the remainder of the time on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The Senator from Tennessee yields back all the time remaining to him.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield back the time remaining to him?

Mr. POTTER. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time remaining on the amendment has been yielded back.

The Chair understood the Senator from Tennessee to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. GORE. I withdraw the suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee withdraws his suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill, it is proposed to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

No credit shall be allowed under the provisions of this subsection, and no credit shall be allowed or payment made under any other provision of this act or of any other act providing Government assistance in the acquisition or construction of vessels, with respect

to any vessel the contract for acquisition or construction of which is entered into after the effective date of this subsection, unless such contract shall have been entered into as the result of competitive bidding and awarded to the lowest responsible bidder.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have discussed the amendment with the Senator from Michigan. I think he is willing to accept the amendment. It merely provides that any contract issued for the construction of any ships which are subsidized by the United States Government must be awarded on a competitive-bid basis and to the lowest responsible bidder. I think the amendment should certainly be part of this or any other bill dealing with a similar subject.

I understand the Senator from Michigan has no objection to the amendment, in which event I shall not speak further on it.

Mr. POTTER. If the Senator from Delaware will yield, I should like to say I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield back the time remaining to me on the amendment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield back the time remaining to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time remaining on the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have one further amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. I might say that if the Senator from Michigan will agree to it as easily as he did to the last amendment, we shall soon dispose of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the appropriate place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. —. *Provided, however,* That the trade-in allowance shall be the original cost of the ship to the purchaser minus usual or recognized depreciation rates.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes on the amendment.

I agree with the Senator from Michigan that we do need an American merchant marine. But if we are going to subsidize it, let us do so aboveboard, spell out the formula, ascertain what the cost will be, and see if the American people want to pay for it.

The Senator from Michigan pointed out that the bill would extend to the Great Lakes shipping industry the same formula now applied to the salt water shipping industry. That statement is partly true, but not quite completely. I think the Senator will agree with me that there can be no question if we adopt the principle of subsidizing the Great Lakes shipping industry by allowing it the differential between cost of ships constructed in this country and abroad, we shall later be asked to adopt the same formula with regard to operational subsidies. If one is worthy of subsidy, the other one must be given consideration. They go together. There can be no

question about that. This bill is just an entering wedge and embraces a principle which will ultimately cost the taxpayers millions if approved.

Likewise I point out that the bill contains a vastly different formula. The formula for the oceanic shipping industry provides that the trade-in allowance shall be the fair and reasonable value of the ship. Then there is an additional formula which provides that the Government shall pay the shipping company the differential between the cost of building the ship in an American shipyard and the cost of building it abroad. But those are two separate formulas.

The formula contained in the pending bill has no connection with the formulas which apply to the oceanic shipping industry. The pending bill merely provides that a shipping company may make use of any old hulk and, if it is able to tow it into a port—regardless of the condition of the ship, regardless of whether it still has any machinery in it, and regardless of the additional cost of placing the ship in usable condition—may have that ship qualify under the provisions of the bill, and be given an allowance of three to four million dollars. This may be many times more than the original cost. I think the Senator from Michigan will agree with me that that is the effect of the bill.

The Maritime Commission has pointed out that the average subsidy paid under this formula would be approximately from \$3,500,000 to \$4 million a ship. Some of these ships were sold originally to the Great Lakes shipping industry by the United States Government for as little as \$102,000 apiece. After the company has operated such a ship for a number of years, should the Government now pay \$4 million for it?

If we are going to give subsidies to the American merchant marine, let us do it openly, not in the concealed manner provided by the bill.

I point out that 302 ships of various types in the Great Lakes fleet are eligible for the proposed subsidy; and if the proposed subsidy is carried to its extreme, it would cost more than \$1 billion.

Let me also point out that 58 of the eligible ships are owned by the United States Steel Corp.; and I think we can agree that the United States Steel Corp. is able to build the ships it needs and is able to pay for them. Fourteen ships which will be eligible for the subsidy provided for in this bill belong to the Bethlehem Steel Co.

Three of the ships belong to the Hanna Coal & Ore Co.; 4 of the ships belong to the Inland Steel Corp.; and 2 of the ships belong to the International Harvester Corp. Others are owned by various ore companies. All these companies are able to pay the proper prices for the ships they need. Certainly those companies are able to pay the necessary differential and are able to pay for the construction of any ships they need.

The subsidy program proposed by the pending bill is a new one. It would be a grave mistake for us to adopt it here without proper study.

If we are to adopt the principle of subsidizing shipping on the Great Lakes,

let us do so in an open manner, and let us state what subsidy shall be paid.

In answer to the Senator's argument that the bill is in the interest of the national defense, I remind the Senate that that is always a good argument to make, but it so happens the Secretary of Defense is not in favor of the bill. Every Government agency has recommended against enactment of the bill and has done so on the basis that there is no justification for its enactment. Certainly those agencies have some responsibility for the national defense and are in a position to know what is good for the country.

Again I say that if the pending amendment is not agreed to, the potential cost of the bill to the American taxpayers will be in excess of \$1 billion, and, furthermore, we shall have no real control over the program after it goes into effect, because then it will be said that we have authorized the Maritime Commission to make these contracts, and that therefore the Appropriations Committee must recommend the necessary appropriations. We have heard that argument made time and time again.

Therefore, now is the time to make the proper decision.

Mr. President, either my amendment should be adopted, or the bill should be defeated.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. Does this amendment apply to the building of vessels in the coastal shipyards, or does the amendment apply only to Great Lakes shipping? It does not apply to transports built in the coastal shipyards, does it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The present amendment applies only to the Great Lakes shipping industry. But I point out that the law applicable to the oceanic shipping already provides a similar formula, by means of which the owners of oceanic ships traded in to the Maritime Commission are allowed the fair and reasonable market value of the ships, and then the construction differential subsidy is paid as such. It is defined as such; and no back-door "gimmick," such as is proposed in the pending bill, is used.

Under the pending bill, it is conceivably possible that the construction differential subsidy would be less than the trade-in allowance, in which event the manufacturer could, unless the formula were more carefully spelled out, get a larger differential subsidy than would actually be justified. The bill does not provide any limit on it.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield at this point?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. It is indicated, then, that the amendment of the Senator from Delaware goes beyond the requirements—even though similar to them—for ships built in the Atlantic coast shipyards and receiving the subsidy from the United States Government. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It goes beyond that, to this extent: If this amendment is

adopted—and I wish to be perfectly frank about the matter—it will delete from the bill the subsidy provisions, because there is no other section of the bill which provides that the Government shall pay to the Great Lakes shipping industry a construction differential subsidy computed as such, and one which could be audited by the General Accounting Office as such. It is my argument that that is an entirely different question. If we are going to adopt such a subsidy provision, then let it be incorporated in a separate bill, and let the proper committee hold hearings on it and then report it to the Senate. But let us not bring in such subsidy formula through the back door in such a manner as would be done by means of the pending bill. That same point was emphasized by the Comptroller General. Under the provisions of this bill, there would be no control over the extent of the subsidy. The subsidy would be the loosest kind of subsidy authority ever made.

Mr. McNAMARA. Then the practical effect of the amendment would be that no ships would be built on the Great Lakes. Instead, and logically, the ships would be built only in places to which the amendment did not apply.

Let me say that I think the amendment is a most unfair one.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I do not think it follows that if the amendment is adopted ships would not be built on the Great Lakes. Is the Senator from Michigan attempting to tell me that the steel companies will not build ships in which to transport their ore? Such a statement would be ridiculous. All of us know that the steel companies will build the ships they need. They must do so. But if we are to provide a subsidy for the steel industry, let us recognize it as such; and if that is what you want, say so.

We should remember that the companies bought many of these ships from the Government in the first instance. I have called attention to the case of a company which bought for \$102,000 apiece, three ships which were only about 4 years old when the company bought them. They had cost the Government an average of more than \$7,500,000 apiece. The Government sold the ships to the company for \$102,000 apiece. How much more subsidy does the company want? Instead of having my amendment apply, the company now wants the Congress to pass a bill under which the company will be paid approximately \$3,500,000 for each of the ships, after the company is through with them.

Mr. McNAMARA. If the Senator from Delaware is asking me how much further subsidy the companies want, let me say that I think the Great Lakes shipbuilding industry should be entitled to the same subsidy that the coastal shipbuilding industry enjoys. I understand that is the aim of those who framed the bill.

In reply to the question, "What do they want?", let me say that I want the Great Lakes shipbuilding industry to receive the same treatment as that received by the coastal shipbuilders.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then a bill to that effect should be introduced separately,

and should be considered by the appropriate committee, and should be reported as such. Then you can explain to your constituents, who will be paying the bill, just where their money goes and who gets it.

It is said that the bill applies only to ships operated on the Great Lakes. However, the bill contains no provision which would prevent ships to which the bill applies from later being placed in the oceanic shipping service and perhaps even operated there under foreign flags.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware is 100 percent in error.

In the first place, when an American operator turns his ship in to the Government, the Government does not pay him for the ship. He turns it in for the American fleet, without costing the Government one nickel for that. The cost to the Government is the differential between the cost of construction in an American yard and the cost of construction in a foreign yard. That forces our operators to build their ships in American yards. The distinguished Senator from Delaware knows that in the case of ships for the oceanic service, the companies can obtain a Government allowance, and then can turn around and have the Government pay the differential between the cost of construction in an American yard and the cost of construction in a foreign yard.

I may add that, so far as the Department of Defense is concerned, we had no testimony on the bill. We received testimony from the Department of Commerce, which said, "We recognize that there is a problem. We recognize that there must be an American-owned flag fleet on the Great Lakes in case of national emergency. We do not know the answer."

It so happens that our committee includes among its membership the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who is probably one of the best informed Members of Congress on maritime matters, and other Senators who have been very diligent in this field. We have a competent staff. It is the best judgment of the committee that this is the type of legislation which is needed to assure and safeguard an American-flag fleet on the Great Lakes.

By 1960, more than 213 vessels, or 62 percent of the fleet, will be 50 years of age or older. The Senator from Delaware knows that a serious problem of obsolescence confronts us at the present time.

The Senator from Delaware sets up a straw man when he says that some 300 ships will be turned in. The Senator knows that we do not have facilities on the Great Lakes to handle construction in such numbers. I predict that in the next 5 years not more than 20 ships will be built under the provisions of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is there anything in the bill which provides that the ships must be built in the Great Lakes area?

Mr. POTTER. Yes; there is.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The provision is that they must be built in American shipyards.

Mr. POTTER. I invite the Senator's attention to the language on page 2, beginning in line 10:

A vessel shall be considered a "new vessel" for purposes of this subdivision if it (A) is constructed after January 1, 1956, in a Great Lakes shipyard within the United States—

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will yield, I respectfully remind him that the amendment which was agreed to, and to which the Senator assented, provides that the construction of all ships must be based upon competitive bidding by American shipyards, and that covers the entire United States.

Mr. POTTER. I had assumed that the Senator's amendment, which we discussed, included Great Lakes shipyards.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The amendment provided for competitive bidding by American shipyards. It was not limited to Great Lakes shipyards. There would be no bona fide competitive bidding if it were limited to certain areas.

Mr. POTTER. There is a limitation at present. Competitive bidding is limited to east-coast shipyards with respect to east-coast construction, and to Pacific-coast shipyards with respect to Pacific-coast construction. There are at least five shipyards on the Great Lakes. It is the intention that under the terms of the bill, ship construction will be confined to the Great Lakes shipyards. I am sure the Senator did not plan to be devious, and that he will accept an amendment confining the construction to the Great Lakes shipyards.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; it was my intention—as it was in connection with the amendment I previously offered—that there should be bona fide competitive bidding. It is not bona fide competitive bidding if we say that the competitive bids must be based upon construction in certain yards. Some of the shipyards are owned by the companies which are to operate the ships. The steel for the ships will be furnished by companies which will be beneficiaries of the subsidies. Surely we are not going to say that the United States Government can accept a bid only from a certain company which may be even going to operate the ships.

Mr. POTTER. I know of no shipyard which is owned by one of the companies which is operating on the Great Lakes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator will admit that the steel for the ships will be furnished by the companies just referred to, will he not?

Mr. POTTER. Perhaps so; but the steel companies do not own the shipyards.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair assumes that the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Michigan have been yielding themselves time by agreement with the acting majority leader.

Do both sides yield back the remaining time?

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, if there is no further debate, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator mean to yield back the remaining time?

Mr. McNAMARA. Not at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There must be some agreement with respect to the time consumed by the quorum call.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a quorum call without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I withdraw my unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the Senator's withdrawing his request to rescind the previous order? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will continue the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senator from Delaware has 4 minutes remaining, and the opposition to the amendment has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be ordered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I personally have no objection to the Senator's unanimous-consent request. However, I know that there is a standing objection on this side of the aisle to requesting a yeas-and-nays vote by unanimous consent. Therefore, if the Senator persists in his request, I shall have to object.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I realize that there are not enough Members on the floor to have the yeas and nays ordered without unanimous consent. Therefore I renew my request for a quorum call. I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask that the time be not charged to either side.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I did not hear the Senator's request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have suggested the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 4 minutes remaining, and the opposition has 9 minutes remaining. Does the Senator from Delaware request that the time consumed in the quorum call be not charged to either side?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I make that request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, what is the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 4 minutes remaining on the amendment. The opposition to the amendment has 9 min-

utes remaining. The Senator from Delaware has suggested the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time consumed in the quorum call be not charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request of the Senator from Delaware is that a quorum call be had, and that the time be not charged to either side.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Has all time for debate on the amendment been consumed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Four minutes remain for debate in favor of the amendment, and 9 minutes remain for debate in opposition.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Why not consume all the time on a quorum call? Then the Senate can proceed in the regular order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. So far as I am concerned, all I shall require is 1 or 2 minutes when more Senators have come into the Chamber.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We are prepared to yield back the remainder of our time. I suggest that both sides yield back the remainder of their time and that then there be a quorum call.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have no objection, if we may have a few minutes for debate on the bill when more Senators have come into the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have no objection to the Senator's request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will call the roll. The time consumed in the quorum call will not be charged to either side.

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 PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Corron in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 4 minutes remaining, and the majority leader has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I merely wish again to point out that my amendment simply proposes, with reference to trade-in allowances, that there be allowed the fair and reasonable market value, taking into consideration the cost of the ships to the persons who originally bought them, minus the usually recognized depreciation rates.

If the amendment is not adopted it will be possible, under the bill, to allow an average of approximately \$3½ million or \$4 million for each ship, regardless of its age and condition. I previously pointed out, as one glaring example, the fact that 3 ships cost approximately \$7½ million apiece to build, and after they were 4 years old they were sold to one of the Great Lakes operators for

\$102,000 apiece. If the pending amendment is not adopted we shall be authorizing the Government to pay from three and a half to four million dollars apiece for these same ships after they are worn out. There is no justification for that.

Mr. President, I again ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. After all time has been yielded back, will it be in order to suggest the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the majority leader yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER].

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware would completely destroy the bill. It would introduce a new factor. Under the bill, the Government would not pay one nickel for the ships traded in. The allowance given would represent the cost of construction in an American yard, where American operators are forced to build their ships, as compared with construction in a foreign yard.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. POTTER. I cannot yield; I do not have the time.

Under existing maritime policy with reference to salt water ship construction and operation, the Government does give an allowance for the ship which is turned in and does give a differential between the cost of constructing a ship in an American yard as against constructing it in a foreign yard. The bill makes no provision for any allowance for a turned-in ship. It is turned over to the Government for a reserve fleet. Even with the passage of the bill our Great Lakes operation would not be on a parity with the generous, and, I think, necessary action in the handling of our salt water maritime problem.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. In the event a ship is not acquired by someone who wishes to operate it on the Great Lakes, it might well be anchored somewhere as surplus, declared to be obsolete, and probably towed out and sunk. There is before us now the question as to what we shall do with surplus vessels. I think it would be sound economics to put them into the fleet on the Great Lakes rather than to anchor them in some harbor further to deteriorate as the years go by.

Mr. POTTER. The Senator from Minnesota is absolutely correct. He knows that during times of emergency we must have all the cargo ships we can obtain. It is not always possible to have a ship-construction program during an emergency. It will be remembered that

during World War II we did not have the necessary ship construction.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware provides that an allowance shall be made on the actual cost of the vessel, minus depreciation. Sixty-two percent of the vessels are 50 years of age or over. Ship construction 50 years ago was considerably different from ship construction today. Most of the vessels have already been depreciated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Michigan has expired.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, does the Senator from Delaware desire to answer the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to read what the Comptroller General said about this bill. He likewise approves bringing this subsidy out into the open.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield myself 2 minutes. The Comptroller General said in his letter to the committee:

To the extent that the credit allowances computed under the bill exceed the fair and reasonable values of the obsolete vessels traded in, the Government's payment of the difference will constitute a subsidy—a hidden subsidy. The 1936 act was conceived with the sound idea of putting an end to the hidden or disguised subsidies contained in the old ocean-mail contracts. Accordingly, we recommend against favorable consideration of this measure and urge that any subsidization of the costs of constructing new Great Lakes vessels or preferential treatment to Great Lakes shipyards which is deemed necessary or desirable by Congress be provided in express terms.

That is exactly what I have been saying all afternoon. If we are to pay a subsidy for these ships, let us do it openly and aboveboard, and not hide it under some little "gimmick" by which an allowance would be made far in excess of what a particular wornout ship was worth.

Regardless of what the Senator from Michigan says, there is an average trade-in value of from \$3,500,000 to \$4 million a ship. A broken-down, wornout ship can be towed into port or one in good condition can sail into port under its own power, and there is absolutely no difference at all in the trade-in allowance. There will be no relationship to the original cost, the age, or the condition of the ship. That certainly is an unsound practice and is not recommended by any agency of the Government.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time. Before I suggest the absence of a quorum I renew my request for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader still has time under his control. Does he yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will yield back the time on this side provided the Senator from Delaware will yield back the remainder of his time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, may we ascertain if we can have the yeas and nays ordered?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief 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 PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I object.

The Chief Clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allott	Gore	Monroney
Barrett	Green	Morse
Beall	Hayden	Mundt
Bender	Hennings	Murray
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bible	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pastore
Bridges	Hruska	Payne
Bush	Humphrey	Potter
Byrd	Jackson	Purtell
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kerr	Scott
Clements	Knowland	Smathers
Cotton	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Laird	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Langer	Sparkman
Douglas	Lehman	Stennis
Duff	Long	Symington
Dworshak	Magnuson	Thye
Eastland	Malone	Watkins
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Welker
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Wiley
Frear	McCarthy	Williams
Fulbright	McClellan	Wofford
George	McNamara	Young
Goldwater	Millikin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I renew my request for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have one further amendment which I should like to submit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to say to the Senators that I shall take only a few minutes to speak on the amendment, and I should like to have the yeas and nays on the amendment. I shall then have no further amendment to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. That the Shipping Act of 1916 is amended by adding a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 45. No common carrier by water subject to this act (the Shipping Act of 1916)

shall directly or indirectly issue any ticket or pass for the free or reduced-rate transportation of any passenger in foreign commerce or in commerce between the United States and its Territories and possessions, or directly or indirectly give any free or reduced rate transportation to any such passenger, except, under such terms and conditions as the Federal Maritime Board may prescribe, to its directors, officers, and employees and their immediate families; witnesses and attorneys attending any legal investigation in which such common carrier by water is interested; persons injured in accidents at sea and physicians and nurses attending such persons; persons rescued at sea; and any person with the object of providing relief in cases of general epidemic, pestilence, or other calamitous visitation. Nothing contained in this section shall prohibit any common carrier by water, under such terms and conditions as the Board may prescribe, from interchanging with any other common carrier by water free tickets, free passes, or free or reduced-rate transportation for the directors, officers, and employees and their immediate families. The provisions of this section shall not apply to any common carrier by water with respect to any vessel that is both documented under the laws of a foreign country and owned, leased, or chartered by a person who is a citizen of a foreign country."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Delaware yield to himself?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I request the yeas and nays on the amendment, while there are a sufficient number of Senators present on the floor of the Senate. Certainly, the Members of the Senate will not mind voting on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested by the Senator from Delaware.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is very simple. It incorporates into the Shipping Act of 1916 the same language and same provision which is applicable now to railroads and airlines; namely, that no Member of Congress, nor any other official of the Government working in any capacity, nor any member of their families can be given free transportation or sold transportation at a reduced rate by any shipping company which has been the recipient of the benefit of any construction differential subsidy or any operational subsidy on its ships.

This will apply to any shipping company affected under the provisions of this act or those affected by any other act previously enacted by Congress wherein that company would be the beneficiary of a Government subsidy.

Simply stated, it prohibits the American shipping industry from subsidizing the vacations of any Government official.

The Senate, by its previous action, has approved the subsidy provision of the pending bill. I recognize that the ships

involved are mostly cargo carriers, and that passengers will not be involved to any great extent. However, the amendment offered is applicable to all water transportation, oceanic or on the Great Lakes. Any passenger-carrying ship which is being subsidized by the American taxpayers will not in the future, if the amendment is adopted, be permitted to carry at reduced transportation fares any Member of Congress, or any Government official in any capacity, or any member of their families.

Certainly the amendment should be adopted. Years ago Congress recognized the danger of the practice whereby railroads were giving free passes to public officials who were in a position to vote on the amount of railroad subsidies. Congress has extended a subsidy to the shipping industry and the same rules should apply. Let us provide that no one in a position to rule on the amount of the subsidy a company will get shall obtain from that company a reduced fare either for himself or for members of his family.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I have no objection to accepting the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If this amendment can be adopted—

Mr. POTTER. The Senator is referring now to passenger fares; is he not? The amendment has nothing to do with cargo.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Certainly; a person goes as a passenger, not as freight. The amendment affects only passenger rates. However, while the language is not contained in the amendment, it would be the intent of the amendment that if a person carried any freight with him, he would have to pay the same rates for freight that everyone else had to pay. I have never heard of a reduction being put into effect in that manner, but if so, it would be prohibited.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield back the time remaining to him?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield back the time remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan if he has an understanding with the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. POTTER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does that make the bill acceptable to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The amendment is certainly acceptable.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Delaware still oppose the bill? Does the acceptance of the amendment clear up the Senator's objection to the bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No. I am not in favor of extending subsidies to the Great Lakes shipping industry, but acceptance of the amendment will greatly improve the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the time remaining to me with the understanding that there will be a voice vote on the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is satisfactory. All that I want is the passage of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield time to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have been very happy to be a cosponsor of Senate bill 3108, because I know something of the situation facing the Great Lakes vessels operators today.

I should like to take these few moments to summarize the situation.

A large majority of the vessels comprising the Great Lakes fleet were built prior to 1920, many during the period from 1905 to 1910. The hulls of these vessels are structurally sound and well maintained, but by modern day standards they are relatively inefficient and obsolete, and should soon be replaced. Yet vessel operators are reluctant to undertake new construction, for good reason.

Mr. President, the backbone of Great Lakes commerce is iron ore. Last year better than 23 million tons of iron ore were imported for consumption in the United States. Most foreign sources are producing in excess of estimated rates, so that the supply of foreign ore will be more than sufficient to take care of the increased demand brought about by our expanding economy. Where these ores move to seaboard ports in low-cost, foreign-flag vessels, such ships are in competition with Great Lakes vessels in the movement of Lake Superior ore.

Great Lakes vessels must also compete with Canadian vessels in the international commerce in bulk commodities between the United States and Canada. This commerce already totals nearly 30 million tons annually, and is growing from year to year. Already American operators are losing out to their Canadian competitors because Canadian costs are only about two-thirds of ours. Once the seaway is completed, the vessels of other nations will be able to engage in this trade. Because of the decided cost advantage which such vessels will have, it seems reasonably certain that they will drive the American-flag vessels from this trade entirely.

Consequently, with the shifting trade picture and increased emphasis upon international trade with Canada, American operators are reluctant to assume the high cost of constructing vessels in Great Lakes shipyards. Without Government aid which will enable them to

obtain new vessels at a price comparable to that paid by their foreign competitors, American operators cannot survive in the international trade with Canada.

S. 3108 is designed to accomplish two things. First, it will enable American operators to turn in uneconomic vessels in exchange for an allowance of credit which will put the cost of a new vessel on a parity with foreign cost. Second, it will establish a reserve fleet for use in an emergency, when, in an all-out war, foreign or overseas sources of iron ore and other strategic materials will undoubtedly be cut off.

Mr. President, my colleagues know that I have long been a staunch advocate of freer international competition. The one exception—a clearly demonstrable one, in my opinion—is in the case of national defense. Considerations of the national defense require that we maintain sufficient bulk-cargo vessel capacity to move over the sheltered route of the Great Lakes the quantities of iron ore and other basic bulk materials required by heavy industry.

At the minimum, the Great Lakes fleet should be maintained at a level where it is capable of moving at least 185 million tons of bulk commodities annually. On the basis of peacetime requirements alone, experts predict that by 1960 the Lake Superior district will be producing about 81 million tons of iron ore, Canada will be producing 20 million tons, and other foreign sources an additional 21 million tons. The Great Lakes fleet should be capable of moving not only our domestic ore, but at least half of that normally produced in Canada. Moreover, sufficient excess vessel capacity should be maintained to absorb the increased demand which would be thrown on the lake fleet in the event overseas sources of ore were cut off. When we add to this at least 73 million tons of other essential commodities, such as coal, limestone, and grain, it becomes readily apparent that a seasonal capacity of 185 million tons is, indeed, conservative.

At the present time in a normal navigation season—that is, from April 15 to November 30—vessels of the Great Lakes fleet, if employed in their usual trades, have a theoretical, maximum seasonal capacity of about 178 million tons. Last year, better than 3 million tons of seasonal capacity were retired because of obsolescence. It is not to be expected that this annual rate of retirement of old vessels will remain constant. The ages of the vessels are such, however, that it will continue, so that, as of now, it may be said that by 1960 the minimum need for new vessels will be about 19 million tons of annual carrying capacity. It is interesting to note that this need will be only slightly less than one-half the probable Great Lakes United States-Canadian commerce in bulk commodities at that time.

If our Great Lakes vessels are unable to participate in this international trade, it is not to be expected that the old vessels which are retired will be replaced. The result will then be that our fleet will diminish to a point where it will be sufficient only to transport our do-

mestic peacetime Great Lakes commerce. In the event of war, there would be a tragic shortage in United States vessel capacity. Among other things, S. 3108 would prevent this shortage by encouraging the construction of new vessels and creating a reserve for the old vessels.

Mr. President, these are the reasons why I believe that passage by the Senate of S. 3108 is in the national interest. I think enactment of this bill is essential to the maintenance and development of privately owned United States-flag vessels on the Great Lakes in the quantity and quality necessary to supply the demands of essential industries with basic bulk commodities, both in peacetime and in the event of a future national emergency.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from Minnesota will remember that 4 or 5 years ago the Government turned 10 vessels over to Great Lakes operators.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, I recall that.

Mr. LANGER. And the Senator from Minnesota will also remember that shortly thereafter, an effort was made to ship wheat in the vessels, but the statement was made that they could not be used for that purpose, because they were under contract with the ore companies. As a result, no space was available for the shipment of wheat.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say that I was one of the cosponsors of the so-called package-freight bill or less-than-carload-lot shipment bill, which was passed. At the time when the freighters to which the Senator from North Dakota refers were to be placed in operation, the Korean war broke out, and, therefore, the ore companies had to utilize the ships for the shipment of the urgently needed iron ore. That is the only reason, let me say, why the incident the Senator from North Dakota brings to our attention was not taken care of in the manner for which the bill was originally designed.

Mr. LANGER. Then am I to understand that if the pending bill is enacted, and if in the future some of my constituents wish to ship wheat, and if no war is in progress, I have the guaranty of the Senator from Minnesota that it will be possible to ship the wheat on the Great Lakes?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I assure the Senator from North Dakota that no one is more interested in the shipment of such commodities on the Great Lakes than I am, and I assure him that I share his view regarding the desirability and necessity of such use in the case of the ships authorized under the pending proposal. I respectfully assure him that wheat will be shipped and will be well cared for.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require on the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I merely wish to say that I have just received the assurance of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that we shall be able to ship our

wheat. May I have the same assurance in regard to flour?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in reply, let me say that, although I will not be owning the ships, nevertheless, I am happy to state that I feel sure that the owners of the ships will be glad to cooperate in all matters of commerce.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I remind the Senators that no provision of the bill requires the owners of the ships to transport 1 pound of agricultural commodities. Instead, the ships could be used entirely for the shipment of ore, if that were desired, and the owners of the ships would still be able to receive the subsidy.

Do not let anyone be confused that this billion-dollar new subsidy program is being supported as a benefit for the farmers. All that the farmers get out of this bill is the right to pay taxes and underwrite the cost.

The large steel companies are the major beneficiaries and every Member of the Senate knows that is true.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I respect the judgment of the Senator from Delaware, of course. But for one who believes as much as the Senator from Delaware does in free enterprise, I cannot imagine that he would wish to attempt to dictate to the owners of the ships as to what would be hauled in them. I assume that they will use the ships legitimately, in legitimate commerce.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But the free-enterprise system must be willing to assume its own responsibilities. The free-enterprise system cannot remain free and continue to unload on the Government all its obligations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We only ask that the Great Lakes shipping industry be allowed the opportunity it needs. We are sure that the Great Lakes shipping industry will operate the ships in the proper way.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of the time available to me, if the other side is prepared to do likewise.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Delaware desire to have 5 minutes yielded to him?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I assume that the Senator in charge of the time for the other side will yield time to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I think the Congress will be making a great mistake if it adopts a new principle of a subsidy for the Great Lakes shipping industry without giving it more study. I think there is no question but that if the bill is passed and is enacted into law, in a few months we shall be asked to subsidize not only the construction but also the operations

by paying the differential in the cost of American labor and foreign labor.

Furthermore, the bill contains no limit. It provides a subsidy of about \$3.5 million or \$4 million for each ship; and according to the Department of Commerce approximately 300 ships are eligible for the subsidy. If the subsidy were carried to its extreme, ultimately it would cost the Government over \$1 billion.

Nor can it be claimed that the bill is in the interest of the national defense, because the defense agency and every other agency have testified that the bill is not needed in the national defense.

Certainly the steel companies do not need such a subsidy in order to transport their own ore.

The adoption of the two amendments—one providing for the awarding of the contracts to the lowest responsible competitive bidder and the other amendment prohibiting further subsidized vacations for Government officials—did greatly improve the bill. However, the rejection of the other amendment still leaves the bill providing for a multimillion dollar new subsidy program, and in my opinion this cannot be justified.

I think it is ridiculous that we are being asked to subsidize the operations of these companies to that extent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all unused time yielded back?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I will yield back the remainder of my time on condition that the acting minority leader do likewise, following which I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. POTTER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been consumed or yielded back.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief 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 PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 3108) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 510 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(1) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized (subject to the provisions of this section) to acquire any obsolete Great Lakes vessel or vessels in exchange for an allowance of credit to be applied upon the purchase price of a new vessel. A vessel shall be considered an 'obsolete vessel' for purposes of this subsection if it (1) is enrolled and licensed under the laws of the United States for trade on the Great Lakes and has been so enrolled and licensed for a period of at least 10 years; (2) is designed

to transport in such trade dry bulk commodities such as iron ore, limestone, grain, or coal; (3) is of not less than 3,000 gross tons; and (4) is owned by a citizen or citizens of the United States and has been so owned by such citizen or citizens for at least 3 years immediately prior to the date of acquisition hereunder. A vessel shall be considered a 'new vessel' for purposes of this subsection if it (A) is constructed after January 1, 1956, in a Great Lakes shipyard within the United States; (B) is capable by reason of design of transporting bulk commodities such as iron ore, limestone, grain, or coal between ports on the Great Lakes, including the whole of the St. Lawrence River and the Gulf of St. Lawrence as far east as a line drawn north and south through the west end of Anticosti Island; and (C) is documented under the laws of the United States.

"The allowance of credit for an obsolete vessel or vessels acquired under this subsection may equal but shall not exceed the excess, as determined by the Secretary, of the fair and reasonable cost of constructing the new vessel (excluding the cost of any features incorporated in the vessel for national defense use, which shall be paid by the United States) over the fair and reasonable estimate of cost of constructing the new vessel, if it were constructed under similar plans and specifications (excluding national defense features as above provided), in a foreign shipbuilding center which is deemed by the Secretary to furnish a fair and representative example for the determination of the estimated foreign cost of construction of vessels of the type proposed to be constructed, and where vessels have been built or are likely to be built, as found by the Secretary, for engaging in the transportation of any bulk commodity in competition with any Great Lakes United States vessel, whether the movement of such commodity be over the Great Lakes or other waters. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as restricting the trade in which such new vessel may be used. With respect to a new vessel, the construction of which was contracted for after January 1, 1956, but before the effective date of this subsection, such allowance may be paid to the owner notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (b). The full credit on the cost of the new vessel shall be allowed only upon the trade-in of an obsolete vessel or vessels having gross tonnage at least equal to or greater than that of the new vessel: *Provided*, That the gross tonnage of such obsolete vessel or vessels may exceed the gross tonnage of the new vessel in a ratio of not in excess of 1.25 to 1, if the Secretary finds that the new vessel, although of less tonnage, will provide utility value equal to or greater than that of the obsolete vessel or vessels. If the gross tonnage of the obsolete vessel or vessels is less than that of the new vessel, the allowance of credit shall be reduced proportionately. If the gross tonnage of such obsolete vessel or vessels exceeds the gross tonnage of the new vessel, then, subject to the provisions of subsection (c) of this section, an additional allowance of credit shall be determined with respect to such excess in accordance with the provisions of subsection (d) of this section.

"Any obsolete vessel acquired by the United States under the provisions of this subsection shall be placed in a national defense reserve fleet of Great Lakes vessels, subject to the provisions of section 11 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (50 App. U. S. C., sec. 1744), unless, in the opinion of the Secretary, it is of insufficient value for commercial or military operations to warrant its further preservation.

"Except as they may be inconsistent with this subsection, all the provisions of subsections (a) through (g) shall be applicable to the acquisition of an obsolete vessel or vessels as provided in this subsection.

"No credit shall be allowed under the provisions of this subsection, and no credit shall be allowed or payment made under any other provision of this act or of any other act providing government assistance in the acquisition or construction of vessels, with respect to any vessel the contract for acquisition or construction of which is entered into after the effective date of this subsection, unless such contract shall have been entered into as the result of competitive bidding and awarded to the lowest responsible bidder."

Sec. 2. That the Shipping Act of 1916 is amended by adding a new section as follows:

"Sec. 45. No common carrier by water subject to this act (the Shipping Act of 1916) shall directly or indirectly issue any ticket or pass for the free or reduced rate transportation of any passenger in foreign commerce or in commerce between the United States and its Territories and possessions, or directly or indirectly give any free or reduced-rate transportation to any such passenger, except, under such terms and conditions as the Federal Maritime Board may prescribe, to its directors, officers, and employees and their immediate families; witnesses and attorneys attending any legal investigation in which such common carrier by water is interested; persons injured in accidents at sea and physicians and nurses attending such persons; persons rescued at sea; and any person with the object of providing relief in cases of general epidemic, pestilence, or other calamitous visitation. Nothing contained in this section shall prohibit any common carrier by water, under such terms and conditions as the Board may prescribe, from interchanging with any other common carrier by water free tickets, free passes, or free or reduced-rate transportation for their directors, officers, and employees and their immediate families. The provisions of this section shall not apply to any common carrier by water with respect to any vessel that is both documented under the laws of a foreign country and owned, leased, or chartered by a person who is a citizen of a foreign country."

GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 9536, the General Government matters appropriation bill for 1957.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9536) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry General Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this is the first of two appropriations involving General Government matters and independent offices.

House bill 9536 provides funds for the Executive Office of the President, under various items; for the American Battle Monuments Commission; for the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission; and for the Subversive Activities Control Board.

As reported to the Senate, the total amount of the bill is \$14,969,975. This is \$44,500 under the budget estimate, and represents an increase of \$120,700 over the House allowance. Seventy thousand dollars of the increase is to restore the budget estimates for the Council of Economic Advisers in the Office of the President, expenses of management improvement, and for the expenses of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. Fifty thousand dollars was added over the budget estimate for the American Battle Monuments Commission, for starting a program to furnish the next of kin a photograph of the cemetery and grave where a deceased veteran is buried.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc, and that the bill, as thus amended, be considered, for the purpose of amendment, as original text; provided, however, that no point of order against any amendment shall be deemed to have been waived by the adoption of this unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

Under the heading "Title I—Executive Office of the President—Council of Economic Advisers—Salaries and Expenses," on page 4, line 9, after the figures "\$300", to strike out "\$350,000" and insert "\$365,700."

Under the heading "Funds Appropriated to the President—Expenses of Management Improvement", on page 7, line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$50" and insert "\$75", and at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "\$350,000" and insert "\$400,000."

Under the heading "American Battle Monuments Commission—Salaries and Expenses", on page 8, line 1, after "\$1,140,000", to insert "of which \$10,000 shall be immediately available for printing relating to the dedication of World War II memorials."

Under the subhead "Construction of Memorials and Cemeteries", on page 8, line 24, after the word "travel", to strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$1,050,000."

Under the heading "Foreign Claims Settlement Commission—Salaries and Expenses", on page 9, at the beginning of line 12, to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$10,000"; in line 15, after the word "Commission", to insert "and employment of aliens", and in the same line, following the amendment just above stated, to strike out "\$795,000" and insert "\$800,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, let me say very briefly, in connection with the American Battle Monuments Commission, inasmuch as some inquiry may be made relative to that item, that the program is underway. It should be completed sometime this year, so that the families of American veterans who gave their lives on foreign soil and whose

bodies have not been brought back to this country will receive from the Government at least photographs of some of the beautiful cemeteries and parks all over the world where deceased veterans from past wars are buried.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, it is my good fortune to be a member of the Battle Monuments Commission. One of the complaints we have received is that the parents or loved ones of deceased veterans have not been able to receive any documents or pictures relating to the burial grounds where veterans have been interred. This new program of the American Battle Monuments Commission is a program which I know will be appreciated by the families and relatives of the deceased servicemen.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We also suggested to the Commission, that it might explore the possibility of having the pictures in color, and they are doing that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 9536) was passed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. KNOWLAND conferees on the part of the Senate.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 9739.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9739) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the pending bill makes appropriations for the independent offices of the Government, and provides funds for 17 agencies and five Government corporations. As reported to the Senate, the bill totals \$5,916,997,258. That amount is \$93,546,032 under the House allowance, and \$265,052,642 under the appropriations for 1956, but is \$133,293,258 in excess of the budget estimates for 1957.

The principal item accounting for most of the differences is the payment to the civil service retirement and disability fund. For this item the estimate of the Budget Bureau was \$295 million; the House provided \$600 million and the Senate committee recommends \$440,438,000.

Other items accounting for the difference are \$6 million for disaster relief; \$50,000 for the Federal Trade Commission, \$610,108 for the Interstate Commerce Commission, and \$1,221,000 for the Veterans' Administration.

The remainder of the bill is \$12,144,742 under the budget estimates.

Restoration to the full budget estimates are provided for the following items: Federal Civil Defense Administration, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Federal Power Commission, Housing Administrator, Public Housing Administration, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, National Capital Housing Authority, National Science Foundation, National Security Training Commission, Securities and Exchange Commission, Selective Service System, and Veterans' Administration medical funds.

There are two amendments which I shall offer, and which I shall explain.

With that brief preliminary statement, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc; and that the bill, as thus amended, be considered for the purpose of amendment as original text; provided, however, that no point of order against any amendment shall be deemed to have been waived by the adoption of this agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object, I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment at this time on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL]. I have discussed the amendment with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, with the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, and with the ranking minority member of the full committee. It involves 2 hospitals, 1 at Nashville, Tenn., and the other at McKinney, Tex. If the Senator from Washington will accept the amendment, we can include it in the bill at this time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; we discussed the amendment at some length in committee. Personally, I see no objection to taking the amendment, which is in the language of the House bill, to conference. There was some suggestion made in committee that we ought to appropriate the money in a general way for the veterans' hospital construction program. However, I see no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? Without objection, the Secretary will state the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] on behalf of himself and the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL].

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 32, line 2, in the committee amendment it is proposed to strike "\$48,135,000" and insert in lieu thereof: "\$51,635,000, of which \$2 million shall be used for technical services for the major alteration, rehabilitation, and modernization for the continued operation of the hospital at McKinney, Tex., and \$1,500,000 shall be

available for technical services for rehabilitation of the general medical and surgical hospital at Nashville, Tenn."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand that the language of the amendment is agreeable to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; it is agreeable to me. I have not discussed it with all the members of the committee, but I have talked to some members about it, and it is agreeable to them. The Senator from Illinois is a member of the committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it occurs to me that at least a brief legislative record should be made with respect to the pending amendment. I should say at the outset that I have not the slightest objection to taking the amendment to conference. I know the language of the amendment appeared in the House bill as it came to our committee.

I believe I should say, Mr. President, that as early as 1950, when the veterans' hospital at Dallas, Tex., was authorized, the Veterans' Administration had in mind that when that hospital was completed, the hospital at McKinney, Tex., would be deactivated. It is entirely possible that the Veterans' Administration will need these additional beds at McKinney. However, I have learned from the Veterans' Administration that there will be no deactivation of that hospital at least for a period of 2 years, because it will take that long for the Dallas hospital to be constructed.

In any event, on the basis of the testimony which has been presented by the Veterans' Administration, but notwithstanding that fact, and in conformance with the desires of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, I am agreeable to taking the amendment to conference, to see what can be worked out in conference in connection with it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate what my friend, the Senator from Illinois has said. I should like to say that this hospital performs a vital role in a section of Texas where the population is increasing rapidly and where veterans in need of hospitalization have great difficulty in finding hospital beds open to them. There is already a long waiting list for both the McKinney and for the Dallas hospitals.

In the words of the American Legion department service officer in Dallas, it is a continuous fight to get sick veterans in either the McKinney or the Dallas hospital.

Each of these hospitals has a long waiting list. Only dire emergency cases are admitted on application.

I quote further from a letter I have received from the Dallas department service officer of the American Legion:

There are plenty of veterans who the VA admits need hospitalization, but not on an emergency basis, and they are thus placed on the waiting lists. It takes them forever to get in.

Mr. President, I am not one who feels that every appropriation of money asked for in the name of American veterans should automatically be granted by the Congress. I strongly believe that

every such request should be backed up by facts proving conclusively that it is justified.

This, in my considered opinion, is such a request.

The need for the services offered by the McKinney Hospital is real and urgent.

Nor does any person familiar with the situation deny the pressing need for major repair and rehabilitation of the hospital.

Mr. President, I respectfully urge in the strongest possible terms that the Senate act to restore the \$2 million for this purpose as approved by the House.

It is my understanding that the modification is agreeable to the committee, and if so, I should like that it be made prior to action by the Senate on the chairman's motion. The modification would restore \$2 million for repair, rehabilitation, and modernization work at the McKinney, Tex., Veterans' Hospital. In effect, it is simply a restoration of the language in the bill as it passed the House.

I thank the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], on behalf of himself and the junior Senator from Texas, to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc? The Chair hears none, and the committee amendments will be considered and agreed to en bloc.

The committee amendments, agreed to en bloc, including the one on page 32, beginning in line 2, which was amended and agreed to on motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, are as follows:

Under the heading "Title I—Independent Offices—Civil Service Commission", on page 2, line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$29,000", and in line 20, after the word "amended", to strike out "\$17,282,500" and insert "\$17,532,500."

On page 2, line 25, after the numerals "1943", to strike out the comma and "or for the compensation or expenses of any member of a board of examiners (1) who has not made affidavit that he has not appeared in any agency proceeding within the preceding 2 years, and will not thereafter while a board member appear in any agency proceeding, as a party, or in behalf of a party to the proceeding, before an agency in which an applicant is employed who has been rated or will be rated by such member; or (2) who, after making such affidavit, has rated an applicant who at the time of the rating is employed by an agency before which the board member has appeared as a party, or in behalf of a party, within the preceding 2 years: *Provided*, That the definitions of 'agency', 'agency proceeding', and 'party' in section 2 of the Administrative Procedure Act shall apply to these terms as used herein."

On page 3, after line 14, to strike out: "No part of appropriations herein shall be used to pay the compensation of officers and employees of the Civil Service Commission who allocate or reallocate supervisory positions in the classified civil service solely on

the size of the group, section, bureau, or other organization unit, or on the number of subordinates supervised. References to size of the group, section, bureau, or other organization unit or the number of subordinates supervised may be given effect only to the extent warranted by the workload of such organization unit and then only in combination with other factors such as the kind, difficulty, and complexity of work supervised, the degree and scope of responsibility delegated to the supervisor, and the kind, degree, and value of the supervision actually exercised."

On page 4, line 12, after the word "organizations", to strike out "\$450,000" and insert "\$525,000."

On page 5, line 17, after "(5 U. S. C. ch. 14)", to strike out "\$600,000,000" and insert "\$440,438,000."

On page 5, line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$186,700."

Under the heading "Federal Civil Defense Administration", on page 6, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$10,000", and in line 17, after the word "conclusive", to strike out "\$15,560,000" and insert "\$21,700,000."

On page 7, line 9, after the word "prescribe", to strike out "\$42,000,000" and insert "\$64,000,000."

On page 7, line 16, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$14,500,000."

On page 7, line 25, after the word "thereto", to strike out "\$1,540,000" and insert "\$6,000,000."

At the top of page 8, to strike out: "No part of any appropriation in this act shall be available for the construction of warehouses or for the lease of warehouse space in any building which is to be constructed specifically for the use of the Federal Civil Defense Administration."

Under the heading "Funds appropriated to the President—Disaster relief", on page 8, line 11, after the word "disasters", to strike out "\$5,386,030" and insert "\$6,000,000", and in line 12, after the word "expended", to insert a colon and "Provided, That not to exceed \$6,000,000 shall be expended in any one State."

Under the heading "Federal Communications Commission", on page 8, line 25, after the word "travel", to strike out "\$7,800,000" and insert "\$7,828,000."

Under the heading "Federal Power Commission", on page 9, at the beginning of line 10, to strike out "\$5,200,000" and insert "\$5,250,000", and in line 14, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$200,000" and insert "\$325,000."

Under the heading "Federal Trade Commission", on page 9, at the beginning of line 23, to strike out "\$227,000" and insert "\$237,000", and in the same line, after the word "travel", to strike out "\$5,400,000" and insert "\$5,550,000."

Under the heading "General Services Administration", on page 11, line 7, after the word "travel", to strike out "\$122,694,200" and insert "\$128,084,500."

On page 12, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "\$42,565,550" and insert "\$42,638,000."

On page 13, line 16, after the words "exceed", strike out "\$81,000" and insert "\$160,000", and at the beginning of line 17, to strike out "\$2,809,400" and insert "\$2,959,400."

On page 14, line 9, after the word "travel", to strike out "\$14,270,000" and insert "\$14,770,000."

On page 14, line 21, to strike out "\$6,818,650" and insert "\$6,893,650."

On page 14, after line 21, to insert: "Survey of Government records, records management, and disposal practices: For necessary expenses in connection with conducting surveys of the records of Federal agencies and of records management and

records disposal practices in Federal agencies, pursuant to section 505 (c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, \$100,000."

On page 15, line 14, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$3,000,000" and insert "\$3,351,000", and in line 25, after the word "the", to strike out "purposes" and insert "purposes."

On page 17, at the beginning of line 16, to strike out "\$9,278,200" and insert "\$9,802,550."

On page 18, after line 15, to strike out: "During the current fiscal year, no part of any money appropriated in this or any other act shall be used during any quarter of such fiscal year to purchase within the continental limits of the United States typewriting machines (except bookkeeping and billing machines) at a price which exceeds 90 percent of the lowest net cash price, plus applicable Federal excise taxes, accorded the most-favored customer (other than the Government, the American National Red Cross, and the purchases of typewriting machines for educational purposes only) of the manufacturer of such machines during the 6-month period immediately preceding such quarter: *Provided*, That the purchase, utilization, and disposal of typewriting machines shall be performed in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended."

On page 19, after line 5, to strike out: "The Administrator is authorized, with regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to place ten positions, in addition to those otherwise authorized, in grade GS-16 in the General Schedule established by said act, and the salary of the Comptroller shall be at the salary rate of grade GS-18 so long as such position is occupied by the present incumbent."

Under the heading "Housing and Home Finance Agency—Office of the Administrator", on page 19, line 22, after the word "Agency", to strike out "\$6,000,000" and insert "\$6,450,000."

On page 20, line 19, after the word "amended", to strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$2,000,000."

On page 20, line 24, after "(40 U. S. C. 462)", to strike out "\$6,000,000" and insert "\$9,000,000."

Under the subhead "Public Housing Administration", on page 21, line 7, after the word "Administration", to strike out "\$9,700,000" and insert "\$10,700,000."

On page 21, line 13, after "(42 U. S. C. 1410)", to strike out "\$90,000,000" and insert "\$96,000,000."

Under the heading "Interstate Commerce Commission", on page 21, line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "forty-five" and insert "sixty"; in line 22, after the word "and", to insert "not to exceed \$1,049,000 for"; in line 23, after the word "travel", to strike out "\$13,900,000" and insert "\$14,610,108", and in line 24, after "(a)", to strike out "not less than \$1,939,000 shall be available for expenses necessary to carry out railroad safety and locomotive inspection activities, and" and insert "not less than \$1,230,178 shall be available for expenses necessary to carry out railroad safety activities and not less than \$849,500 shall be available for expenses necessary to carry out locomotive inspection activities, and."

Under the heading "National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics", on page 22, line 24, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "\$61,475,000" and insert "\$63,200,000"; and in line 25, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$600,000" and insert "\$1,500,000."

On page 23, line 6, after the word "Committee", to strike out "\$13,000,000" and insert "\$15,000,000."

Under the heading "National Capital Housing Authority", on page 23, at the be-

ginning of line 12, to strike out "\$37,000" and insert "\$39,000."

Under the heading "National Science Foundation", on page 24, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "\$35,915,000" and insert "\$41,300,000"; and in line 6, after the word "expended", to strike out the colon and "*Provided*, That of the foregoing amount not less than \$9,500,000 shall be available for tuition, grants, and allowances in connection with a program of supplementary training for high-school science and mathematics teachers."

On page 24, after line 9, to insert:

"NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION
"Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the National Security Training Commission, including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not in excess of \$50 per diem; and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; \$75,000."

Under the heading "Securities and Exchange Commission", on page 25, line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$750" and insert "\$1,500"; in line 5, after the word "law", to insert "purchase of one passenger motor vehicle;" and in line 8, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "\$5,700,000" and insert "\$5,749,000."

Under the heading "Selective Service System", on page 25, line 15, after the word "of", to strike out "nineteen" and insert "thirty-eight"; in line 21, after the word "Specialists", to strike out "\$28,442,000" and insert "\$29,050,000"; and in the same line, after the word "*Provided*", to strike out "That of the foregoing amount \$20,586,050 shall be available for registration, classification, and induction activities to local boards; *Provided further*."

On page 26, after line 4, to insert:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the officer of the Army now serving as Director of the Selective Service System shall, effective upon the day preceding his retirement, be considered to hold the grade of lieutenant general for all purposes, without regard to any limitations on the number of officers in that grade, and shall receive the pay and allowances of an officer of that grade and his length of service, and when retired under any provision of law shall be advanced on the retired list to such grade and shall receive the retired or retirement pay at the rate prescribed by law computed on the basis of the basic pay which he would receive if serving on active duty in such grade."

Under the heading "Veterans' Administration", on page 27, line 9, after the word "employees", to strike out "\$162,118,260" and insert "\$163,936,000"; in line 10, following the amendment just above stated, to strike out "of which not less than \$17,640,042 shall be available for such expenses as are necessary for the loan-guaranty program", and in line 13, after the word "of", to strike out "twenty" and insert "fifteen."

On page 28, line 8, after the word "equipment", to strike out "\$16,099,600" and insert "\$16,453,000."

On page 32, line 2, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$50,935,000" and insert "\$51,635,000."

On page 32, line 12, after the word "facilities", to strike out "\$4,447,000" and insert "\$4,533,000."

Under the heading "Title II—Corporations—Federal Home Loan Bank Board", on page 36, line 24, after the word "of", to strike out "\$978,400" and insert "\$1,095,000", and on page 37, line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$42,400" and insert "\$51,500."

On page 38, line 14, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$532,000" and insert "\$596,000."

Under the subhead "Housing and Home Finance Agency", on page 40, line 5, after the

word "exceed", to strike out "\$318,000" and insert "\$418,000."

On page 41, at the beginning of line 2, strike out "\$2,000,000" and insert "\$2,310,000", and at the beginning of line 18, to strike out "\$7,900,000" and insert "\$8,400,000."

On page 41, at the beginning of line 22, to strike out "\$3,700,000" and insert "\$3,850,000."

On page 43, line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$11,550,000" and insert "\$12,800,000", and in line 22, after the word "travel", to insert "purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U. S. C. 2131)."

Mr. MAGNUSON. 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 Washington will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 21, lines 23 and 24, it is proposed to insert "\$14,797,196" in lieu of "\$14,610,108"; on page 22, line 4, to strike out "and"; and on page 22, line 6, after the word "law", to insert the following: "and (c) \$187,088 shall be available for salaries and travel and other expenses for 22 additional inspectors for the Bureau of Motor Carriers."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the committee has held long hearings on the work of the Interstate Commerce Commission with reference to the question of safety and both motor-carrier and railroad inspection. The appropriations have been inadequate for some years, and the committee saw fit to increase the number of safety inspectors so that they can handle more work than could be handled in times past.

In the field of motor carriers the growth of the industry has grown so rapidly that the inspectors have not been able to catch up.

The effect of this amendment would be to add \$187,088 to the bill for the Bureau of Motor Carriers in the Interstate Commerce Commission. I consider this increase to be absolutely essential if this agency is to carry out its responsibility to the public in the field of motor safety, in the field of safety on our highways.

This \$187,088 will provide for 22 additional safety inspectors. The bill as reported to the Senate allowed for a total of 78. This additional sum will bring the total force to 100.

Unless this amount is added there will be at least 12 field offices in the United States with no safety inspectors, and another 10 offices will be badly undermanned.

Since my committee marked up this bill new information has come to light which more than justifies the action I am requesting. Had this new information been fully available to the committee at the time we were marking up the bill I am certain this additional amount would have been in the bill when it came to the floor.

The new information to which I refer comes as a result of a nationwide safety check made by the Bureau of Motor Carriers.

I quote from a news release by ICC which presents a summary of their findings. The lead on the story reads: "ICC

road check finds defects in 90 percent of vehicles."

I read from the release:

The Bureau of Motor Carriers of the Interstate Commerce Commission announced today its nationwide road check of interstate motor vehicles showed that 7,021 vehicles or 90.8 percent of the 7,734 checked had one or more defects or deficiencies.

The 5-day check by 131 district supervisors and safety inspectors of the Bureau's field staff was made to obtain information for the commission on the extent of noncompliance with ICC safety regulations. Each vehicle was checked as to 58 possible violations.

In its preliminary findings, the bureau noted that the relatively small number of vehicles checked and the random method of selection did not provide a true cross-section of the estimated 1,150,000 interstate trucks.

The Bureau found, however, that the study developed valuable information as to leads for further investigation of carriers or classes of carriers which are permitting their trucks to operate on the highways in an unsafe condition or without proper regard for safety practices. It also provided information on which the Bureau may base future educational activities or punitive action.

Of the total inspected, 4,603 vehicles were operated by carriers holding ICC operating authority while 3,131 were operated by private or "exempt" carriers—under the so-called agricultural exemption—which are subject only to the Commission's safety and hours-of-service regulations.

Mr. President, the lives of people are involved. It is imperative that motor vehicles, subject to the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Motor Carriers, be in safe operating condition when they are on the highways.

I move the adoption of the amendment to add \$187,088 to the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Since the committee marked up the independent offices appropriation bill the Senate has considered the Federal highway bill. In connection with that bill, I notice that if fatalities on our highways continue at the rate experienced in the first few months of 1956, probably 42,000 men, women, and children will lose their lives in traffic accidents this year. That is a ghastly total, which probably comes into better perspective when we think of it as 10 times the number of persons who were killed in the bombing of Pearl Harbor in December 1941.

The additional money requested by the chairman of the committee relates to only one facet, namely, motor carriers licensed by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Notwithstanding that fact, it is a component in the overall safety picture. The insane death and accident toll on our highways simply cannot be ignored, because some day there will be real revulsion on the part of the American public. In prior years we have appropriated inadequate funds with which to carry on the work.

I have no objection to the amendment, and I shall be glad to have the proposal go to conference for final adjudication.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amend-

ment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Washington a question or two. I ask, first, for information, whether this is the proper time at which to raise an appropriation question relative to an increase in the number of personnel for the Interstate Commerce Commission for policing the use of boxcars.

As the Senator from Washington knows, the committee has held rather extensive hearings with reference to the boxcar shortage, and the testimony showed very clearly that so-called service agents are in such short supply that in Portland, Oreg., for example, there is only one service agent acting for our State, and he has not been supplied with even a stenographer, so that he has to sit down to his typewriter and spend a great deal of time typing his own reports to the Interstate Commerce Commission. Thus, has little time for policing boxcars.

I am convinced that one of the major reasons for the shortage of boxcars is the gross inefficiency of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

If ever there was an independent agency of the Government which needed a shaking down or a shaking up, it is the Interstate Commerce Commission. Each year when a boxcar shortage occurs, and there arises the issue of getting an adequate number of service agents to police the distribution of boxcars, I get a little weary of having the Interstate Commerce Commission tell me, "Mr. Senator, we do not have enough help to do the job."

My reply has been, "Have you asked for the help, in the first place; and have you been denied the help after you have asked for it?"

I ask the Senator from Washington two questions: First, is this the place to raise the issue in regard to additional service agents for the Interstate Commerce Commission; and if it is, has the Interstate Commerce Commission asked for additional service agents? Second, what did the Senator's committee do about it?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That matter was looked into by the committee. I feel as the Senator from Oregon feels about the situation, probably a little more keenly, because every year in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce we are confronted with the same situation.

Congress has supplied a tax incentive. The committee has brought railroad and Interstate Commerce Commission representatives before it. We have tried to do something to remedy the condition. But the result has been that there are fewer boxcars in operation today than there were when the matter first came to our attention.

The committee held hearings about 2 weeks ago on a bill which would give the Interstate Commerce Commission the authority to move the boxcars around with greater flexibility. I have learned from figures which have been supplied to me that we in the West feel the impact of this situation more than do the people in the East.

The cost of building a new, modern boxcar is about \$8,000; and of a reefer,

about \$12,000. The demurrage rate now as between railroads is \$2.40 a day. The president of the Northern Pacific Railroad, for instance, told me only a few weeks ago that he could not justify spending \$8,000 of the railroad's money and getting back only \$2.40 a day in rental.

The movement of freight cars from east to west runs in a ratio of about 60-40. The Pennsylvania, for instance, keeps on its line more cars of other railroads than it turns back to the western railroads. The same thing is true, I believe, of the New York Central and other large eastern roads.

So the committee has before it a bill which would allow the Interstate Commerce Commission to take some action to remedy that condition. I think the committee will act on the bill at its next session. What the Senator from Oregon has stated is correct. Another facet of the situation is the failure of the Interstate Commerce Commission to make sufficient car inspections. The committee added \$165,000 to the Interstate Commerce Commission appropriation to provide for 20 additional car service agents. The senior Senator from Washington thought the Commission should have 30 agents. But the Interstate Commerce Commission took the position that it requires a little time to train such persons, and the Commission thought it could operate satisfactorily this year with 20 additional service agents. I do not know whether that number will be sufficient, but it will be a start; and for that purpose we have added \$165,000 to the appropriation.

Mr. MORSE. I made a pretty fair investigation of this question myself. In my judgment, the argument of the Interstate Commerce Commission that they cannot use more than 20 additional agents is about as phony as are most of the arguments which have been made to us in connection with the boxcar shortage matter. The country would be in a better position with respect to the boxcar shortage if the Interstate Commerce Commission staff were not so honeycombed with former railroad employees. That is one aspect of the problem in connection with the boxcar shortage.

The shippers of the Nation have not been getting from the American railroads the cooperation they are entitled to receive; and in part the difficulty lies in the Interstate Commerce Commission, where too many of the personnel are heavily saturated with the railroad point of view rather than with the public point of view.

It is not true that trained personnel are not available to the Interstate Commerce Commission. Do not forget that during the war there were considerably more than 100 boxcar service agents throughout the country. I have gone into the matter sufficiently to satisfy myself that the agents are available to the Interstate Commerce Commission if the Commission will only employ persons who are not saturated with the railroad point of view, but who can be hired to represent the public point of view.

The Commission's own communications, in response to requests which have

been made to them in recent years to get more help in order to relieve the boxcar shortage, are replete with repetition after repetition of the statement that the difficulty is that the Commission has not had sufficient appropriations to enable it to employ an adequate number of persons to do the work.

If the Commission is asking for only 20 additional persons this year, let me say that that will not make a dent; it will not begin to solve the problem. I think this is a matter which calls for at least some discussion in conference.

May I ask the Senator from Washington if he would be willing to accept an amendment to increase the amount in the bill to equal the cost of 30 rather than 20 additional car service agents, to be made available to the Interstate Commerce Commission?

I would not speak so emphatically on this subject if I had not been engaged in this fight for several years on behalf of the shippers of my State, shoulder to shoulder with the Senators from Washington and the Senators from California, because those three Western States, particularly, have had to sustain great losses by reason of the failure of the railroads to provide an adequate number of boxcars.

I see on the floor the distinguished junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young]. The shippers of his State have been in the same tight fix experienced by the shippers of the west coast, so far as the boxcar shortage is concerned.

I think this is the year to make the record so crystal clear to the Interstate Commerce Commission that never again will they give to a single Senator the alibi that they are not doing a better job of servicing the boxcar supply because they do not have the personnel.

I have asked them in numerous letters, "Did you ask for them? Did you request appropriations for them?" I have gone to the Senator's committee in the past and have found that the Commission had not begun to ask for appropriations in sufficient amounts to provide them with the number of agents they need.

I say most respectfully that an additional 20 are not enough when the whole Pacific area—Zone 25—today is being served by three service agents, and they are not supplied with even a stenographer to help them with their reports and other clerical work. That ought to serve as an example of why there is a boxcar shortage.

The Senator from Washington stated that the Congress had helped the railroads by establishing a tax amortization program. I am for that. I will vote for more of it if only the railroads will build more cars. But that is not what they have done. They have decreased the number of cars under the tax amortization program. While they have built new cars, they have taken out of operation old cars which ought to have had slight repairs made to them in order to keep them on the tracks.

The railroads admit this. They admit, when they are confronted with the question, that as a result of the tax amortization program, amounting to many millions of dollars, there are fewer

boxcars in America today than there were when the program started.

I do not know why Senators, because of this condition, should have to take a beating year after year from irate shippers—and they have reason to be irate. But the Interstate Commerce Commission keeps passing the buck to us, for the correspondence which the shippers send us is to the effect that Congress did not give the Interstate Commerce Commission the personnel necessary to do a proper police job.

I say that the addition of 20 agents is not sufficient. I ask the Senator from Washington if he would be willing to take to conference an amendment to the Interstate Commerce Appropriation which would provide for 30 instead of 20 additional agents.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. In my section of the country a continuous boxcar shortage has existed ever since the close of the war. Conditions are no better today than they were 3 years or 5 years ago.

While we have a surplus of wheat, during most of the year our wheat cannot be shipped out, thereby causing our farmers to lose a large sum of money on the premiums they could have received on the top-quality wheat.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I suppose the Senator from Washington can be said to be taking a beating, because day after day, for at least 10 days, I sat in the committee listening to testimony relating to this situation.

I thought the addition of 30 persons would be a good start. I am perfectly willing to add 30 to the bill. It will be necessary to have a conference with the House anyway. This matter is very vital to all of us.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I sympathize with those who are confronted with the problem of the boxcar shortage. When the Senator from Washington proposed an increase of 20 in the number of such employees—

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from New Hampshire thought I was going a little too high then, did he?

Mr. BRIDGES. I thought the Senator was going a good distance then. I thought we were making an excellent start when we agreed upon an increase of 20. But when the distinguished Senator from Oregon rose and proposed 10 more, he somewhat startled me, because I thought we were going a long way when we proposed 20.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We shall have to have a conference with the House, anyway. I hope the Senator from New Hampshire will not oppose the amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not intend to object. I was saying I thought we had made a major start when we provided 20 additional service agents. I thought a good enough job had been done so that next year it would not be necessary to ask for more.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to say, in support of the amendment, that we have an extraordinary situation on the Pacific coast. We are approximately 2,000 miles away from the center of population and the center of distribution of merchandise in the United States. Most of our forest products and agricultural products have to be shipped over half the width of the continent in order to be sold. That is an unusual condition. People in the South, in New England, and even in the Middle West, are not confronted with that problem. It does seem to me that anything which will enable the use of more freight cars will help our people in the West. It is extremely urgent that the problem be met. Many persons in our State have to send their products 2,000 miles to find a market for them.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may add that our western railroads are penalized economically because of the impractical way the cars are moved about.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Of course, the whole transportation system of the Far West often is penalized. For instance, the 10 percent tax on freight transportation may not be very important to other areas of the country. But in the State of Oregon, and I am sure it is true in other Pacific Northwest States, the transportation tax on products amounts to actually more than the net return received by some farmers, when one considers the taxes paid, the cost of the land, and the cost of irrigation pumping, if it is arid land. The situation is critical. We have lumber operators and farmers in our State whose whole solvency is imperiled when we encounter a critical shortage of freight cars.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I send to the desk an amendment, and ask that it be taken to conference, with the understanding that the amendment has to do with the employment of more car service agents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Oregon proposing to amend the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is a separate amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has not acted on the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered is an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Washington. My amendment simply changes the figure on page 21, line 23, from "\$14,797,196" to "\$14,879,696", for the purpose of adding 10 additional car-service agents to the 20 already added by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall certainly not object, I should like to say

that I do not concur in the sentiments uttered by my distinguished friend from Oregon with respect to the point of view of the personnel in the Interstate Commerce Commission. I think in the main they have served the country and the Government eminently well. I have served on the subcommittee on independent offices for years, indeed, I believe it is all of 18 years ago that I first encountered the appropriations and the requests for the Interstate Commerce Commission.

It should not be forgotten that, in connection with those requests, first they must go to the Budget Bureau. After the Budget Bureau makes its determination, the requests come to the Congress, and the figure so transmitted is the one on which Congress takes testimony. I have, in all of the 18 years, had no occasion to believe that the employees and the Commissioners of the Interstate Commerce Commission did not have a thoroughly public viewpoint, and that they did not undertake to do that which was in the interest of the public, and particularly in the interest of the shippers of the country.

They have a full understanding of the fact that in proportion as freight is moved, as commerce is generated, it is reflected in the tax receipts of the Treasury. They are not insensible of that fact. So I should not like to see them charged with an oblique view.

I remember, from earlier experiences, that they were practically starved in the appropriations for a good many items, and I think, as a matter of fact, the junior Senator from Illinois, who is now speaking, has on occasion used the surgeon's scalpel in order to cut back some of their appropriations. I still believe the Commission serves the country well, and that its viewpoint is one of essential public interest.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The important thing, in my judgment, is that the Senator from Illinois and I agree that we as Senators ought to do the best we can to supply a sufficient number of agents to service the business of the shippers. The Senator from Illinois and I may disagree on the kind of job the Interstate Commerce Commission is doing. I do not fully share his views with regard to that matter, but I am delighted to have the assistance and support of the Senator from Illinois in regard to the amendment. His assistance is always cherished.

In fairness to the Record, I think I should say the criticism I have made of the Interstate Commerce Commission in regard to boxcar policing is the result of information I have obtained from within the Commission itself, when members of the staff who have visited me have stated that the difficulty has arisen, at least in part, because of an attitude to see to it that the railroads get what they want rather than what the public ought to have.

Therefore it is important, when providing for personnel such as service agents, that those hired have not been previously in railroad employment. It does not follow that, in order to under-

stand the problem of boxcar service, the agents must be persons who have formerly been employed by railroads.

Be that as it may, I daresay that if the Senator from Illinois will read the criticisms from shippers in my part of the country, and read the answers which the Interstate Commerce Commission has sent to them, his blood will boil when he interprets the replies as simply passing the buck to the Congress, and alibiing to the shippers that the reason why they do not get better boxcar service is that the Congress has not appropriated enough money for that purpose.

For these reasons the amendment ought to be taken to conference and there thoroughly discussed. I believe the 30 additional boxcar service agents will be less than the number needed to serve adequately the shippers of the country.

I respect the fact that the Senator from Illinois does not agree with my view of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Unfortunately I have not had too many happy experiences with the Interstate Commerce Commission affecting shippers in my part of the West.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Probably no Member of the Senate or of the House has not harassed—politely, of course—the members of the Commission in the peak shipping seasons, because of boxcar shortages. That statement applies to the Fruit Belt, the Potato Belt, the Cereal Grain Belt, the Corn Belt, and other areas. I know that over a long period of years I have contacted the Commission time and time again, in an attempt to get the necessary rolling stock so that perishables could be gotten to market. I think the Commission has done a good job under the circumstances. If the service can be improved by the addition of personnel, I am delighted to go along with the proposal.

I think the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] stated the case well when he said he thought we were making a substantial start when we added 20 new service agents; but I say, let us agree to the additional 10 sought by the Senator from Oregon. Then the amendment can be taken to conference, additional data can be obtained from the Commission, and we shall then be able to determine what ought to be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], on page 21, line 23.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington, as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in view of the adoption of the amendment as amended, it will be necessary, on page 21, line 23, to strike out the numeral "\$1,049,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,085,000." That is the limitation on travel expenses. The amendment will not add to the cost of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President—

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to some legislative language on page 26 of the bill. It relates to the Selective Service System. Even though the language is legislative in character, the committee included it in the bill because the committee sought to express to a very distinguished public servant its appreciation for the long and faithful service he has rendered in a highly sensitive position. I refer to General Hershey, who for 16 years has been Director of the Selective Service System.

The committee thought it should follow the precedent of a pattern which was established many years ago, and should make provision for General Hershey, so long as he is the incumbent, to receive some additional retirement benefits.

Since this provision was written into the bill, I understand that an announcement will soon be made, and probably will care for this matter without having this provision included in the bill.

I yield now to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, in order that he may make the announcement.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the other Members of the Senate that I concur in the general objective of the provision. General Hershey has rendered long and distinguished service to the country in a very difficult role. I believe that service warrants his promotion as he reaches the retirement age and passes out of the active service.

As the Senator from Illinois has said, there is precedent for making a promotion in the way proposed, although it is not the usual way to make it.

On yesterday at the White House this matter was under discussion. This morning, at a conference in the Pentagon, the matter was also under discussion. I think I am at liberty to say that at the White House meeting the President authorized the statement I am making. This morning the Secretary of the Army, Mr. Brucker, authorized—although not in the specific words I shall use—a statement to the effect that it would be preferable to handle this matter in the manner in which promotions are usually handled.

I understand that if this provision is deleted from the bill, within the immediate future there will be forthcoming from the Department of the Army, to the White House, and from the White House to the Senate, a nomination. In fact, I understand that while I have been speaking the nomination from the President has been received here. I now read it:

THE WHITE HOUSE.

Nomination sent to the Senate on June 6, 1956:

The following-named officer under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated

by the President under subsection (b) of section 504, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. Lewis Blaine Hershey, O6530, United States Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

Therefore, Mr. President, there is no need for me to speak further about the matter; the nomination is an actual fact.

Consequently, I suggest to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that the language of the committee amendment on page 26 be eliminated, and that the nomination be handled in the usual manner.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment: On page 26, strike out the language in lines 5 to 16, inclusive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is an agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I have known General Hershey for a long time. In the past 22 years I have known many administrators. I doubt that I have ever encountered any who knew his business so well and who knew so well the statutes under which he was operating, and who operated with such a firm and fair hand. I think it is only proper that we testify to the efficient services of General Hershey in one of the most sensitive spots in the Government. Mr. President, this advancement, with the additional retirement benefits, is a richly deserved honor for him.

I merely wished to make this additional statement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to say that personally, and in conjunction with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and other Senators, I suggested this language. I am glad the nomination has now been made, and that the matter has been handled in that way. I could not say whether the nomination would not have been made if we had not suggested this language. However, we have now served our purpose, and I think the honor to General Hershey is a well-deserved one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I wish to use 30 seconds to add my voice in expressing appreciation of the service General Hershey has rendered his country.

When I first came to Washington, I took up with General Hershey a number of problems. I have never found anyone in the Federal Government more understanding, more sympathetic, or more anxious to be of service than General Hershey. So I am delighted that he has been given this recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President—

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Ohio, who has an amendment to submit.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 32, after line 8, it is proposed to insert: "Provided, That the construction of the hospital at the Wade Park site is to furnish not less than 800 G. M. and S. beds."

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I took up this matter with the chairman of the subcommittee and its ranking minority member. I believe the amendment is satisfactory to them.

As I understand, it was intended to have the bill provide for 800 beds. In fact, in the House of Representatives it was the feeling that certainly the Cleveland area needs this consideration more than does any other area in the country—as has been testified to amply by experts in the medical profession.

I believe we are, by means of this amendment, merely taking out a little insurance. I hope the amendment will be taken to conference. I shall appreciate it very much if the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee will accept the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I shall be glad to accept the amendment and take it to conference. As the Senator from Ohio has said, it relates to language already in the bill. So I think the matter can be worked out with the conferees on the part of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President—

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota, who wishes to submit an amendment.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment: On page 15, line 3, strike out "\$100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$200,000."

Mr. President, the amendment would restore the amount of the budget estimate.

Let me say that because of the conflict of committee work, it was not possible for me to be present at the meeting of the Appropriations Committee when this item was considered by it.

This amendment relates to the item for a survey of Government records, records management, and disposal practices, which constitute one of our major and most extensive problems. This work results in the compilation of documents and the saving of hundreds of millions of dollars. According to the Hoover report, in the first year this work would save up to \$15 for every dollar spent on it, and thereafter the ratio would be approximately 50 to 1.

I think such work should continue, and I was sorry to see a cut made in the amount of the budget estimate.

I hope the chairman of the subcommittee will take the amendment to conference.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am not inclined to disagree with the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota. The committee held rather long discussions regarding the value of this work. It is true that the General Services Administration's representa-

tives testified regarding the matter, and there is before us a record to the effect that they feel they will save approximately \$14 for every dollar that is spent on this work.

The increase called for by the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota is not a large one, when we consider the billions of dollars' worth of appropriations with which we are dealing.

I personally think this has been a good program. The House had some doubts about it. I do not know whether it included anything for this item; but I think the House struck it all out. So obviously we shall have a little trouble with our friends on the other side of the Capitol. I am perfectly willing to accept the figure of \$200,000, which is the budget estimate, and see if we cannot convince the House conferees that this work should continue. The General Services Administration feels that it is a fine work.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared in support of my amendment.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR YOUNG

Could I have been present as a member of the committee when the Independent Offices bill was considered, I would there have moved an amendment to increase from \$100,000 to \$200,000, the money available to GSA for its further promotion of the program to weed out more of the tremendous waste involved in the management of Government records, said by the Hoover Commission to be costing us \$4 billion a year. I respectfully ask the committee to accept such an amendment now. It would only restore the budget estimate.

Two years ago we appropriated \$300,000 for the initiation of this program to give GSA help in its program to fight these costs. The result of that expenditure is revealed by the printed hearings on the pending bill, from page 260 to 285. Included in these pages is a letter and papers submitted to the committee by our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Government Operations Committee, urging the continuation of the records management work. He has submitted with his letter a report on the subject by the staff director of his committee, along with a letter from the Administrator of GSA, which letter is found on page 278 of the hearings. A breakdown of the report on results of our earlier expenditure of \$300,000 on that page, reveals that the money bought actual and immediate savings of about \$15 for every dollar spent, and that once all the recommendations made were implemented the saving would be close to \$60 for every dollar spent. I am advised that much of this annual saving is recurring, a saving coming each year as a result of this single expenditure.

I trust my amendment may win the approval of the committee and that there will be insistence upon holding the item in conference and making the full budget estimate available to GSA for the effective work it wishes to continue. Any thoughtful reading of the hearings on the subject seems to dictate enthusiastic approval of the full amount. Certainly the hearings constitute an overwhelming justification for continuation of these projects. Indeed, they would appear to justify larger appropriation and broadening of the approach by GSA with outside expert help.

This is a showing of accomplishment revealing that there are ways to spend money in Government to ends that actually save money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has an amendment to offer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 31, line 2, immediately before the period it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That payment received from Federal funds for a fellowship from the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Academy of Science, the National Institutes of Health, the United States Public Health Service, or any other agency of the Government shall not constitute duplication of benefits under section 232 (h) of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 for persons whose graduate studies were interrupted by service in the Armed Forces during the period beginning June 27, 1950, and ending February 1, 1955."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I must reserve a point of order on this amendment. I think it is legislation, and clearly subject to a point of order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator from Minnesota explain his amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this amendment is a proviso such as is incorporated in bills of this type time after time.

The amendment would permit those who, because of unusual talents, have been granted fellowships or scholarships for postgraduate study, to retain their privileges and rights under the GI benefit program. If a student goes to a college or university under the provisions of the GI bill of rights he is entitled to certain allowances as a matter of right and law. However, if the same veteran is given a scholarship for graduate study, a scholarship based upon the merit or quality of his basic background and intelligence, he is denied the opportunity to receive benefits under the existing veterans laws.

More succinctly, this amendment would have the effect of permitting graduate students whose graduate studies were interrupted by military service during the Korean conflict and who are entitled to education allowances under Public Law 550, 82d Congress, the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, to receive payment from Federal funds for a graduate fellowship in any of the several Federal fellowship programs. Among these programs are those of the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Academy of Science, the National Institutes of Health, and the United States Public Health Service.

I offer this amendment because the law, as it now reads, penalizes some of the most brilliant of our young scientists

and engineers who are undergoing graduate training today.

The shortage of scientific and engineering personnel has now reached crucial proportions. There are many proposals before the Congress to deal with the problem, and I again want to express my deep interest in these proposals. By comparison with the Soviet Union's program of training such personnel, our own program is dangerously lagging.

This amendment, Mr. President, offers a small and partial, but nevertheless real and immediate, solution to the problem of this growing shortage of scientific personnel.

Furthermore, this amendment would remove a serious injustice to certain young men whose graduate studies were interrupted by military service during the Korean conflict.

For example, let me cite the case of a young man of my acquaintance, in Minnesota, who has been forced to relinquish his educational allowances under Public Law 550 because of his acceptance of a research fellowship from the Public Health Service. This young man, like so many other graduate students whose careers were interrupted by military service between 1950 and 1955, is married and has children—a burden which is exceedingly difficult to carry through graduate school.

This young man has won his fellowship because he is a brilliant student. He is a promising scientist. Yet because of his talent, because the Federal Government sees in him the possibility of important research on problems of public health, he and his family are forced to exist on a far smaller income than they would have had if he had taken other employment.

This young man could have chosen work as a shoe salesman or a ribbon clerk or any number of perfectly good jobs which carry no research responsibilities and contribute nothing to the advance of science. In each case he could have retained his GI benefits.

Mr. President, I ask whether this is either just or intelligent. So far as I am concerned, to deprive a young man whose brilliance is first rewarded by a Federal research fellowship and then penalized by removal of his GI benefits, simply does not make sense.

How many other cases like this exist, I do not know. Presumably they are relatively few. The category is rather narrow—graduate students whose graduate studies were interrupted by military service between 1950 and 1955. Yet by this amendment we have the opportunity to correct a hardship and to right an injustice. We have an opportunity to encourage, rather than discourage, the development of at least one group of promising young scientists.

I am confident that there must be hundreds of such cases. The situation boils down to this: If the Government of the United States sees in a man great qualities and promise in the field of research and science, and he is given a Federal research scholarship, he loses all his GI benefits. Yet he could take a job in private industry, as a research student or as a scientist, and still retain his GI benefits. I am sure there must be a

sense of justice adequate to meet this situation. It seems to me that the place to meet it is in the pending bill. That is why I have offered the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Minnesota that I am thoroughly in sympathy with what he is trying to accomplish in this connection. However, I must say to him that the proposed amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill, and that it is subject, I believe, to a point of order.

I would be willing to take the amendment to conference. I am afraid that the House might insist on taking it out of the appropriation bill, but it would at least highlight the situation. No one is more interested in the subject than I am, because I was the author of the Science Foundation legislation. I know that in some cases men who are brilliant enough to receive scholarships become pinched.

If the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has no objection, we might discuss the amendment in conference, and it might lead to a modification of the veterans legislation which would take care of the injustice.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should greatly appreciate it if that were done, even if it were done only by way of highlighting what I consider to be a gross inequity in the law. Whether or not an agreement could be reached on the amendment in conference may be problematical. However, at least something should be done for the long-term future. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have no doubt that injustices such as those described by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota arise from time to time. I can clearly see the injustice in the case he cites. However, we have had no testimony on this subject. There is no way of determining how many persons may be involved. Hundreds of thousands of veterans have had the benefit of the GI Assistance Act. We have not the slightest information as to the number of persons who might be affected, or the degree to which they might be affected. Consequently the amendment enters an undefined field, which should be legislatively explored.

I quite agree that something should be done; but this is not the place to do it, because it involves a question of policy, which has no proper place in an appropriation bill.

Reluctant as I am, and distressed as I always am when I depart from the footsteps of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Washington, I must renew my point of order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senator from Illinois will yield while the Senator from Minnesota is present, let me say to the Senator from Minnesota that as a result of discussing this question in the conference, we might, in the report, call attention to the situation and call upon the Veterans Bureau to bring the facts before us. Then we could correct the situation legislatively.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Long in the chair). The present occupant of the chair regrets that the amendment is not in order. He would personally

favor it if the parliamentary situation were such that it could be considered. However, the amendment is clearly legislation. It would change the existing law. Under paragraph 4 of rule XVI, the Chair regrets that he must sustain the point of order.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota understands the ruling of the Chair, and he will subsequently offer the amendment in the form of new legislation, so that it may receive proper consideration. I hope that the committee in its report on the overall bill will allude to this injustice and thereby highlight it, so that we may get further consideration of the subject.

I should like to call to the attention of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee language in the pending bill at page 10, lines 4, 5, and 6. At that place in the bill it is provided: "Provided further, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for a statistical analysis of the consumer's dollar."

That language relates to the appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission. Is it not correct that this provision is legislation on an appropriation bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct that it is legislation. However, that language was placed in the bill by the House. Therefore it is not subject to a point of order in the Senate. If it had been inserted by the Senate committee, it would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then I offer an amendment to strike from the bill the language I have read on page 10, beginning on line 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is in order.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have just a word or two to say on the amendment. If anything is necessary today in terms of statistical analysis by the Federal Government, it is an objective and responsible statistical analysis of the consumer's dollar.

We heard a great deal about the consumer's dollar during the debate on the farm bill, and we heard a great deal about the problems the American farm producer faces. We heard the charge made that his problem was primarily due to labor costs. We heard rebuttal from labor to the effect that that was not true. Then we heard the statement from industry that industry was not responsible.

It is about time the Government of the United States discharged its responsibility by providing an economic analysis and showing what is happening to the consumer's dollar, and how the consumer's dollar is being divided.

It will be recalled that the Federal Trade Commission is authorized to make such an analysis, provided that there is not a specific limitation placed on the appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission.

This subject was brought before us some years ago and was debated very vigorously in the Senate. By a very close vote, as I recall, the language contained in the bill was sustained. Since that time, however, there has been a con-

siderable amount of rethinking about the subject. Certainly, in the light of what has been happening in terms of inflation and in terms of our agricultural problems, there is a great need for a study of the consumer's dollar.

If the language had been inserted by the Senate committee, it would be interpreted as legislation on an appropriation bill and as not germane. Merely because the language I have referred to was inserted in the bill by the House is no reason why we should let it stand. Therefore, I offer my amendment to strike that language from the bill, because it should not be a part of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for some words of commendation?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am always glad to yield for such a purpose. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. There are many words of commendation I could say to the chairman and to the other members of the subcommittee.

I went over the bill very carefully. I wish to say particularly that there are many provisions of the bill which deserve special credit, but special testimonial statements on the bill would take too much time today. Therefore, I will say that it is a source of great satisfaction to me to learn that the Subcommittee on the Independent Offices Appropriation Bill and the Committee on Appropriations have restored in H. R. 9739 the figure requested for the National Science Foundation in the President's budget, \$41,300,000. The amount approved by the House of Representatives was \$35,915,000, and was \$5 million less than the figure requested, and I am personally most happy that the Senate committee has restored the full amount.

The problem of the shortage of scientists and engineers has been a problem which I have frequently discussed on the Senate floor. It was my concern with that problem which originally led me to be particularly interested in the appropriations this year for the National Science Foundation. I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted at this point in my remarks a letter that I sent to Dr. Alan T. Waterman, the Director of the National Science Foundation, in which I requested the compilation of the accomplishments of that Foundation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. On that point I wish to say that every member of the committee is concerned by the lack of scientists in this country. In the past few months it has become apparent that Russia is moving far ahead of us in many fields. The National Science Foundation, as the Senator well knows, makes awards mainly of graduate fellowships in connection with projects which require men who have been trained for a long time and who are doing fine work.

The House reduction would not allow the Foundation to go ahead with some of the projects.

We also get down to the real problem of basic scientists and teachers. We feel that the National Science Foundation should award fellowships to help persons become teachers of science. I am almost of the opinion that in order to develop basic scientists we will first have to do something about getting them to go to school. I believe the best way to do that is to give parents who have children who are pursuing their education in these fields an exemption in their income taxes. I believe it would pay us in the long run to do so. I hope the House will accept our figures.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thoroughly agree with the figures the committee has inserted. The Senator from Washington was the original sponsor of the National Science Foundation, and has had an abiding interest in it.

I have asked unanimous consent that my letter to Dr. Waterman, the Director of the National Science Foundation, 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:

JANUARY 6, 1956.

DR. ALAN T. WATERMAN,
Director, National Science Foundation,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. WATERMAN: The problem of the shortage of scientists and engineers concerns me as I am sure it does you. Its complexity is such—extending as it does all the way back to our secondary schools—that I think it really can be dealt with only in a large way. For that reason I suggested to the President a few months ago that the appointment of a Presidential commission might be the best approach to the problem. However, I would like to do whatever can be done in a legislative way to alleviate the shortage. If you have any recommendations I would be most interested in learning of them.

There is one other matter which I have been thinking of for some time; I would like to place in the RECORD a compilation of all the accomplishments, so far, of the National Science Foundation. If this is agreeable, I wonder if you could have someone on your staff prepare such a report for me. There is no hurry, of course, though it might be helpful if I could have it before the time when appropriations for the Foundation are being considered. Use your best judgment on what should be included. I would like to bring to the attention of the Congress a full account of the fine work the National Science Foundation has been doing over the years.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Dr. Waterman replied to my letter on January 16, 1956. I ask unanimous consent that his reply 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:

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
Washington, D. C., January 16, 1956.
The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Thank you for your letter of January 6 in which you refer to the shortage of scientists and engineers and indicate that you would like to place in the RECORD a compilation of the accomplishments of the National Science Foundation.

We shall develop a statement of the kind you suggest and send it to you shortly. If we have any recommendations with respect to legislation, we shall also certainly keep in mind your kind offer of assistance.

We are sincerely grateful for your understanding and continuing support of science and the National Science Foundation.

Sincerely yours,

ALAN T. WATERMAN,
Director.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on April 11, 1956, Dr. Waterman wrote me again, enclosing a copy of a letter written by him to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the independent offices appropriation bill, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. I ask unanimous consent that the copy of the letter be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
Washington, D. C., March 16, 1956.
The Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee in Charge of
the Independent Offices Appropriation
Bill, 1957,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: In reply to your letter of March 2, 1956, the National Science Foundation requests the following changes to H. R. 9739 entitled, "Independent Offices Appropriation Bill, 1957":

Page 23, line 6, delete "\$35,915,000"; insert "\$41,300,000", the amount contained in the President's budget.

Lines 6-10, delete that portion which reads: "Provided, That of the foregoing amount not less than \$9,500,000 shall be available for tuition, grants, and allowances in connection with a program of supplementary training for high school science and mathematics teachers."

The total appropriation approved by the House is \$5,385,000 less than the amount recommended for the Foundation in the President's budget. As indicated by the Committee Report No. 1847, the House strongly endorsed the Foundation's program for the training of high school science teachers, which is one part of the education in the sciences program, and increased this item over the amount requested in the budget.

The net reduction in the appropriation was apparently accomplished by increasing that part of the education in the sciences program related to the training of high school science teachers by \$5,650,000; and by reducing the allowances for other programs of education in the sciences by \$1,025,000, the activity "National science policy studies" by \$50,000, the subactivity "Grants for research facilities" by \$3,500,000, and the subactivity "Grants for research projects" by \$6,460,000.

The amount, \$41,300,000, contained in the President's budget provided for a balanced program directed to the several problem areas in science now confronting the Nation. This should be noted in considering the House action, i. e., the programs of the Foundation are all closely related and are directed to the common objective of improving the national position in science. Although some parts of the total problem may have become more urgent than others, we believe it is imperative to maintain a balanced program that will permit us to move forward in all essential areas to the maximum extent that our resources—both manpower and money—will permit.

Progress in science depends in the long run on the supply of trained scientists; on a strong national effort in basic research; and on the availability of necessary research fa-

cilities. The training of an adequate supply of competent scientists for the immediate future depends to a considerable extent upon the opportunities available to younger scientists to continue their studies through graduate school and by participation in research projects. In the long run, for the maintenance of an adequate level of research, and for the training of a sufficient number of skilled scientists to fill our technological needs, we must depend upon a full supply of competent science teachers in our high schools and colleges. More able college teachers are needed to train more able high school teachers. Together they provide the stimulation and the quality of instruction necessary not only to improve the scientific education of our students, but also to motivate more students of high ability to pursue careers in science.

SPECIFIC EFFECT OF HOUSE ACTION

Education in the sciences

The Foundation's program, "Education in the sciences," is directed to the long-range problem of increasing our scientific and technical manpower both in numbers and in competence. The program is divided into three principal subprograms:

1. Strengthening present science teachers (p. 94 of the budget justification): This program is directed to improving the quality of science teaching through providing year-long training for high school teachers at universities and through summer institutes for both school and college teachers. The House bill apparently limits such training to high school teachers.

2. The improvement of science curricula (p. 99 of the budget justification): The provision of improved courses of study which will contribute to better teaching is fundamental to the problem of securing more highly competent scientists and science teachers. The Foundation proposes to attain this objective through such means as the development of science curricula, subject matter syllabi, and supplementary teaching aids for science teachers.

3. Motivation of able students to consider careers in science and science teaching (p. 104 of the budget justification): This program is directed toward identifying young people with aptitudes for science and encouraging them to study science either for careers in research or in teaching. Included in this program are programs for the support of student participation in science activities and provision for distinguished scientists to serve as visiting lecturers at schools and colleges.

The limitation proposed in the House bill requires that \$9.5 million of the appropriation be expended for the supplemental training of high school science teachers only as compared with the \$3,850,000 contained in the President's budget for such training of high school and college teachers. Furthermore, the President's budget contained \$1,525,000 for the two other subprograms of education in the sciences; the House action would apparently allow only \$500,000, a reduction of \$1,025,000.

The Foundation concurs with the House committee that there is need for accelerating the high school science teacher training program. We believe, however, that if we are to be successful in attacking the serious scientific manpower problem now confronting the Nation, we must move ahead with vigor in several areas simultaneously. If we are to assure that the Nation is adequately supplied with capable scientific personnel, efforts to improve the quality of science teachers at the high school level alone are not sufficient. We must insure that the quality of science teaching in our colleges will be adequate to develop further the potentialities of the high school students who will be the scientists and science teachers of tomorrow. We must develop and support

programs which will give to the teachers better curricula, and more effective teaching aids. We must not only stimulate our present teachers to become better teachers of science, we must also increase the number of science teachers for the future. Therefore, we must encourage a larger number of our most capable youth to enter science as a career both in teaching and in research. Finally, we must insure that a young research scientist, on completing his academic work, is provided with the opportunity and the necessary tools to use his talents for the conduct of research.

The net effect of the limitation in the House bill is to concentrate our effort on the supplementary training of secondary school science teachers. Important as this is, it is strongly felt that the long-range problem of increasing our scientific manpower potential requires more attention also upon the other aspects just discussed.

Grants for support of research projects (p. 49 of the budget justification)

The programs carried on under this subactivity make two significant contributions to the scientific potential of our Nation through the support of individual research projects:

1. The support of basic research projects provides the means for increasing the fundamental knowledge which underlies our technology and, therefore, the national security, welfare, and economy.

2. It also provides advanced training in science for students who have already chosen science as a career, thereby providing prompt increase in our output of scientific manpower.

The reduction proposed by the House would eliminate the support of approximately 500 individual basic research projects and the advanced training of approximately 1,200 graduate students in science and engineering.

Grants for support of research facilities (p. 59 of the budget justification)

The President's budget requested \$7 million for the construction and support of research facilities, including the following: \$3,500,000 for the construction of a radio astronomy facility; \$1,900,000 to partially support the procurement by universities of nuclear reactors and electronic computers; \$600,000 for studies preliminary to the construction of a modern optical astronomical observatory; and \$1 million for the support of biological field research facilities. The House recommended that the amount be reduced to \$3,500,000 for all facilities. The report further stated that the committee "expects that the Foundation will not start a project unless it has all the funds available that are required for it to be completed."

Although the report stated that "the committee does not want to specify approval as to specific projects" the net effect of the language would, for example, prevent the Foundation from beginning construction of the radio astronomy facility. Restoration of the total amount of the appropriation request would permit the Foundation to proceed with the research facilities requested and urgently needed for the advancement of science and for the training of additional scientists.

National science policy studies (p. 10 of the budget justification)

The House report states "the budget estimate includes \$800,000 for making national science policy studies. The committee reduced the item by \$50,000, which is indeed a very small amount and it will expect the agency to greatly reduce this item next year."

While the reduction recommended by the House is small, the Foundation is seriously concerned that the House committee expects that these studies be greatly reduced in future years. The studies carried out under

this activity provide necessary factual information and analyses for the determination of policies with respect to the role of the Federal Government in science.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Foundation strongly recommends that—

(1) the appropriation be restored to the \$41,300,000 requested in the President's budget; and

(2) the limitation providing "that not less than \$9,500,000 shall be available for tuition, grants, and allowances in connection with a program of supplementary training for high school science and mathematics teachers" be eliminated.

In making these recommendations, the Foundation does not propose that each item discussed above be restored to the specific amount requested in the President's budget. Approval of these two recommendations will enable the Foundation to conform to the spirit of the House action and the committee recommendations and will provide the balance and flexibility necessary for the development and conduct of well-balanced programs in all areas important to the national scientific effort.

It is requested that the Foundation be granted a hearing before your subcommittee to discuss these matters in greater detail.

Sincerely yours,

ALAN T. WATERMAN,

Director.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Finally, Mr. President, the National Science Foundation in answer to my request has prepared an excellent summary of its record to date. This summary is so important and helpful to the growing number of people in the Senate and in the country who are interested in the activities of the Foundation, that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks, together with the accompanying letter from Dr. Waterman.

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

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION,

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,

Washington, D. C., April 11, 1956.

The Honorable HUBERT M. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Enclosed is a statement on the activities of the National Science Foundation which you suggested that we send you some weeks ago. You indicated that there was no hurry about it but that it might be helpful if you could have it before the time when our appropriations are being considered.

As you may know, the House increased our appropriation this year to \$35,915,000 from last year's figure of \$16 million. This is still \$5 million less, however, than the figure requested for the National Science Foundation in the President's budget—which we are asking the Senate to restore. Enclosed is a copy of our letter on the subject to Senator MAGNUSON.

I should like to say again that we are really grateful to you for your interest in the program of the Foundation.

Sincerely yours,

ALAN T. WATERMAN,

Director.

ACTIVITIES OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION INTRODUCTION

Dr. Vannevar Bush, wartime Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, recommended in 1945 the establishment of a National Science Foundation as the essential part of an action program to meet

the crisis in scientific research existing at the end of World War II. He said, in part, in his report entitled "Science: The Endless Frontier":

"The Government should accept new responsibilities for promoting the flow of new scientific knowledge and the development of scientific talent in our youth. These responsibilities are the proper concern of the Government, for they vitally affect our health, our jobs, and our national security. It is in keeping also with basic United States policy that the Government should foster the opening of new frontiers, and this is the modern way to do it. For many years the Government has wisely supported research in the agricultural colleges, and the benefits have been great. The time has come when such support should be extended to other fields.

"The effective discharge of these new responsibilities will require the full attention of some overall agency devoted to that purpose. There is not now in the permanent governmental structure receiving its funds from Congress an agency adapted to supplementing the support of basic research in the colleges, universities, and research institutes, both in medicine and the natural sciences, adapted to supporting research on new weapons for both services, or adapted to administering a program of science scholarships and fellowships.

"Therefore, I recommend that a new agency for these purposes be established. Such an agency should be composed of persons of broad interest and experience, having an understanding of the peculiarities of scientific research and scientific education. It should have stability of funds so that long-range programs may be undertaken. It should recognize that freedom of inquiry must be preserved and should leave internal control of policy, personnel, and the method and scope of research to the institutions in which it is carried. It should be fully responsible to the President and through him to the Congress for its program."

The new agency recommended by Dr. Bush was established by the National Science Foundation Act of 1950.

During the 5-year period when legislation concerning the Foundation was being considered by Congress, support of basic research was undertaken by such agencies as the Office of Naval Research, the National Institutes of Health, and the Atomic Energy Commission. Outbreak of the Korean war in 1950 resulted in increased emphasis upon applied research and end-item development with a relative decrease in emphasis on basic research. Increased support for basic research now being provided by the National Science Foundation is tending to decrease this imbalance in the Nation's scientific effort. Other activities of the Foundation, described below, are proceeding in consonance with the objectives outlined by Dr. Bush and the functions outlined in the National Science Foundation Act of 1950.

Activities of the National Science Foundation

"To develop a national policy for the promotion of basic research and education in the sciences:"

1. From its inception, the Foundation has had the purpose of planning and administering its research-grant program in such a way as to stimulate the Nation's production of significant scientific knowledge and at the same time to expand the Nation's potential scientific resources. The scientific merit of proposed research projects is critically evaluated in each case by outstanding scientists in the appropriate field. On the basis of these evaluations and recommendations of the Foundation staff, final selection of those proposals to be supported within limits of available funds must be approved by the National Science Board—the Foundation's 24-member governing body. The primary concern of the Foundation is that granted funds be used in a manner which

will make maximum contribution to the progress of science.

By this careful review process critical and impartial judgment is thus brought to bear on all proposals for research support—assurance that Foundation funds are directed toward support of the broad requirements of the Nation's economy, welfare, and defenses. Some promising areas of basic research which meet these requirements and which the Foundation has supported during fiscal years 1952-55 are: Radio astronomy, enabling scientists to observe and measure phenomena of outer space, to "see" by means of radio waves what has heretofore not been visible with optical telescopes; new sources of power, energy from the atom nucleus, supplementing the basic research of the Atomic Energy Commission, and from the sun, each of which, when probed more deeply by research in basic science, may yield better sources of heat and power; photosynthesis, basic research into the problem of how plants convert the energy of sunlight to food and fuel, out of which may derive vast benefits for mankind; solid-state research, the mechanical properties of solids, what holds the atoms together in a solid, and the electrical and magnetic properties of solids, high-speed computation, present-day advances in several science disciplines have outdistanced methods of calculation, calling urgently for wider accessibility of the modern, but costly, facilities in high-speed computation; geochemistry, with its promise of new methods of detecting ore deposits through research in the fluids and solutions of matter during geologic processes; geophysical research, using the world as an observing laboratory as in the international geophysical year program. Because none can predict where such promising areas of research may push into the advancing frontier of science, the Foundation supports a comprehensive program of grants for basic research across the science spectrum in the best interests of the Nation's economy, welfare, and defense.

2. Each year the Foundation sponsors scientific conferences in special areas of unusual interest. During the 1952-55 period the Foundation helped underwrite more than 50 such conferences. Proceedings and papers are usually published at the conclusion of the conference so that the value of the proceedings to scientists extends well beyond the limits of the conference itself.

A complete listing of all Foundation-sponsored conferences would be impractical, but the following titles indicate their scope: Astronomical Research and Photoelectric Techniques, High-Energy Physics, Methods of Determination of Steroids, Utilization of Solar Energy, Photosynthesis, Cosmic Rays, Low Temperature Physics and Chemistry, International Arid Lands Symposium, Man's Role in Changing the Face of the Earth, Mechanics in Engineering Education, Radio Astronomy, Mathematical Tables, Evolution of Behavior, Molecular Quantum Mechanics, Problems in Human Communication and Control.

Widely diversified subject matter is indicated by the foregoing titles, covering many areas of physical and life sciences. Often attracted to the conferences were leading scientists of other countries who shared their knowledge with associates in the United States.

3. While vigorously supporting efforts of investigators to dig the known out of the unknown, the Foundation seeks more precise knowledge about the state of scientific activities as a whole in order to obtain intelligent data on the nature and amount of national resources expended in scientific pursuits. Such information is best acquired through the cooperation of panels and committees of experts representative of each field, and often subfield, of a scientific discipline. Four fields of science are currently more formally being surveyed with support

by the Foundation—physiology, psychology, mathematics and demography. In physiology, the survey is analyzing data from 3,500 American physiologists with reference to their educational, social, economic and geographical background; their activities, division of time among research, teaching and administration; personal and motivational factors; in psychology, the survey seeks to evaluate the status of psychological knowledge and an analysis of occupations in psychology; in mathematics, the survey seeks data on research potential and training in the field as a whole; and in demography, the basic objective of the survey is to determine gaps and deficiencies in the fund of knowledge and demography, its theory and methodology, and in its resources and facilities for research and training. Similar comprehensive studies are being considered in other scientific disciplines, complementing and supplementing the above-described conferences in special areas of unusual interest.

4. Since its establishment, the Foundation has been concerned with problems of national science policy, especially the role of the Federal Government in support of science. In attempting to carry out this responsibility, it found that most basic data essential to sound planning were not available. The Foundation, therefore, began the painstaking task of accumulating necessary data concerning the national effort in scientific research and development. Industry, educational institutions, private foundations and laboratories, and Federal agencies supporting research all cooperate in these studies. The studies will provide a firm basis for policy recommendations to strengthen the national scientific effort and furnish guidance to define the responsibilities of Government in the conduct and support of research.

For example, Federal Funds for Science, published annually, provides detailed information on the extent of Government-sponsored scientific research and development, and shows important trends in the level and direction of Federal expenditures for science.

Recently published, the study, Science and Engineering in American Industry, shows that private industry's annual budget for research and development is close to \$4 billion (\$3.7), and enabled the Foundation, on the basis of accumulated data, to state clearly that total United States expenditure for research and development is more than \$5 billion—nearly half of which is supported by the Federal Government.

The Foundation's just-published study, Scientific Research Expenditures in the Larger Private Foundations, covering the 77 largest privately endowed foundations, removed guesswork from assumptions about the amount of support such foundations extend for scientific research. The study indicates that the percentage of support from this source for basic scientific research has declined steadily for the years studied—1939, 1946 and 1953. Medical sciences and social sciences are the fields of first interest to private foundations, at the present time.

Similar fact-finding studies, many nearing completion, will provide a solid base on which the Foundation can build recommendations for future action. These include (a) a report on organization of the Federal Government for scientific activities showing the structure of Federal units and functions performed in science; (b) a survey of Government-university relationships analyzing sources of support for research at colleges and universities and the nature of such research; (c) a survey of research by trade associations and similar organizations; (d) a survey of research at nonprofit institutes and commercial laboratories; (e) a survey of research supported by selected State governments; (f) a survey of the financial sup-

port of graduate students and Federal stipends to undergraduate and graduate students in the sciences; (g) a survey of Federal scientific manpower; and (h) a history of science in the Federal Government.

5. The Foundation was asked by the Bureau of the Budget to make a study of indirect costs practices among Federal agencies on research grants and contracts at universities and colleges and to recommend a uniform Government policy. The Foundation recommended to the Bureau of the Budget as follows:

"The National Science Foundation recommends that in supporting research in institutions of higher learning, agencies of the Federal Government, if requested, reimburse these institutions for those indirect costs of research supported."

6. The Foundation enunciated the principle that in making grants for unclassified basic research it will not pass judgment on the loyalty of an individual on the basis of unsupported charges but will make grants upon the judgment of scientists having a working knowledge of his experience, competence, and integrity. The Foundation, however, will not knowingly make a grant in support of the research of one who is an avowed Communist, or anyone established as being a Communist by a judicial proceeding, or anyone who avowedly advocates change in the United States Government by other than constitutional means, or one who has been convicted of sabotage, espionage, sedition, or a similar crime involving the Nation's security.

"To support basic scientific research and to appraise the impact of research upon industrial development and the general welfare":

7. All scientific advances are ultimately dependent on basic research. The Foundation awards grants to support the work of qualified scientists who desire to engage in such research. Grants are given only on the basis of recommendations by advisory panels of specialists in the various scientific fields.

During the period 1952 through 1955, the Foundation made 1,232 grants in the amount of \$14.3 million for the support of basic scientific research. These grants helped able scientists in over 250 American colleges and universities to explore new frontiers in the biological, medical, mathematical, physical, and engineering sciences. Requests for support of research submitted to the Foundation during this period totaled more than \$66 million. During fiscal year 1956, more than \$10 million will be granted in support of about 900 additional projects for basic research. The President's budget for 1957 included \$22.8 million to support of this program by the Foundation in fiscal year 1957.

8. In keeping with the Foundation's responsibility for encouraging and stimulating development of the Nation's scientific resources it should be noted that funds in the average Foundation grant support 1 or 2 graduate student research assistants. This support enables young men and women, who might not otherwise have the opportunity, to make their own contribution to research, to become trained in ways of research under direction of experienced research leaders, and to continue their formal academic training. This continuing and immediate contribution by the grants program to the Nation's pool of highly trained scientific talent is of utmost importance to the Nation's future scientific strength. Thus, in addition to contributing to the Nation's store of scientific knowledge, the grants program also provides opportunities to an estimated three to four thousand graduate science students to participate as assistants to mature research investigators and to further their academic training.

"At the request of the Secretary of Defense, to support specific defense research activities":

9. During the current fiscal year, the Office of Naval Research has transferred funds to the Foundation for support of basic research in areas of science in which the two agencies are mutually concerned.

"To award scholarships and graduate fellowships in the sciences":

10. To encourage gifted science students to pursue their studies on a full-time basis, the Foundation during its first 5 years of operation awarded 2,456 predoctoral fellowships and 249 postdoctoral fellowships in the sciences at a cost of approximately \$6.5 million. The Foundation awarded over 900 fellowships in fiscal year 1956. Every State in the Nation is represented among fellows of the Foundation, selected by rating panels of leading American scientists. Candidates are judged on the basis of (1) test scores on general ability, scientific aptitude, and competence in their science field, (2) previous scholastic record, and (3) confidential reports and evaluations from the applicant's faculty advisers. Fields of science represented among the fellows are the life sciences, chemistry, engineering, earth sciences, mathematics, and physics, and astronomy. Average annual costs to the Foundation for predoctoral fellows are about \$2,500 per fellow, and for postdoctorals, \$4,180. In addition to the stipend to the fellow, the award covers tuition costs and allowance for dependents. These fellowships permit the fellow to study for an academic year at the institution of his choice. In addition to these programs, the Foundation has instituted fellowship programs for senior postdoctoral scientists, and will institute fellowships for college science faculty members.

"To foster the exchange of scientific information":

11. Progress in science research is impeded to the extent that lines of communication among scientists are clogged. Investigators in a particular field of science must have access to the research of their associates. Meanwhile, published material in the sciences is reaching large proportions while publication costs are constantly climbing. As a remedial measure, the Foundation has for several years supported scientific publications needing emergency help over difficult periods as they attempted to increase reserves and become self-supporting. It also supports worthwhile research which promises improved methods for processing, storing, retrieving, and providing scientific information.

In addition, the Foundation has sought to open communication channels among scientists by giving support (1) to the improvement of bibliographic tools, (2) to the Library of Congress for preparation and publication of comprehensive lists of United States and Russian scientific serial publications, (3) to the American Institute of Physics for translating and publishing an English edition of the Russian Journal of Experimental and Theoretical Physics, and (4) to investigators working on the mechanization of information searching and machine translations.

12. In cooperation with the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, the Foundation published in 1955 Nicholas DeWitt's definitive study, Soviet Professional Manpower. The book pointed up the fact that the Soviet Union is graduating almost twice as many technical specialists in certain fields as the United States—682,000 professionals in the engineering field between 1928 and 1954 as against 480,000 in the United States during roughly the same period. While serving to focus nationwide attention on the capabilities of other nations in science and technology, the book drew attention as well to domestic problems concerned with identifying and training persons with special aptitudes for careers in science and technology.

"To maintain a register of scientific and technical personnel and to serve as a central clearinghouse for information covering such personnel";

13. Current information about the supply of scientists in the United States is quickly available through the National Register of Scientific and Professional Personnel maintained by the Foundation. The register, which now contains manpower data on all major fields of science, has been compiled with the cooperation of scientific societies in the several fields of science and engineering. Each society collects basic registration information on professionally trained individuals in its field of specialization, whether or not they are members of the society. Societies also maintain individual registers on a current basis. Duplicate copies are sent to the Foundation for the national register. Thus, the Foundation can quickly provide data concerning professional qualifications, training and employment of scientists by field, and can follow trends in the utilization of trained scientists and engineers.

As such manpower data become available and are analyzed, the Foundation from time to time issues reports and bulletins on the supply and characteristics of the manpower in a particular scientific field. These are released under such typical titles as "Manpower Resources in Chemistry," "Manpower Resources in Physics," and cover the several major disciplines in science. In particular demand has been the bulletin on shortages of scientists and engineers in industrial research, and such special reports as highlights of a survey of June 1951 college graduates and highlights of a survey of graduate student enrollments, fellowships and assistantships.

"To evaluate scientific research undertaken by Federal agencies and to correlate the Foundation's research programs with other such programs";

In support of this directive from Congress, underscored by the President's Executive order of March 1954, the Foundation has undertaken to study and evaluate the scientific research programs and activities of the Federal Government, with special reference to the role of the Federal Government in the support of basic research.

14. In conformance with a recommendation of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission, a study was made by a Special Commission for Rubber Research appointed by the National Science Board concerning the support by the Government of basic research on synthetic rubber. This now completed study recommended that the Federal Government withdraw further support for research in synthetic rubber, thereby saving the Government an annual expenditure of more than a million dollars.

15. At the request of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, a Special Committee on Medical Research, appointed by the National Science Board, undertook a review and evaluation of the medical research programs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The report of this committee has just been released.

16. The worldwide program of special observations of various earth sciences phenomena planned between mid-1957 and the end of 1958—the International Geophysical Year (IGY) is of special interest. Scientists of at least 55 nations will cooperate in making simultaneous observations from a vast network of stations extending over the surface of the earth. The Foundation has responsibility on the part of the Government for obtaining appropriations from Congress and for administering these funds, including coordination of Federal agencies' interest in the undertaking. Federal appropriations to the Foundation to support the United States program may be made available by grant or transfer of funds to other Government agencies and private institutions engaged in the

work. Planning and technical direction of the United States program are in the hands of the United States National Committee for the IGY, which exists under the aegis of the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council. The world program is coordinated by an international committee, Comité Spécial Année Géophysique Internationale (CSAGI). Estimates of total world cost of the IGY vary from \$200 million to \$300 million. The Congress has appropriated \$12 million for the United States program and the Foundation is requesting \$28 million supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1956, the bulk of the latter to be used for the earth-satellite program undertaken by the United States.

Although lay interest may center on the drama that will surround launching of earth-bound satellites and expeditions to the Antarctica, scientific interest will focus on measured data which will come from worldwide cooperative efforts of scientists who will collect and coordinate geophysical data on meteorology, upper atmosphere physics including the ionosphere, aurora, geomagnetism, oceanography, glaciology, seismology and as a special additional program, redetermination of latitudes.

17. In accordance with recommendations of the President's Materials Policy Commission, the Foundation established an Advisory Committee on Minerals Research which is now making recommendations on a program of minerals research in the United States.

"To cooperate in international scientific research activities";

18. During the 5-year period of operation, the Foundation provided grants for partial payment of travel expenses to enable American scientists of outstanding ability to participate in selected international and scientific meetings. A total of 314 scientists received such grants permitting them to attend 68 different international scientific meetings. Grants average about \$580, indicating that recipients must make substantial personal contributions to attend the meetings. Foundation policy stipulates that recipients shall participate if possible in the actual work of the conference. International meetings supported by travel grants are carefully selected, and scientists who receive Foundation grants are chosen with equal care by panels of consultants or by appropriate committees of national scientific organizations.

19. The Foundation concerns itself with other aspects of international science as follows: (a) preparation and publication of reports concerned with international scientific activities including a quarterly List of International and Foreign Scientific and Technical Meetings; (b) certain conferences on important aspects of science which the Foundation helps support are international in character and are attended by scientists from abroad; (c) since successful candidates for Foundation fellowships are permitted to select institutions they desire to attend, a small percentage attend institutions in other countries; (d) a few grants in support of basic research have been awarded to principal investigators, part or all of whose work is conducted outside the United States—example, a grant of \$5,000 for 1 year to Dr. A. C. Smith of the Smithsonian Institution, supported his work in descriptive flora of the Fiji Islands; (e) support of translations of foreign scientific papers. In all its relationships with international science, the Foundation works closely with the National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council and with the approval of the Department of State, supporting those programs and projects which relate significantly to the economy, welfare, and defense of the United States.

20. The Foundation is currently undertaking a study of the kinds of activities in

which the several departments and agencies engage with reference to international science. The study takes cognizance of the contribution science can make toward lifting the domestic and external prestige of nations, facilitating economic development, easing international tensions, and contributing to a larger world reservoir of scientific knowledge and trained science manpower.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing review of several programs of the National Science Foundation indicates methods by which the Foundation attempts constantly to improve the environment of science and the quality of scientists through support of basic research in the sciences, providing opportunities to improve the training of scientists and engineers, gathering factual data necessary to recommend sound science policies for the Federal Government, maintaining a running account of United States scientific manpower resources, and encouraging a more complete and speedier exchange of information among scientists. However, these identifiable activities represent only part of the story—the very existence of the Foundation and the opportunity it provides for leadership in support of science in the Federal Government may well outweigh specific and tangible items. The position of trust which the Foundation has achieved in the university community is one which rests in part on the confidence built up during the comparatively short period of its existence.

In carrying out its assignment, the Foundation believes strongly that its responsibilities are leadership and guidance, not direction. Only in a free environment are scientists able to do their most creative work. In working out its program of activities, the Foundation has followed the wise admonition of Dr. Bush that "it should recognize that freedom of inquiry must be preserved and should leave internal control of policy, personnel, and the method and scope of research to the institutions in which it is carried on."

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues this splendid report. It is one of the most detailed compilations of the work of the National Science Foundation I have seen to date. It is a report of encouragement and of progress, and one that fully justifies the appropriations which have gone into this very worthwhile and all-important project of our Government.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 27, line 13, to strike the word "fifteen" and insert in lieu thereof the word "twenty-two."

Mr. President, this relates to the number of people the Veterans' Administration can employ in public relations work. In 1947, Congress set a limit of 100 for this purpose, and year after year the number has been going down, until finally, in the full committee, on motion of one of the members of the committee, the number carried in the bill was reduced to 15. Obviously, this is too small a number to provide information to the country and to the veterans.

There are 21 million living veterans, and I understand from the so-called Bradley report that there are nearly 1½ million veterans of World War II who are service-connected disability cases who do not receive disability pay today.

There are only two ways in which information relative to the veterans' program can get to the public. One is through contact offices, and the other is through information offices.

In 1947, there were more than 900 offices to which a veteran could go and get the last word on veterans' benefits. Progressively, as a result of diminution in appropriations, the number of contact offices has been reduced from 900 to 300, and the number of officers has been reduced from a ceiling of 100 to a low of 15.

Obviously, Mr. President, if the veterans are going to get some advisory information as to what their rights are and what benefits they can properly enjoy under the law, we must have a few persons who can provide information, in a compact, understandable package, on what the law and the regulations are.

Certainly, Mr. President, as against a potential of 21 million living veterans, 15 public-relations officers are far below the ratio of any service agency in the Government. I think the number ought to be restored in accordance with the request which has been made.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator is completely correct. I wish to raise a question as to whether the Senator has made the figure sufficiently large. There is a difficulty of semantics in this problem. I think it is unfortunate that the phrase "public-relations officers" should be used, because there seems to be a rather negative connotation in connection with that phrase in the minds of many persons. They look upon it as some sort of propaganda or publicity or advertising service. As the Senator from Illinois has stated, it is not that at all.

For what do we primarily need these men? We need them as contact men to be of advisory service to the veterans who are going to lose many of their rights and who are not going to be able to take advantage of the services available to them if someone does not tell them about those services. It is very easy for us to find these things out for ourselves, but we should keep constantly in mind that there are not only the 21 million veterans to whom the Senator from Illinois has referred, but there are a great many fellow citizens who have performed patriotic service for all of us who are not educated men and do not have the advantages of persons who are well educated. They need this kind of a special service.

We should be calling it, I think, an advisory service instead of a public relations service. I do not believe that for want of a better name we should do the injustice which will be done to the veterans if we fail to provide them with an adequate number of advisers. I like to think of it as an advisory service.

I congratulate the Senator on the amendment he is presenting. I heartily endorse it, and I hope it will go to conference.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I appreciate the remarks of my distinguished friend from Oregon.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will prevail, and I hope we shall be able to persuade the distinguished conferees of the House of Representatives of the rightness of our cause.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have one last amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Washington will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 28, line 9, in lieu of "\$16,453,000" to insert "\$20,773,800, of which \$10 million shall be available for medical research."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, because the amendment involves a considerable amount of money, I think I should briefly advise the Senate of its purpose.

We discussed in the committee at some length the question of medical research by the Veterans' Administration. The Veterans' Administration had submitted its request to the Budget Bureau many, many months ago. I do not know whether the amount requested was cut by the Budget Bureau, but the amount was cut a great deal. It was suggested that they should spend so much money of their vast appropriations—it is quite a large one—for medical research, on the ground that it would be economy, in the long run. We did not, however, add any specific amount to the bill.

Since that time I have discussed the matter with some of the representatives of the Veterans' Administration, who tell me that they might be somewhat handicapped in doing the research they wish to do unless we specify the amount. So I have submitted the amendment.

During the current fiscal year the VA is spending \$662 million for the inpatient care of veterans. Over and above this it is spending an additional \$82 million for outpatient treatment for veterans. As against this total expenditure of approximately \$740 million for medical care—it is spending only \$5,679,000 for research.

Mr. President, it is not good sense to spend less than 1 percent of a total medical budget to discover the research answers to the great killers of our day. Unless we find new treatments for these major diseases—America is faced with an annual tax bill of billions of dollars a year just for the care of its veterans.

Let me document this point. The total medical bill of the VA for fiscal 1956 has reached the staggering sum of \$3,717,000,000. This sum includes hospital and clinic care, compensation and pensions, and new hospital construction.

Mr. President, this tax load is going up astronomically each year. Let me give you an example. In 1945 the Veterans' Administration spent approximately \$38 million for the hospital care of mentally ill veterans. In 1955—only a decade later—the hospital bill for mentally ill veterans had soared more than 500 percent, to an excess of \$220 million. And this is not all. Over and above this the Congress is now appropriating more than \$400 million annually in compensation costs for service-connected

psychiatric disabilities. A Hoover Commission medical task force report recently estimated that our bill for mentally ill veterans would soon reach a billion dollars a year. The three big diseases which afflict veterans are cancer, heart disease, and mental illness. With our veteran population growing older every year, these diseases are taking an increasing toll of our veterans. There is only one way out of the dilemma—to spend money for research to find cures for these diseases. The committee has proposed that the Veterans' Administration submit a plan to the Appropriations Committee for next year outlining their accelerated program against these major causes of death and disability among our veterans in order that hospital costs might be cut, and that the veterans might be returned to normal life—able to work and be self-supporting.

Mr. President, the Veterans' Administration should be spending at least 10 percent of its total budget upon research and upon the training of skilled medical personnel. I use the figure 10 percent because the National Governors Conference on Mental Health in 1954 adopted a statement that research and training should comprise 10 percent of the budget of any public medical facility. If we were to use this yardstick with relation to the Veterans' Administration program, we would find that the Veterans' Administration should currently be spending approximately \$66 million this year on research and training.

I propose a gradual pointing up to the 10 percent figure. For next year, I believe the VA could wisely spend a total of \$10 million in the major killers and cripples—heart disease, cancer, and mental illness, which is what this will be for. There are an enormous number of research leads in these fields, and the VA has a magnificent hospital system in which to test new therapies and drugs. In other words some of the best hospitals we have are the VA hospitals. This was proven several years ago when the VA undertook an evaluation of the new drugs against tuberculosis. The magnificent work of the VA in that research project helped to extend the clinical application of these drugs throughout the world and to cut the death rate in the United States from tuberculosis by 75 percent. Several thousand beds in the VA hospital system were released with the advent of these new drugs. More important, several thousand veterans who suffered from tuberculosis are now back at work and are supporting their families. We cannot place any price on the happiness which the research effort against tuberculosis has brought to so many of our veterans and their families.

We must do the same type of research with the remaining big killers. There are thousands of compounds currently being studied against cancer. The VA should engage in a large scale evaluation of these important compounds. There are important leads in heart disease. There are new treatments for arteriosclerosis, including anticoagulation, special diets, and hormones. The VA

must pursue the existing research leads in this field. In mental illness there are new drugs which offer great promise. I am happy to note that the VA has started an evaluation of two of these drugs. However, this work should be expanded tremendously, because more than 50 percent of VA hospital beds are occupied by the mentally ill.

Mr. President, there are sound economic justifications for these expenditures. I have documentation to show that every dollar in Federal research expenditure has brought back \$7 in economic productivity and tax returns. If we do not accelerate our expenditure we will, within the next decade, face a total Veterans' Administration bill in the neighborhood of \$10 billion a year.

We must act, and we must act now. That is why I ask that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I certainly concur in the objective sought by my friend, the Senator from Washington. I wish, of course, it could have been achieved within the money limitations which were in the bill as it came from the full committee. I think, however, we can take the amendment to conference. Certain it is that there are a good many fields of research which are not covered by the National Institutes of Health. Only yesterday the Senate passed the appropriation bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and in that bill a great many additional millions of dollars were provided over and above the budget estimates. But that money is to be used for research in the fields of cancer, heart disease, and all the other diseases which are commonly known to the people.

I think a special field is involved here. Military personnel serving abroad are subject to tropical diseases and diseases which are incident to other countries and other areas of the world. If the increase were not justified for any other reason, that would be a justification in itself.

So while the whole amount may not be retained in conference, I shall be glad, indeed, to go along with it. Then probably we shall be able to secure some additional assistance with respect to this item.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate the statement made by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I support the amendment of the Senator from Washington and agree wholeheartedly with what he has said regarding the ever-increasing need for research in the activities covered by his amendment. I agree also that in the past Congress has been very niggardly in providing necessary funds for this purpose.

Our colleagues may remember that only yesterday the Senate passed an appropriation bill providing funds for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I expressed great gratification over the appropriations which were recommended for the various activities carried on by the National Institutes of Health. They mark a very great step forward.

During the debate the distinguished Senator from Washington pointed out the gains which had been made during the past 2 or 3 years because of the in-

creased appropriations which had been made, particularly for research. He cited figures showing that there had been an improvement of, I believe, 19 percent in the discharges of cured patients from mental hospitals because of the use of the new drugs which have been developed and are now in general use.

The Senator from Washington also gave extremely interesting figures with respect to the hopeful progress which had been made in cancer research and in research in the case of respiratory diseases, and circulatory diseases.

I think that if we do nothing else, we will have taken a long step forward if we continue in Congress to provide as generous appropriations for research work as are possible. We have shown a disposition to increase the appropriations for many activities dealing with the health of the people, but the funds for such work are still insufficient and still inadequate. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

While I am on my feet, I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Washington upon his superb work in formulating this appropriation bill. Not only has he been active in this particular department, but he has also worked vigorously in the preparation of the budget for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which the Senate approved yesterday. I congratulate him and the members of his subcommittee upon their excellent work. It has been work well done.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9739) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I commend my delightful friend, the very able senior Senator from Washington, upon his thorough, statesmanlike work in presenting the two appropriation bills to the Senate today.

I have served on committees of Congress with the senior Senator from Washington for almost 20 years. I know of no person who is more expert in the fields in which he has chosen to operate than WARREN MAGNUSON. I know of no one who is more capable of carrying a bill through either the Senate or the House than the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. He is a very valued colleague, and has done outstanding work not only on the Independent Offices appropriation bill, but also on the other appropriation bill for which he is responsible.

I commend him for offering the pending amendment, and assure him of my whole-hearted concurrence in the objective he seeks to achieve.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Washington for a moment, I wish to say I find myself so enthusiastically in support of his amendment that it would be a high honor if he would list me as a cosponsor of it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon may be listed as a cosponsor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have listened with great amazement to the figures on the Veterans' Administration's medical program presented so ably by the subcommittee chairman, the distinguished Senator from Washington.

I think it is about time the people of this country were let in on what is going on in the Veterans' Administration. Many of us sitting here today voted appropriations 11 years ago to create a medical-care program for our veterans second to none in the world. It is my impression that under the first two medical directors of that program—Drs. Paul Hawley and Paul Magnuson—we were well on our way to achieving the goal set by the Congress.

I am therefore disturbed when I hear that the Veterans' Administration is spending only about \$5 million a year in medical research, as against a total Veterans Administration medical bill in excess of \$3 billion a year.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks an explanation of the listing of the Veterans' Administration total medical bill as \$3,717,000,000.

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

EXPLANATION OF LISTING OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION TOTAL MEDICAL BILL AS \$3,717,000,000

Direct hospital cost.....	\$663,000,000
Outpatient care.....	82,000,000
Hospital construction.....	48,000,000
Compensation for service-connected disabilities.....	1,416,000,000
Compensation for nonservice disabilities.....	468,000,000

The remaining sum is composed of dependents receiving compensation on account of service-connected death of the veteran, pensions to living veterans physically unable to support themselves, and some miscellaneous items. I think all these costs can be attributed to the medical-care program of the VA.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, yesterday we voted greatly increased medical-research appropriations for the National Institutes of Mental Health because we were presented with incontrovertible evidence that for every dollar the Federal Government invests in research it receives a return of \$7 in reduced costs for medical care and in increased economic productivity. I do not understand why in each of its annual reports over the past few years the Veterans' Administration has pointed up the vital necessity of greatly expanded medical research, but on the other hand, has not yet developed

a decently financed medical-research program.

Let me quote a section on medical research from the 1955 annual report of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs:

The Department of Medicine and Surgery must conduct research activities in order to provide better patient care. The research program in a hospital serves both as a stimulus to the medical staff and provides an incentive for recruitment. The results of medical research improve the health and medical care of the veteran patient and secondarily supply new and important scientific information. The best patient care is usually provided in those hospitals wherein research and education activities are an integral part of the patient-care program.

I ask you to particularly note, Mr. President, the last sentence in that quotation, emphasizing the fact that the best patient care is provided only in those hospitals where research is an integral part of the program. By that yardstick, then, I seriously question whether the Veterans' Administration is today giving the best medical care to the 118,000 veterans now hospitalized in its institutions.

Further along in the 1955 report I came across the admission by the Veterans' Administration that it has a "serious responsibility" in medical research. Let me quote that section:

It should be recognized that the Veterans' Administration has a serious responsibility in medical research due to the problems associated with:

1. The large numbers of hospitalized veterans with a variety of diseases that are not well understood and for which there is no effective treatment.
2. The large number of veterans receiving compensation or pension for medical disabilities.
3. Disabilities and diseases of an aging veteran population.

I wonder how many of us realize how serious a problem medical care for our veterans really is. Speaking as past chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I am proud of the record I made during my term in that office in seeking passage and accomplishing the passage in the Senate of a considerable amount of veterans legislation which sought to protect the welfare of the veterans of the United States.

I point out that there are 21 million veterans in this country at the present time. Of these, 118,000 are hospitalized, and several million are receiving compensation for service-connected disabilities.

Furthermore, the problem is seriously aggravated by the increasing age of veterans, with a consequent increase in chronic and disabling illnesses. The average age of the hospitalized veteran is now 48. More than 13,000 hospitalized veterans are over 65 years of age.

My study of the Veterans Administration reports indicate that we are approaching the danger of having the Veterans' Administration hospital system turn into a series of homes for the chronic and disabled. The Veterans' Administration itself has admitted that more than one-half of all hospitalized patients have been in a veterans' hospital for more than 1 year, and that almost one-third of all patients have been hospitalized for more than 5 years.

Yesterday afternoon the Senator from Washington and I engaged in a colloquy in which we discussed the question of domiciliary care for our veterans. I am all for that. I have voted, and shall continue to vote, for any domiciliary hospital the Veterans' Administration requests of the Congress of the United States. But that is not the major obligation of the Veterans' Administration when it comes to medical care. Its major obligation, I may say most respectfully, is to provide such care as will help veterans to recover from a curable disease. In order to insure that, we need to enlarge our appropriations for medical research, because, as the Veterans' Administration's own report shows, it can do a good job of medical care of its patients only to the extent that, through research, there are discovered new ways to treat some of the death-dealing illnesses from which so many veterans suffer.

The Senator from Washington pointed out what we are doing in the field of medical research in connection with cardiac disease, cancer, and the other great death-dealing diseases; but I submit that it is important to build up the medical research services for the veterans' hospitals.

Now the Veterans Administration has some fine words to say about the aging population of veterans, and I quote again from the 1955 report:

The Veterans' Administration has a responsibility to investigate these chronic and other diseases in order to be able to develop and provide for effective methods of diagnosis and treatment. These methods in turn should and do effect significant economics. A better understanding of patients with long-term illnesses will undoubtedly result only if this opportunity is capitalized.

Mr. President, the Veterans' Administration hospital system is the largest in the world. Medical scientists have testified before congressional committees that it is a superb closed system in which to study disease. Dr. George M. Lyon, Assistant Chief Medical Director for Research of the Veterans' Administration, corroborated the statements of these scientists when he reported in January 1955 that—

Because of the large number of patients hospitalized, because of the wide variety of diseases and disabilities encountered in Veterans' Administration hospitals, and because of the fact that these are observed within a single hospital system—the largest in the world—there exists the greatest opportunity imaginable for the clinical study of disease in man. The close association of 91 Veterans' Administration hospitals having research facilities with 72 medical schools in which active research programs are also underway makes it possible to pursue the study of disease in the hospitalized patient in a way, and to an extent, never before envisaged.

What is the Veterans' Administration doing with this magnificent opportunity? I cannot find that it is doing very much at all. Each year the Congress appropriates large sums for new Veterans' Administration hospitals; each year the cost to the taxpayers rises astronomically. As my distinguished colleague from Washington has pointed out, the cost of hospitalizing mentally ill veterans alone has gone up more than 500 percent in less than a decade—from ap-

proximately \$38 million in 1945 to \$223 million in 1955.

Look at the figures on heart disease, Mr. President. We are spending more than \$200 million annually in compensation payments to veterans afflicted with heart disease. By contrast, the Veterans' Administration is spending only a few hundred thousand dollars for research on heart disease, the Nation's No. 1 killer.

Mr. President, my record shows that I would never economize at the expense of the veteran. However, I want to see that our veterans get the best medical care, which the Congress is duty bound to provide them. It is not good economy, nor is it humanitarian, to spend pennies on medical research and millions and millions of dollars on mere custody. I join my colleague from Washington in supporting a \$10 million amendment as a minimum appropriation for the medical-research activities of the Veterans' Administration during the coming fiscal year. Furthermore, I join him in insisting that the Veterans' Administration present to the Congress next year a long-range medical-research program leading to a major attack on the diseases which now disable thousands upon thousands of our veterans.

Last of all, Mr. President, I wish to answer one of the fear arguments which I find has crept into the thinking of some veterans' organizations, in regard to the appropriation of funds for research purposes. Apparently there is a fear that the funds for research will be used to turn the veterans who are hospitalized into guinea pigs; that experimentation will be practiced upon them for no good end except for experimentation.

Mr. President, I wish to make it clear that that is not a part of the medical-research program. There is no ground for a fear among the veterans that a medical-research program in a veterans' hospital will be any different from such a program in any other hospital. Such a program does not constitute a guinea-pig approach, but only puts into practice the findings of medical researchers that will aid in the patient-care of the veteran himself. Therefore, if we vote today for this \$10 million amendment, we shall do much to improve the patient-care of a veteran who goes to a hospital in an endeavor to recover from the disease which put him in the hospital in the first place.

I wish to congratulate the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the other members of the subcommittee for what I consider to be the excellent job they have done for the Senate in submitting the bill in such fine form to it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Washington whether he will allow me to be listed with him as a cosponsor of this amendment, which has such an enlightened and worthy a purpose, namely, by increasing the appropriation to do away with the inadequacy of the present medical-research expenditures on the part of the Veterans' Administration. I understand that the senior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] also wishes to have his name listed

as a cosponsor, if that is agreeable to the distinguished Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I join my distinguished colleague from Washington in his grave concern about the inadequacy of the medical research expenditures of the Veterans' Administration.

I have been interested for a considerable length of time in the problem of cancer and its cruel effects. Figures recently released by the American Cancer Society in its April 1956 campaign indicate that if we do not achieve any major research breakthroughs against cancer in the next few years, approximately 40 million people now alive in the United States will have some form of cancer during their lifetime, and an estimated 24 million of these will die from cancer.

During World War II, cancer took a greater toll than enemy bullets. Almost 2½ times as many people died of cancer during World War II as were killed in action in all of our far-flung battles over the face of the world. Furthermore, in 1 year cancer killed nearly 10 times the number of Americans who were killed in action during 3 years of war in Korea.

We learned a little of the ravages of cancer as we drafted our young men, the healthiest group in the Nation, into service in World War II. Of this group of men between the ages of 18 and 37, the so-called prime of life, 32,000 were rejected for cancer, a number sufficient to man at least 2 Army Infantry divisions.

On the basis of reliable current statistics, 1 out of every 4 veterans now living will have cancer unless medical research discovers some new cures and preventive measures. Since there are now 21 million veterans in the United States, about 5 million veterans will be hospitalized, or will be entitled to hospitalization, for cancer.

If 80 percent of the veterans developing cancer receive full hospitalization from the Veterans' Administration, they will cost the taxpayers a total of \$5 billion. If only 50 percent receive full hospitalization, they will cost the taxpayers \$3 billion.

Even now the cost of cancer to the Veterans' Administration is mounting astronomically. Hospital care for veterans suffering from cancer now costs about \$25 million. In addition, more than \$10 million was spent last year in compensation payments to 11,000 veterans disabled by cancer.

In the face of these rising costs, what is the Veterans' Administration doing in research upon cancer? Currently, it is spending less than \$1 million a year against a disease whose cost runs into the hundreds of millions of dollars. Even that small expenditure of funds has produced several vital research discoveries. A talented research scientist of the Veterans' Administration has discovered that cancer and leukemia are caused by a virus, and that the virus may be transmitted from parent to children, in whom cancer later develops. This discovery is of fundamental importance because it opens up a whole new avenue

of approach. Yet I am convinced that the Veterans' Administration is doing far too little in exploiting that magnificent discovery.

On June 5 we heard the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], in discussing this Nation's medical research program, point out that "recent advances in virus research have opened up the possibility of exploring with unprecedented thoroughness earlier suggestions that some forms of cancer may be caused by, and others may be susceptible to, cure by viruses."

On the basis of this evidence, the Senate Appropriations Committee allocated several million dollars to a pursuit of this exciting lead. But the Veterans' Administration, with the finest hospital system in the world, drags along on a cancer-research budget far less than that of a single cancer institute in this country—the Sloan-Kettering Institute, in New York City.

Mr. President, we heard our colleagues from Washington and Oregon and other Senators refer to the aging of our veteran population. The average age of the hospitalized veteran is now 48. In another 10 years it will be 58. With increasing age, there is increasing susceptibility to cancer.

Mr. President, are we to face a sorry and tragic future in which, for want of research knowledge, we allow 5 million of our veterans to die from cancer? I say this need not be. I join my colleagues from Washington and Oregon in proposing an increase of \$5 million for the coming fiscal year for the medical research programs of the Veterans' Administration, and also in insisting that the Veterans' Administration submit to this Congress a long-range medical research program leading to the conquest of the major killers of millions of Americans.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] be added as cosponsors of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], on behalf of himself and other Senators.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 9739) was passed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. MCCARTHY, and Mr. POTTER the conferees on the part of the Senate.

FREE OR REDUCED AIR TRANSPORTATION RATES FOR MINISTERS OF RELIGION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2030, Senate bill 3149.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3149) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to permit certain air carriers to grant free or reduced rate transportation to ministers of religion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "That", to insert "the last sentence of", and after line 4, to strike out before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: "and, in the case of foreign air carriers, and air carriers not receiving payments made by the Board under the provisions of section 406 of this act and Reorganization Plan No. 10 of 1953, to ministers or religion" and insert after "such persons" a semicolon and the following: "ministers of religion on a space available basis", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence of subsection (b) of section 403 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 is amended by inserting after "such persons" a semicolon and the following: "ministers of religion on a space available basis."

USE OF BOXCARS FOR SHIPMENT OF LUMBER AND OTHER PRODUCTS IN TRANSIT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have several documents dealing with a common subject which I should like to introduce into the RECORD.

We have a problem in the Pacific Northwest over a service order of the Interstate Commerce Commission known as Service Order 910. It deals with the question of the use of boxcars for the shipment in transit of lumber, particularly, although it may apply to other commodities as well. A small lumber mill may load a boxcar and start it in transit for Chicago, and the lumber may be sold en route. One of the controversies is over the question whether or not this practice results in so delaying shipments that it has the effect of creating, to some extent, an additional factor in the boxcar shortage problem.

The lumbermen themselves are in dispute over the question. For the most part, the big lumber operators seem to be in favor of Service Order 910. The small mills are against Service Order 910.

Some of the small mill operators, testifying before the committee of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], claimed that the cancellation of Service Order 910 would result in more time being taken in shipment, because what would be done would be to take the longest route around rather than the shortest route.

Be that as it may, the position I have taken is that the question should be the subject of a public hearing. The shippers should be given an opportunity to present to the Interstate Commerce Commission their points of view on both sides in a public hearing.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am chairman, will make, or is in the process today of making, such a suggestion to the Interstate Commerce Commission. This is too important a subject to be dealt with arbitrarily.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate very much the statement of the Senator from Washington. It will be very helpful.

My position is that there should be a public hearing on the question. The service order is not a sudden decision on the part of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The record is replete with proof that the Interstate Commerce Commission has been planning Service Order 910 for a long time past. Even the court, in a decision which I shall insert in the RECORD, had that thought clearly in mind, as will be seen from the language of the court.

I have been very frank on this subject. I have stated in my correspondence with both big and small lumber operators that such an order issued by an administrative tribunal should be based on a full record. One group wants the order. The other wants it canceled. I have said, "This is an administrative tribunal, which, under the law, has the legal duty and right to issue such an order, but it ought to issue it on the basis of a full record made by the parties in interest."

This question became such a hot issue among the lumber industry in my State that it got into court. A few days ago the court handed down a decision. This decision is by a three-man Federal court.

I ask unanimous consent that the decision be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON, CIVIL No. 8541

DAUGHERTY LUMBER CO., ET AL., PLAINTIFFS, v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION, DEFENDANTS; ATLAS LUMBER COMPANY, ET AL., INTERVENORS PRO-PLAINTIFF; STAR LUMBER COMPANY, A CO-PARTNERSHIP, ET AL., INTERVENORS PRO-PLAINTIFF; THE NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL TRAFFIC LEAGUE, INTERVENOR PRODEFENDANT; WEST COAST LUMBERMEN'S ASSOCIATION, WESTERN PINE ASSOCIATION AND CALIFORNIA REDWOOD ASSOCIATION, INTERVENORS PRODEFENDANT

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Before: Stephens, circuit judge, and Solomon and East, district judges.
East, district judge.

Acting Chief Judge Albert Lee Stephens, circuit judge, Ninth Judicial Circuit, es-

tablished this court by order entered on April 16, 1956.

Parties

The plaintiffs, Daugherty Lumber Co., et al., consist of some five business organizations engaged in the business of buying and selling lumber on a wholesale basis and as such utilize railway transportation for the movement of such lumber products from the Pacific Northwest to other portions of the United States. One of the plaintiffs is a manufacturer of lumber products and disposes of its products to the mentioned wholesale lumber brokers.

The intervenors, Atlas Lumber Co., et al., proplaintiff, consist of some 63 business organizations engaged in the sale and transport of lumber products through interstate commerce throughout the United States.

The intervenors, Star Lumber Co., et al., proplaintiff, consist of some six business organizations engaged in the manufacture and distribution of lumber products through interstate commerce originating from the State of Oregon.

The intervenor, the National Industrial Traffic League, prodefendant, is a voluntary national association composed of and representing business organizations engaged in the shipment and receipt of commodities transported by railroads in every State of the United States.

The intervenors, West Coast Lumbermen's Association, et al., prodefendant, are associations representing business organizations engaged in the manufacture, sale, and distribution of lumber products throughout the Pacific Northwest.

The defendants are the United States of America and its administrative agency, the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Commission's order

On March 19, 1956, the Commission issued service order No. 910, to be effective 12:01 a. m., April 9, 1956.

The plaintiffs complained and by order, per East, D. J., dated April 7, 1956, the Commission was temporarily restrained in the execution of said order.

On April 13, 1956, the Commission made a corrected service order No. 910, to be dated as of March 19, 1956. The order, as corrected, to our concern, reads:

"It appearing that an acute shortage of freight cars exists in all sections of the country; that the movement of loaded freight cars is being delayed solely for the purpose of gaining additional time; that present rules, regulations, and practices with respect to the use, supply, control, movement, distribution, exchange, interchange, and return of freight cars are insufficient to promote the most efficient utilization of cars; it is the opinion of the Commission that an emergency exists requiring immediate action to promote car service in the interest of the public and the commerce of the people. Accordingly, the Commission finds that notice and public procedure are impracticable and contrary to the public interest, and that good cause exists for making this order effective upon less than 30 days' notice."

Whereupon the following regulations of concern were prescribed:

"(1) No common carrier by railroad subject to the Interstate Commerce Act shall willfully delay the movement of loaded freight cars by holding such cars in yards, terminals, or sidings for the purpose of increasing the time in transit of such loaded cars.

"(2) Loaded cars shall not be set out between terminals except in cases of emergencies or sound operating requirements.

"(3) Backhauling loaded cars for the purpose of increasing the time in transit shall constitute willful delay and is prohibited.

"(4) Through loaded cars shall not be handled on local or way freight trains for the purpose of increasing the time in transit of such loaded cars.

"(5) The use by any common carrier by railroad, for the movement of loaded freight cars over its line, of any route other than its usual and customary fast freight route from point of receipt of the car from consignee or connecting line, except in emergencies, or for the purpose of according a lawfully established transit privilege (not including a diversion or reconsignment privilege), is hereby prohibited."

Furthermore, the Commission, in deference to the mentioned restraining order, stated in its official report that "No action will be taken to enforce Service Order No. 910 until further order of the Commission."

Authority of the Commission

Section 1 (15) of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U. S. C. A. 1 (15)) reads as follows:

"Whenever the Commission is of opinion that shortage of equipment, congestion of traffic, or other emergency requiring immediate action exists in any section of the country, the Commission shall have, and it is hereby given, authority, either upon complaint or upon its own initiative, without complaint, at once, if it so orders, without answer or other formal pleading by the interested carrier or carriers, and with or without notice, hearing, or the making or filing of a report, according as the Commission may determine: (a) to suspend the operation of any or all rules, regulations, or practices then established with respect to car service for such time as may be determined by the Commission; (b) to make such just and reasonable directions with respect to car service without regard to the ownership as between carriers of locomotives, cars, and other vehicles, during such emergency as in its opinion will best promote the service in the interest of the public and the commerce of the people, upon such terms of compensation as between the carriers as they may agree upon, or, in the event of their disagreement, as the Commission may after subsequent hearing find to be just and reasonable; * * *

It is conceded by all of the parties that the Commission acted upon its own initiative without complaint and without notice, hearing, or the making or filing of any report except to publicize order No. 910 after issuance in the Federal Register.

Contentions of plaintiffs and intervenors, proplaintiffs

These parties, through plaintiffs' petition, assert that for many years last past plaintiffs and other lumber manufacturers and wholesalers of lumber products situated in the States of Oregon, Washington, and California, have traditionally operated their respective businesses in the following manner:

Upon completion of loading a car of lumber, the bill of lading and ownership of said car has been transferred to a lumber wholesaler or lumber broker who thereupon pays the invoice price of said car even though said wholesaler or broker has no present customer for said car; said wholesaler then normally commences the movement of said car toward the eastern seaboard without instructions to the railroad to expedite the movement of said car, but with instructions to the railroad to keep the wholesaler advised of the progress of said car toward a particular transfer or diversion point; during the eastward progress of said car, the wholesaler finds a purchaser for same, and upon finding such purchaser the railroad is notified to move said car to destination forthwith.

They claim that said Service Order No. 910 of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the subject of this bill, would overnight change this traditional method of buying, selling, and transporting lumber between points on the Pacific coast and points in the eastern parts of the United States without affording to lumber manufacturers or wholesalers an

opportunity, if such were possible, to revise their methods of operation.

Further, "that if said Service Order No. 910 were allowed to become effective, it would seriously and adversely affect plaintiffs in the conduct of their respective businesses in the following manner:

"1. That wholesalers would refuse to purchase cars of lumber from sawmills until such time as they had a specific order for said cars and therefore plaintiffs would have to accumulate large inventories of lumber far beyond their capacity to finance same, or in the alternative, plaintiffs would have to stop production until such time as plaintiffs should receive an order for a specific type of lumber and then proceed to cut same and load the car and invoice the wholesaler.

"2. That said order would prevent plaintiffs and others similarly situated from maintaining an efficient and economic production schedule in that they would no longer be able to set up their respective mills to cut a substantial amount of the same type of lumber but rather would be forced to set up and reset over short periods of time to cut specific orders.

"3. That said Service Order No. 910 would require such large investments of plaintiffs in their respective businesses as to make it impossible for plaintiffs to continue their businesses.

"4. That said Service Order No. 910 will have the effect of eliminating and destroying many small lumber manufacturers and diverting their business to large manufacturers who do not sell their lumber on a diversion basis.

"5. That said Service Order No. 910 would result in requiring small lumber manufacturers to maintain inventories of lumber at their respective yards far beyond their financial capacity to do so and thus discriminate against them in favor of larger and better financed lumber companies.

"6. That purchasers of lumber in the East would also be adversely affected in that they would be unable to control the arrival time of cars upon their spur tracks and thereby prevent economical and efficient unloading of the same and would require large expenditures of such purchasers of additional spur tracks and additional facilities.

"7. That the enforcement of said Service Order No. 910 would tend to bunch loaded cars at switching points thereby delaying the movement of cars requiring expedited service.

"8. That instead of alleviating any actual or contemplated car shortage, the effect of said Service Order No. 910 would be to aggravate the situation.

"9. That there is no actual car shortage at the present time, nor was there at the time the Commission entered said Service Order No. 910.

"10. That if there be any car shortage, this situation is caused primarily by the failure of the eastern railroads to return cars to the West.

"11. That 'slow routine' is not just a convenience for a few isolated shippers, but is in fact a standard integral part of the distribution system employed by a large percentage of the lumber industry; that said practice has been accepted and encouraged by all concerned as the normal and standard method of lumber distribution; that the many small producers and wholesalers in the West, and the small users and retailers in the East, have founded their entire businesses upon the existence of such practice and are inextricably bound to it so that said Service Order No. 910 will result in chaos among the small-business men so engaged."

The defendants and intervenors, pro-defendant, through their appearances, admit the alleged factual situation, but, in effect, deny the legal effect thereof.

It has been agreed among counsel, with the consent of the majority of the court,

that the issue of law presented by these respective contentions should be submitted to the court upon the record and the briefs of the parties.

Accordingly we accept as true all that the plaintiffs and intervenors proponent allege and contend in their respective appearances.

Legislative emergency

The plaintiffs urge that Service Order No. 910 is invalid for the reason that no emergency existed at the time of its entry. This suggestion causes us to reflect and remind ourselves that the first step of governmental tyranny is through policing and restrictive acts without notice or hearing to the persons thereby affected. In this view one might think that before declaring the existence of an emergency and ordering a disruption of the 20-year existent practice of shipping via railroads by a large segment of the lumber industry of the Pacific Northwest, the Commission would afford prior notice and an opportunity to be heard by those affected by its order. However, this observation of policy is of no import for the reason that Congress has delegated the inquiry of the existence of an emergency in the province and in the opinion of the Commission. See *Avent v. United States of America* (266 U. S. 127; 69 L. Ed. 202).

The congressional authority thus granted to the Commission is an implement or enforcement of legislative action. It follows, therefore, that the definition or meaning of "emergency" must be viewed in a legislative sense as distinguished from the commonplace meaning of an "unforeseen combination of circumstances which calls for immediate action."

Legislative emergencies are those situations where the common good or public interest is legislatively declared to be paramount to individual interests. Common knowledge tells us that legislative action effective immediately, has on legion occasions been adopted to correct an adverse public interest situation of long standing. Furthermore, common knowledge tells us that a shortage of railroad cars available to the lumber industry in the Pacific Northwest has occurred during the summer and fall months annually for many years last past. We further know, from common knowledge, that the reason or cause of this car shortage is a contentious question among the railroads and the several classes of shippers. We accept the contention of the plaintiffs that the enforcement of Service Order No. 910 will not alleviate the car shortage; however, this court has no province in the matter as a legislative emergency declared by Congress or one of its administrative agencies is not subject to judicial review upon its merits.

"The commission having based their order on their opinion that an emergency such as was contemplated by the statute existed, it is not within the power of the court to annul their order on the ground that the administrative power conferred on the commission was unwisely or improvidently exercised." (*Baltimore, etc. R. Co. v. Lambert Run Coal Co.* (258 U. S. 377, 66 L. Ed. 671).)

The "opinion" of the Commission had to be based upon some information before it and in the absence of a contention that the "opinion" of the Commission was motivated by fraud, wrongdoing or capriciousness, this court has no office to review the "opinion" of the Commission.

"The Commission is the expert in the field of transportation. And its judgment is entitled to great deference because of its familiarity with the conditions in the industry which it regulates."

"Even though, upon a consideration of all the evidence, a court might reach a different conclusion, it is not authorized to substitute its own for the administrative judgment." (*Swayne & Hoyt, Ltd. v. United States* (300 U. S. 297, 304). See also *Federal Communications Commission v. WOKO, Inc.* (329 U. S. 223, 229); *United States v. Pierce Auto Freight Lines, Inc.* (327 U. S. 515, 535-536); *Barrett Line, Inc. v. United States* (326 U. S. 179, 199).)

East Texas Motor Freight Line, Inc., et al. v. Frozen Foods Express, the Secretary of Agriculture, et al. Nos. 162-164 in the Supreme Court of the United States entered April 23, 1956.

Shipper's right of selecting route of shipment

The Congress has recognized that (49 U. S. C. A. 15 (8)) "the person * * * making such shipment subject to such reasonable exceptions and regulations as the Interstate Commerce Commission shall from time to time prescribe, shall have the right to designate in writing by which of such through routes such property shall be transported to destination, and it shall thereupon be the duty of the initial carrier to route said property and issue a through bill of lading therefor as so directed, and to transport said property over its own line or lines and deliver the same to a connecting line or lines according to such through route, and it shall be the duty of each of said connecting carriers to receive said property and transport it over the said line or lines and deliver the same to the next succeeding carrier or consignee according to the routing instructions in said bill of lading."

Should it be the purpose of the Commission, through the provisions of paragraph (5) of its order, to interfere with this right, ample judicial relief is open to any aggrieved party. The mentioned paragraph (5) is not, in our opinion, so vague or indefinite as to impute such an intent on the part of the Commission that would authorize judicial restraint.

Standing of plaintiffs

The effect and restriction of the order applies to all shippers and is not discriminatory. Therefore, any adverse effect upon one mode of marketing as against another mode not so affected, even though engaged in business competition, is not an infringement upon a legal right. (*Sprunt & Son v. United States* (281 U. S. 249, 254-255, 256-257 (1930); *Pittsburgh & W. Va. Ry. v. United States* (281 U. S. 479, 486-488 (1930); *Edward Hines Trustees v. United States* (263 U. S. 143, 148 (1923); *Merchant Truckmen's Bureau v. United States* (16 F. Supp. 998) (S. D. N. Y., 1938).)

It follows that neither plaintiffs nor intervenors proponent have a legal right or interest that is unjustly affected by Service Order No. 910.

Conclusion

Therefore, we conclude that plaintiffs' petition and bill in equity and the petition of intervenors proponent should each be dismissed and the temporary restraining order of this court, dated April 7, 1956, aforesaid, should be vacated as of the date of entry of a judgment of dismissal herein, all without costs to any party.

Counsel for the defendants are requested to submit appropriate judgment order.

Dated this 31st day of May 1956.

ALBERT LEE STEPHENS,
United States Circuit Judge.
GUS J. SOLOMON,
WILLIAM G. EAST,
United States District Judges.

Mr. MORSE. On page 8 of the decision the court said:

The plaintiffs urge that Service Order No. 910 is invalid for the reason that no emergency existed at the time of its entry. This suggestion causes us to reflect and remind ourselves that the first step of governmental tyranny is through policing and restrictive acts without notice or hearing to the persons thereby affected. In this view one might think that before declaring the existence of an emergency and ordering a dis-

ruption of the 20-year existent practice of shipping via railroads by a large segment of the lumber industry of the Pacific Northwest, the Commission would afford prior notice and an opportunity to be heard by those affected by its order. However, this observation of policy is of no import for the reason that Congress has delegated the inquiry of the existence of an emergency in the province and in the opinion of the Commission. See *Avent v. United States of America* (266 U. S. 127; 69 L. Ed. 202).

I have no doubt that the court, in the decision which it handed down sustaining the Interstate Commerce Commission and its authority to issue the order, is technically correct. I am not questioning the legal soundness of the decision of the court. What I am seeking to point out is that the Interstate Commerce Commission ought to heed the language of the court in its decision, in which the court, in effect, raises its legal eyebrows at the practice of the Interstate Commerce Commission in not scheduling such questions for a hearing, so that all sides may be heard.

That is all I have ever asked for in this controversy. I appeared before the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate and asked that public hearings be granted by the Interstate Commerce Commission. To date it has refused to do so. Again on the floor of the Senate today I renew my request for a hearing. I do not know what the final decision ought to be with reference to Service Order 910, because I think that will depend upon what the parties themselves offer by way of proof in the record at a hearing. I have heard, for the most part, spokesmen for small mills. They are very much disturbed, and have made strong representations, which I presented before the committee.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a joint letter which the two Senators from Oregon wrote under date of June 1, 1956, to Commissioner Owen Clarke, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, dealing with the decision which was handed down, and with our request that the question be made the subject of a hearing.

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

JUNE 1, 1956.

HON. OWEN CLARKE,
Commissioner, Interstate Commerce
Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR COMMISSIONER CLARKE: We understand that the Federal court at Portland, Ore., has dissolved the temporary restraining order issued by the court against Interstate Commerce Commission Service Order 910 and has dismissed the suit for an injunction against that order.

While technically this upholds the authority of the ICC to issue an order of this kind, we have received numerous telegrams and letters from small lumber shippers in Oregon that point out the extreme hardship that would be caused these shippers if the provisions of Service Order 910 were enforced. From a smaller number have come wires and letters supporting 910, indicating the highly controversial nature of the order and underscoring the need for a hearing on the question in the area concerned.

We respectfully request that you arrange hearings in Oregon and any other appropriate places on the Pacific coast to allow ship-

pers to express the varied opinions on transit shipping of lumber.

Once the various points of view have been presented to the Commission, regardless of the final decision, there will be a more gracious acceptance of the Commission's action.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senator.

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,

United States Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks certain excerpts from an article on this subject published in the *Traffic World* for June 2, 1956. The article appears on pages 37 and 38.

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

The Southwestern Industrial Traffic League, in its annual membership meeting on May 22, at the Buccaneer Hotel, Galveston, Tex., decided to oppose proposed legislation to facilitate establishment of "incentive rates" (low rates on trainloads, multiple carloads or multiple truckloads), gave support to a Senate joint resolution providing for an ICC investigation of car shortages.

ACTION ON CAR SUPPLY PROBLEM

The league discussed, but took no action on, a railroad proposal to increase demurrage charges and bills in Congress to empower the Commission to impose penalty charges on railroads, in addition to daily car rental charges (per diem) in times of actual or threatened car shortages. However, after expressions of concern over the present car supply, the league voted to instruct its secretary to bring to the attention of the United States Senators from the Southwestern States "the inadequate supply and deplorable condition" of freight cars in the Southwest and to urge support by those Senators for Senate Joint Resolution 171. That joint resolution, it was stated, would direct the Commission to investigate in conferences with shippers and carriers the car supply situation, and to make recommendations with respect to, among other things, a proposal for establishment of a separate corporation to supervise distribution and use of the freight-car supply.

The statement was made that the freight-car shortage was now averaging 7,000 to 8,000 a day. Several members of the league agreed in the view that the car service order No. 94, of the Association of American Railroads, requiring expeditious return of empty cars to the owner lines in the West, was unfair to the roads, including those of the Southwest, from which those cars were taken while no provision was made to bring back to those roads the cars they themselves owned which were on "foreign" lines. As a result of operation of order 94 it was said, one industry which normally loaded 100 cars a day had been forced to shut down.

It was agreed, ultimately, that the only way in which the railroads could "help" was to order more cars and step up maintenance of the existing car supply.

Mr. MORSE. The resolution to which reference is made in the article is the joint resolution which my colleague from Oregon and I introduced sometime ago.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an excerpt from a letter which I received from a representative of small lumber operators in the State of Oregon, in which he discussed certain objections which he thinks can be raised to Service Order 910. I think it is only fair that his point of

view be in the RECORD. These objections involve arguments which I think need to be developed at a hearing before the Interstate Commerce Commission. How can the Interstate Commerce Commission fully appreciate and understand the effect of Service Order 910 if a small mill operator such as this man represents is not given his day in court, so to speak? When I talk about a "day in court" I am not talking about an informal conference with the Interstate Commerce Commission. I am talking about a hearing of record, where there can be made the judicial record which may be needed in order to follow other legal steps if one decides that he has grounds upon which to take a case to court, on the basis of the arbitrary and capricious exercise of discretion on the part of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

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

Perhaps the decision is right on technical terms, but the effect of the decision is to (a) work a severe hardship on small mills and wholesalers; (b) disrupt a 20-year practice without a hearing; (c) is the first step of governmental tyranny by taking unilateral action without notice or hearing to the persons affected thereby; (d) favors big business—i. e., the railroads; (e) will not alleviate the car shortage, which is simply the lack of adequate cars, and not faster movement thereof; (f) will discriminate in favor of eastern wholesalers, who route cars to the East and then sell them en route, thus causing hardship to western wholesalers; (g) will pinch small western mills, many of whom will go out of business, because of the prices they will receive will be substantially less than formerly; (h) force small mills to sell to large businesses, thus doing away with advantageous prices, and eliminating western wholesalers; and (i) taking of property without due process of law.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks certain excerpts from a letter which I received from another representative of small mills in my State. The excerpts are marked in the letter.

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

With the office on summer schedule, I am left to do the typing if this is to reach you on Monday morning with a copy of the opinion of the court in *Daugherty Lumber Co. v. United States*.

The opinion of the court is enclosed. It concludes that the ICC is vested with statutory power to issue Service Order 910 without prior notice or hearing having been accorded to the affected persons and interests. As I stated at the hearing before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on May 8, WFIA was not challenging the naked legal power of the ICC to issue the order.

In discussing the procedure followed by the ICC, the court finds itself reminded of "governmental tyranny." With this concept, WFIA has also been in accord. We have suggested that the procedure adopted by the ICC in the issuance of its order was a willful evasion of congressional intent, arbitrary, and imperious. We have intimated that perhaps the reluctance of the ICC to hold a hearing in the matter may be reasonably attributed to the embarrassment it might suffer should it appear that the ICC was not acting with adequate knowledge of the situation it was seeking to regulate.

Our prime concern is the fact that the Commission elected to proceed with Order 910 under the provisions of section 1 (15), 49 USC 1 (15) of the Interstate Commerce Act rather than under section 1 (14) of the act. Under section 1 (14), the Commission could not have issued the order without first having held a hearing. Under section 1 (15), no hearing is necessary. But section 1 (15) authorizes the Commission to issue orders without a hearing only when there exists an emergency which requires immediate action.

Here the Commission knew a year in advance that it would issue Order 910. It might then have held a hearing. Certainly it could not then have issued the order without the hearing. But to evade this statutory requirement, to ignore fundamental concepts of fair dealing by a government with its own citizens, to provide a cloak for its own possible ignorance—the Commission waited for the beginning of the annual car shortage. Then, with its anticipated emergency finally at hand, the Commission was able to issue its Order 910 without a hearing. This may be, as the court concludes, legal. But it is sharp dealing. It is imperious and arrogant. It has led a thoughtful court to reminisce of "governmental tyranny."

To outline the current situation:

Many months ago, the ICC knew that it intended to issue order 910. (See *Traffic World*, May 12, 1956, p. 30.)

The Commission deliberately awaited the onset of the anticipated car shortage before issuing its order in order to evade the necessity for a hearing.

The Commission, while pointing to gross loss in car-days resulting from transit type lumber shipments, has never considered whether, as many experts contend, there are gross savings resulting from quicker loading of transit cars, more nearly full loading of transit cars, absence of lost days that result from the partial unloadings experienced by firm order cars, etc.

The Commission has not adduced data to show whether there is a net gain or a net loss in car-days resulting from the transit sale technique for lumber.

If there is a net loss, the Commission should have considered the economic impact of its order on many lumber producers and the payrolls and communities they maintain in order to arrive at a thoughtful conclusion as to whether the net loss, if any, in car-days is more harmful to the public interest than is the dislocation and disruption likely to stem from ICC Order 910. It is difficult for us to believe that such information and understanding of the complex economics of this industry could have been achieved without a full hearing conducted locally and a careful, intelligent study of the record. Absent a hearing, we have government by ignorance.

To issue the order without notice and hearing was an arrogant, imperious procedure.

A hearing might have been held at any time before the issuance of the order. A hearing might have been held while enforcement of the order was temporarily restrained by the district court. A hearing might still be held. It is seldom too late to cure the ignorance of those who wish to learn.

Failure to hold the hearing flaunts accepted standards of governmental conduct. Even in the gravest of emergencies, ex parte orders of courts must be followed promptly by hearings. Congress acts only after public hearings conducted by its committees, excepting only instances where national security compels secrecy. In short, the ICC deliberately adopted a procedure which the Court may not, and Congress would not employ.

A hearing held for the lumber industry apparently would accommodate all of the protests received against order 910. (See *Traffic World*, supra, p. 30.)

Perhaps it is also pertinent to remark that if the ICC had buckled down to the job it is supposed to be doing, it is unlikely that Service Order 910 would even have been considered. Instead of tackling the fundamentals of the car shortage and presenting to Congress a comprehensive plan for assuring that the Nation's industry and agriculture will not be cut off from raw materials and markets, the ICC has stumbled along with makeshifts and piecemeal notions bottomed on the risky foundation of ignorance and speculation. In this connection, the need for Senate Joint Resolution 171 becomes apparent. It is disheartening to think, however, that a joint resolution of the Congress is needed to induce the ICC to do its basic job. Why won't the ICC rush in to do its job without waiting for this additional congressional directive?

Possibly the ICC would hold a hearing on Order 910 if the Magnuson subcommittee or the full committee would issue an appropriate report and recommendation. This would not invade the quasi-judicial functions of the ICC. It would align the committee clearly with the courts in suggesting that a hearing is in order.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD* at this point as a part of my remarks a letter which I have received from Mr. J. E. Bauer, a lumberman of my State, who takes strong exception to Service Order 910. I think his point of view should be in the *RECORD*, and I think he should be given an opportunity to appear as a witness at a public hearing on this subject, called by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

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

DEAR SENATOR: Reference ICC Order No. 190. May we suggest that you point out on the floor of the Senate that this order is discriminatory against the small-business men in this United States, not only the small wholesaler and mill man in Oregon but retailers and others throughout the United States all of which are small-business men. Also, point out that the three-judge court has declared that they have no province in the matter of suspending ICC Order 910.

At the same time point out that Mr. Eisenhower has time and time again said that the backbone of our economy is the small-business man, and now we would like to see if the administration is going to take the side of the small-business man and do something about ICC and Service Order 910 or will take the side of big business which many contend, as ICC Order 910 is without a question in favor of big business. It will be interesting to see which side the administration will take.

Yours very truly,

J. E. BAUER.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me say to the small lumber mill operators of Oregon, here and now from the floor of the Senate, that, given that hearing, if they cannot make a case which on the basis of the preponderance of the evidence supports their view that this order ought to be canceled, then I will say to the Interstate Commerce Commission it should insist that its order go into effect. My criticism of the Interstate Commerce Commission is limited on this point solely to the fact that up to this hour the Commission has not given the lumbermen of my State the hearing which I believe under our system of fair trial in

this country they are entitled to have, as is clearly intimated in the language contained in the court's decision.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD* at this point in my remarks a telegram I received from the Timberlane Lumber Co., of Eugene, Oreg., sent to me by Mr. R. B. Taylor, dealing with the same subject matter. Mr. Taylor is another lumberman who thinks that at least he ought to have a right to be heard and to make a record on this subject.

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

EUGENE, OREG., June 2, 1956.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Federal court's dismissal restraining order on ICC Service Order 910 apparently means Commission has dictatorial powers allowing no recourse by hearing or through courts; therefore, you are our only hope to prevent the continuation of this tyrannical deprivation of a way of doing business so essential to small-business men in this area. The court in its opinion confirmed our contention that the order was unwise and would not alleviate the car shortage, but said they lacked jurisdiction to stop the order. Obviously, this is another attempt of big business to gain competitive advantage. Can any remedy be found to curb this situation?

TIMBERLANE LUMBER CO.,
R. B. TAYLOR.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, lastly I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD* at this point in my remarks a statement prepared by Aaron Jones, W. C. Kelsay, Russ Fryburg, and Dana McBarron, supplementing their oral testimony of March 29, 1956, before the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

With respect to Service Order No. 910, however, we can not concur in the Commission's judgment. This is not because of lack of respect for the Commission's expert knowledge of carriers. Indeed, we are confident that if the Commission had as much knowledge of the economics of the production and distribution of lumber as it does of the economics of rail transportation, Service Order No. 910 would not have been issued.

Certainly a knowledgeable Commission would not have adopted the imperious procedure used in the promulgation of Order 910. On March 30, 1956, the Commission informally advised us that in October 1955 it began collecting statistics to support the order. Until the Commission releases its statistics, careful analysis of them is premature and impossible. Suffice it to say at the moment that the Commission in gathering its statistics was acting in obvious ignorance of the subject matter because its statistics fall even to allude to the car savings created by lumber transit sales. In effect, the Commission looked only at the liability side of the balance sheet and through ignorance or otherwise ignored the asset side.

But the salient and terribly distressing fact is that in October 1955 the Commission began to gather its inadequate statistics. On March 19, 1956, the Commission issued Service Order 910. For over 5 months the Commission was apparently preparing for the issuance of its order. It is an order which strikes at an industry of which the Commission has no expert knowledge. Indeed,

the order exerts almost its total force against only the small- and medium-sized independent units of that industry. Yet in this entire 5 months' period there was no consultation with these small- and medium-sized business units. Indeed, there was not even a word of warning.

Without prior notice, on March 19, 1956, the order was issued, to become effective April 9. Nor was this gap of a few days intended to afford these stricken people an opportunity to make any adjustments. The Commission's view, as related to us, is that the gap was intended to accommodate only transit cars then en route. The Commission intended that from the moment of notice of its order, transit sales would stop. What the small mills were to do, what the lumber purchasers were to do, what was to become of Oregon's economy, seems not to have been considered. There was no consultation with us—no warning. It is difficult to conceive of discretionary power exercised more arbitrarily, more imperiously.

In the circumstances, we ask the committee to use whatever persuasion or power it possesses to induce a suspension of this Service Order No. 910 until the Commission holds a hearing, formal or informal, in western Oregon, for the purpose of acquainting itself with the economics of the lumber industry it seeks to regulate, and particularly of acquainting itself with all aspects of the transit-sale technique.

AARON JONES.
W. O. KELSAY.
RUSS FRYBURG.
DANA MCBARRON.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to say again to the Interstate Commerce Commission: "Give us a hearing, so that you will relieve the Commission of the just criticism which I believe is implied in the court's decision that failure to accord a hearing in such a matter really lays the foundation for the danger of establishing a trend toward tyranny in administrative law processes in our country."

NEW FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have recently had occasion to mention on the Senate floor the imaginative and provocative study of foreign aid which has been prepared by Max Millikan and Walter Rostow of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Center for International Studies. An excellent and detailed analysis based on this study appeared in the Washington Sunday Star for May 20, 1956. The article discussed first "some misconceptions" about foreign aid as judged by Professors Millikan and Rostow, and then summarizes their proposed program. I ask unanimous consent that 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:

NEW FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY STUDIED

(This article's background: A bold and comprehensive plan for revamping the United States' foreign economic policy was being circulated on Capitol Hill and in the highest echelons of the executive department last week. Its passionately nonpartisan approach apparently has impressed most of the men who are studying it. Authors of the 104-page, 24,000-word proposal are Max Millikan and W. W. Rostow, professors at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Center for International Studies. They make their proposals as private citizens, although

the research on which their conclusions are based was conducted by MIT. Their summary of the proposal is given under the heading *Some Misconceptions*. A provocative tabulation of popular misconceptions about foreign aid, as judged by Mr. Millikan and Mr. Rostow, is given under the heading *The Proposed Program*.)

SOME MISCONCEPTIONS

Since many of the challenging criticisms of foreign assistance proposals have been directed against what we believe to be misconceptions of the kinds of political and psychological effects that such programs can be expected to have, it is well to take a look at some of these misconceptions.

The simplest misconception is that gratitude for help and assistance extended by us will lead the recipients to act in ways we desire simply because we want them to. Crudely put, the notion is that we can buy friendship and affection and that these in turn will insure behavior in our interest. Anyone who has had experience in the psychology of the grantor-grantee relationship in private charity or in international relations will not consciously fall into this error.

The grantee's sense of dependence commonly produces aggressive feelings of resentment toward the grantor which may easily worsen rather than improve relations between the two. If on other grounds we determine that large-scale assistance is in our interest, we must expect that an incidental result will frequently be less rather than more spirit of cooperation and mutual respect, even and perhaps especially if the aid programs are successful in achieving their objectives.

Many measures can be taken to reduce the severity of these hostile reactions to economic assistance, but they are often the precise opposite of the measures likely to be taken by an official smarting from the hurt of these reactions or spurred by a Congress so hurt. Our public role as donor must be minimized, not maximized; exaggerated credit must be given the recipient for his own contributions; demands for demonstrations of alliance and agreement must be reduced rather than increased.

Aid adds military strength?

A second misconception is that the central purpose of economic aid programs is always to strengthen the economies of the recipient countries to enable them in short order to carry a much larger share of the burden of military buildup against Communist armed forces.

There is, as we have already recognized, a good case for military assistance to allies who, as in Western Europe, have real industrial potential. This idea has been extended much too uncritically, however, to the less developed areas. The first trouble with it is that the resources of most of the underdeveloped areas are so limited that even with massive aid the contribution they can make to defense against open military aggression by the Communist nations is inevitably going to be very small.

We must face squarely up to the fact that resistance to determined military aggression by the Soviet bloc powers is a job for the United States with help from NATO powers of Western Europe. The hope that we can create and maintain such a defense cheaply by organizing the manpower masses of Asia, that we can prevent aggression by getting Asians to fight Asians, is largely illusory because Free Asia (perhaps excluding Japan) does not now have and cannot in the near future create, even with our assistance, the economic potential to support a major military effort.

In the second place, while these countries can help to resist minor aggression and should be able to maintain order internally, weapons and military potential are ineffective without the will to use them. Some of

the underdeveloped areas appear to have this will, others clearly do not.

Aid bolsters private enterprise?

There is an expectation frequently associated with American aid programs that they can and should be used to halt or reverse the trend toward socialism present in many underdeveloped areas.

We agree with those who hold that a private market system with maximum opportunity and incentive for individual enterprise will in the long run promote self-sustaining growth better than a highly bureaucratized system dominated by central government. But we believe paradoxically that we shall promote ultimate reliance on private incentives more effectively by not insisting on any particular economic philosophy as a condition of aid than by attaching private enterprise strings. A favorable environment for private investment can, in some cases, be established only after a period of rather heavy capital formation under Government auspices.

This is what happened in Japan in the decade after 1868, and, more recently, the whole set of measures instituted by the Indian Government in the period starting in 1951 have, by 1956, created an environment in which the Indian private sector is undergoing rapid growth.

Thus we believe on the one hand that crude attempts to force a free private enterprise philosophy on recipient countries as an explicit or implicit condition for aid are almost certain to be self-defeating; on the other hand we believe there are good reasons for expecting countries now avowedly Socialist but determinedly democratic to move toward greater reliance on private incentives as their development proceeds.

Communism springs from hunger?

A final and serious misconception which exposes proposals for economic programs to effective attack is what may be called the Marxist fallacy underlying the thinking of many conservative people on the role of economic change in political development.

Crudely stated, it is held that revolt and protest are the result of hunger and poverty and that relieving hunger and reducing poverty will therefore reduce revolutionary pressures. In other words, if we can supply the wherewithal to feed people better, they are much less likely to support Communist or other extremist movements.

The implied picture of the forces affecting social and political change is so naive as to be vulnerable to attack from a number of directions.

In the first place, the spirit of revolt does not breed easily among people who are chronically destitute. In the rigid feudal societies which still characterize some parts of the world those at the bottom of the scale have for generations accepted a fatalistic view that it is in the nature of things that they should be poor. People do not organize and conspire to promote change when they believe change to be inherently impossible.

These facts are well understood by the Communists, who concentrate their efforts not among those who are hopeless but among those in whom expectations have already been aroused.

The first and most powerful effect of economic development efforts is likely to be to dislodge convictions and habit patterns which have in the past insured stability. A further factor contributing to unrest is the education which accompanies economic change. With a growing understanding of the huge discrepancies in rewards customary in backward societies comes a growing awareness that these discrepancies are not the inevitable result of God's will.

The proposed program

As we see it there are two priority tasks for United States foreign policy. The first of

these is to meet effectively the threat to our security posed by the danger of overt military aggression. This danger arises, at the moment, from the capabilities and possible future intentions of the Communist bloc countries.

It is to be met primarily by maintaining or increasing United States military strength and second by solidifying alliances with other countries in a position to contribute significantly to American strength. One of the instruments to be used in this effort is military and economic assistance to countries with important industrial potential, mainly the NATO powers, designed to make that potential militarily more effective. This is part of our current policy and need not be discussed further.

The second priority task of our foreign policy is to use our influence to promote the evolution of a world in which threats to our security and more broadly to our way of life are less likely to arise. Success in this task would mean the freeing of a large volume of resources from military to more constructive uses. More important, it would mean freeing our society from the oppressive pressures inevitably associated with a garrison state, pressures which threaten our most cherished values.

The components

We may summarize the component parts of our proposals thus:

The United States should launch at the earliest possible moment a long-term program for sustained economic growth in the free world. This program would make available to the underdeveloped areas sufficient additional capital and technical assistance to satisfy all likely demands for such assistance which meet fairly high standards of eligibility based on the prospective productivity of investment. The levels of investment assumed would be sufficient to make possible an overall one percent annual increase in real income per capita for all the underdeveloped countries of the free world. In practice, some would grow faster, some slower, than this rate.

As part of this program the United States Government should offer to provide a new long-term capital fund of from \$10 to \$12 billion to be available for loans and grants over a 5-year period to accelerate economic growth in underdeveloped areas. Although an initial 5-year allocation is recommended, the plan would look ahead for a longer period, at least a decade.

This sum would be accompanied by commitments from the advanced countries to make additional loans and grants of from \$2 to \$3 billion over the same time period as part of a unified free world program.

Concerted measures should be taken to enlarge the international flows of private capital. Such measures might yield an addition over present level of \$3 to \$4 billion during the first 5-year period.

These sums must be made available to free world countries without any military or political strings, but under strict business-like criteria.

Recipient countries must show evidence of widespread popular support of the broad goals of the programs.

It is most unlikely, if such criteria are enforced, that the whole of the sums offered would be taken up. It is essential to the plan, however, that availability of the full amount be guaranteed in order to remove capital as a bottleneck to economic growth and to provide maximum stimulus for the governments and peoples of the underdeveloped countries to expand their capacities to use capital effectively.

A systematic plan should be worked out for establishing international stocks of agricultural surpluses to be made available for development purposes. Such a plan must contain certain provisions designed to in-

sure that distribution of such stocks would not interfere with the normal markets of exporting countries.

Loans and grants should be administered by existing national and international agencies, including the Export-Import Bank, the International Bank, the Colombo plan organization, etc. New machinery is required, however, to set the ground rules and lay down the criteria for the investment program.

The program would include the following features:

1. To restore and maintain an efficient international division of labor, insuring for industrial countries sources of agricultural products and raw materials and markets for their products.
2. To stabilize in the interest of the supplying countries raw material and foodstuff markets and prices.
3. To liberalize United States trade policies by progressive stages.
4. To achieve free world currency convertibility.
5. To achieve a common free world policy on East-West trade.

Sharp edge of policy

This program will not achieve its basically political and psychological purposes unless its fundamental features are preserved. The sharp edges of policy which must be preserved appear to be these:

The additional sums envisaged must be large enough to remove capital as a bottleneck to growth, under the tough criteria of productivity envisaged.

There must be no tie between economic aid and military pacts, and no explicit political conditions within the free world beyond the requirement that development goals be democratically established. An aid program with strings yields satellites, not partners.

The plan must look to a long future and envisage a sustained United States effort.

There must be a real measure of international contribution and international administration.

Without these elements, the proposal would probably be rejected by some nations we would wish to see join in the effort, e. g., India. With these elements maintained, we believe this plan will go far toward restoring and maintaining the unity of the free world.

THE RUSSIAN DEEMPHASIS OF STALIN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of our gifted and outstanding former colleagues of this body recently delivered an important speech to the Overseas Writers' Club here in Washington. Speeches and articles by former Senator William Benton are always stimulating and this one is no exception. Senator Benton criticizes the administration for its failure to take full advantage of the historical opportunity offered the free world by the new Russian deemphasis of Stalin. This important and significant speech has not yet attracted the attention it deserves.

As Senators will recall, former Senator Benton recently visited the Soviet Union for an extended period of time, and some of the observations he made on his visit have been very informative and educational to the American people.

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

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

REMARKS BY WILLIAM BENTON, PUBLISHER, ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA, OVERSEAS WRITERS' CLUB, HOTEL STATLER, WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 30, 1956

These past few months the American people have suddenly awakened to the fact that our influence and prestige abroad are skidding. At the same time Soviet influence and prestige are, on net, going up. The Middle East turmoil; Iceland's request that we withdraw our troops; the defeat of its strongly pro-Western government by Ceylon; French Premier Molle's sharp criticism of our foreign policy; all of these have come as a surprise to most Americans and as a shock to some.

Not all the voices asking whether we are losing the cold war are those of Democratic Party presidential hopefuls. Even the Eisenhower administration seems alarmed. A new note has appeared in recent speeches by President Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles. Obviously some very serious reappraisal, maybe even agonized soul searching, is taking place in this city. The hunt for ideas seems to be on. I'd therefore—on my first visit to Washington in some months, occasioned by testimony tomorrow before a subcommittee of the Atomic Energy Committee—I'd therefore like to throw out a few ideas as a good will offering from a defeated Democrat to a victorious Republican administration.

The focus of the world struggle has shifted to the field of propaganda. Its focus is likely to remain fixed on propaganda and economic policy and appropriations, for a long time to come. When he has put his mind to it President Eisenhower has been, and can be, a great propagandist. His atoms for peace speech before the United Nations in December 1953 was a top propaganda move—in the best sense of the word. So, judged strictly as propaganda, was his aerial inspection plan for armament control. I personally favored his proposal for an atom peace ship—though many opposed it. Such a ship could be worth a dozen in the Navy. President Eisenhower can compete with Bulganin and Khrushchev as propagandists—if he wants to—and I'm not suggesting he undertake the strain of world tours. Secretary Dulles seems to enjoy the latter chore, and good for him, because such tours are greatly needed.

But first the President must appreciate the importance of competing. He has discovered, and I'm sometimes perplexed as to whether gladly or sadly, that he must be the chief propagandist of the Republican Party. He must now discover that he is the essential man as the chief propagandist of the free world, and this involves a more aggressive propaganda world role than any since Wilson, including Franklin Roosevelt with his four freedoms. The world-wide propaganda of the West is no longer a job for a second- or third-ranking Assistant Secretary. It is for the President himself who must speak out. He must speak often and well, continuously carrying the refrain of the fight for freedom. Only he can speak for America in a voice that all the world will listen to. Even the Soviet press has now conceded that it must let its readers know what Eisenhower is saying. And that means that when he speaks, he can speak to the Soviet people and to the satellite people directly.

Jack Raymond of the New York Times was in the Ukraine last week. He talked to the mayor of Odessa. This is how Raymond describes what the mayor had to say:

"He declared he had obtained his first inkling of Stalin's role in a statement made by President Eisenhower that was published in the Soviet press. He said the President had asserted that upon Stalin's death the

'Stalin era' had ended. This expression set him to thinking, he declared."

How revealing this is. The Times could have livened its editorial page by comment on Raymond's dispatch. The President of the United States makes a speech. It gets printed in the Soviet press. It starts the mayor of one of Russia's biggest cities to thinking along new lines. And are we to suppose that the mayor was the only one who started thinking? There's quite a lot of new thinking going on today in Russia and in Eastern Europe. And our job is to help that thinking along, to provide it with fresh facts and new ideas.

An enormous—a historic—opportunity has opened up to us. Will we take advantage of it? The anti-Stalin campaign is shaking Russia psychologically in a way it has not been shaken in the 38 years of the Soviet regime. For decades, the people of the U. S. S. R. were told that Stalin was the wisest, the kindest, the sweetest, the greatest man who ever lived. In a word, that he was infallible. Ever since World War II that theme has been hammered into the captive peoples of East Europe. Now the word is that he was a maniac; he was also a murderer and a monster. His victims are being released from jail, or posthumously "rehabilitated." Books, movies, plays, poems, and pictures produced during his lifetime must now be scrapped. What was yesterday's white is today's black.

Only last week Khrushchev's attacks on Stalin were reported to be growing still tougher. Stalin is alleged to have been more anti-Semitic than Hitler, with all Jews having been scheduled for deportation to Siberia. Can and should we now assume that the Soviet people are so stupid that they will not draw conclusions from the evidence given them by their own leaders, now laid each week before them, of how a madman deceived them, of how he lied to them and of how he even killed their brothers and sisters, their fathers and mothers?

For an American parallel we have to imagine how Americans would have felt in 1789, the year of our Constitution, if they had suddenly found out that George Washington was a British spy, and Benedict Arnold a patriotic American whom Washington had framed.

The men in the Kremlin are concerned about this shock. Look how slowly and carefully they are releasing the news to their people. Look at the happenings in Tiflis last month, when Soviet troops had to machinegun Stalin's countrymen in the streets. Even in the Soviet Communist Party there has been a reaction which caused Pravda to denounce what it calls "rotten elements" in the party. These elements, we can hope, may be those who have been stimulated to doing some thinking for themselves.

In Poland, the news has been given to the people straight, not slowly and carefully as in Russia. Here's what the Polish radio had to say a few days ago:

"The cult of Joseph Stalin. How strong was the reaction of every one of us when the figure of this man emerged before us in the full glare of historical truth. Many of us experienced this with as much pain as if it were a blow delivered to ourselves. For thousands, for millions of people Stalin was the personification and symbol of justice, infallibility, genius, and goodness. The reaction was strong and painful. It sometimes started with rebellion. People said in factories the following: 'We shall not allow Stalin to be taken from us.'"

Then the broadcast continued:

"Recently we read in the weekly paper Poprostu the statement by one of the young leaders: 'As a result of bitter reflection on the subject of the cult of personality, I came to the conclusion that no authorities exist, beginning with the secretary of the

basic party organization and ending with the Secretary of the Central Committee.'"

Mind you, this is a Communist radio commentator speaking, a Communist commentator in Poland where Stalin has been glorified only for 10 years. How much sharper, how much more explosive must be the present psychological reaction among Soviet youth where most of the population can't remember a time when they were not told that Stalin was the personification of all that is noble.

Can it be that because of the tremendous successes of the Communist propaganda since 1917 and even before—can it be that the Soviet leaders have now at last overestimated the power of their propaganda? When they now tell the youth of Russia about Stalin, when they tell the youth of Russia that Stalin was not infallible—may they not be sowing the seeds of unbelief in the Soviet propaganda? I like a phrase of Allen Dulles. He writes me of his "cautious optimism." I agree. From such seeds as the present cynical reversal on Stalin, from these may we not hope that future disbelief and discord may develop. The question before the Eisenhower administration is how to cultivate this hope, how to seize it and develop it, and in this area we should now be seeking the ideas for the President and his administration.

Khrushchev is worried. It is now 2 months since he delivered his secret speech to the Communist Party Congress. The speech has not yet been published anywhere. Moreover, it must be clear to many Russians that the full story of Stalin's crimes has not been told, even by Khrushchev. Khrushchev and his associates are trying to preserve part of Stalin's past reputation in order to hang on to Soviet material gains which Stalin's crimes made possible. Moreover, they have a personal interest in preserving part of Stalin's reputation: They were his proteges who might be nothing today if it were not for Stalin. So far as we know, Khrushchev and company still have not publicly answered the key question: Why didn't they stop Stalin while his crimes were being performed? For them this is a question of the stop-beating-your-wife variety. They don't propose to answer it because the answer is obvious. Theodore Kagan printed an amusing anecdote on this point, which he reported is circulating in Europe. While Khrushchev was at the height of his denunciation of Stalin, while the congress was in executive session so to speak, a note came up to the rostrum. Khrushchev opened it and read aloud: "Where were you while all this was going on?" Khrushchev raised his eyes and said, "Will the comrade who sent this note please stand up." No response in the congress. Khrushchev said "I demand that the comrade who sent this note stand before I give a count of 3." Still no response. Khrushchev then said, "Comrade, you have my answer. I was just where you are today."

This anecdote, if true, as it may well be, helps show Khrushchev's talent with a phrase; his own skill as a propagandist.

The attack on Stalin helps bring into the open, it helps define the opportunity now before the American people through their President. I suggest that President Eisenhower now authorize a series of statements directed to the Soviet people, and to the people in the satellites. The theme should be Stalin himself, and only Stalin. This is the theme forced upon us by the Soviet leaders themselves. The top issues in the world today, as defined by these leaders, are Stalin's crimes, Stalin's lies, Stalin's aggression, and Stalin's personal responsibility for the cold war, the arms race, and most of the world's troubles.

Ideally, the President himself should make these statements, perhaps in the form of personal broadcasts carried by the Voice of

America. As I think we here today can agree, his is the one voice that speaks most effectively for the United States, and his words, as President, are the only words the Communist press might not now dare to ignore. However, I have been around Washington enough to know that one does not demand that the President "must" do anything, and today I have no wish of any kind to add to the strains upon a busy man who quite understandably has much else on his mind in this election year. Perhaps a series of statements under his signature or made for him by the Secretary of State, will break through to the Soviet and satellite peoples.

Here are some of the things the President could say with productive results to the free world:

First, he ought to call on Khrushchev to make public the secret speech he made before the party congress. He might even suggest that it would not run counter to the "spirit of Geneva," the great new propaganda slogan of the U. S. S. R., if the Communist leaders quit treating the Soviet people like political infants who can only be fed one drop of the truth at a time.

Second, he ought to tell the Soviet and satellite peoples that the true history of the past several decades was far, far different from what they have been taught. Did you see the news reports on the textbooks I brought back from the U. S. S. R., given me by Mr. Kalov, then Minister of Education? They don't mention the United States in the victory over Japan in World War II—and they state flatly that General Eisenhower only launched the Normandy landing after the heroic Soviet armies had defeated the Nazi armies.

The President ought to discuss in detail such Stalinist crimes as these:

The Hitler-Stalin pact of 1939.

The German-Soviet partition of Poland.

The destruction of the Baltic States independence by the Red army.

The deliberate way Stalin let the population of Warsaw be murdered by the Germans during the Warsaw uprising while the Red army stood nearby and did nothing to help the heroic Polish underground in 1944.

The Katyn Forest massacre in which Stalin murdered the flower of the Polish Army officer corps.

The enslavement of the captive states after 1945; and the destruction of the freedom of Czechoslovakia in 1948.

The attempted takeover of northern Iran in 1945 and 1946.

Soviet atomic espionage against the United States.

The Communist aggression against South Korea.

The germ warfare lie campaign.

Third, the President should explain to the Soviet people how it is difficult for us to trust the present Soviet leaders who were Stalin's henchmen throughout the period of his worst crimes. The members of the Presidium were picked and trained by Stalin. We have no guaranty that they will not repeat his treachery if given a chance.

Fourth, the President should make clear that we of America and the free world have no intention of interfering in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union. At the same time he should make clear our belief that Soviet collective leadership, as it is practiced today, is only collective dictatorship. He should stress that we fear the power of a dictatorship to deceive its people, and to misuse the nation's resources for political, economic, and military aggression. He should set forth and underscore our belief that only a democratic regime in Russia, or in any other country, can make certain that the people's yearning for bread and peace will be met.

Fifth, the President should openly challenge the Soviet leaders to present his words to the Soviet people, in full and not in part,

To the best of my knowledge, Secretary Byrnes was the first to do this, when I was serving under him a decade ago. He got away with it, too, in one critical speech.

The President can again remind Khrushchev and company that their speeches are printed here in the United States in full, that they are available to every person who wants to read them. He should stress that, if they suppress his messages, world public opinion will know there is no sincerity in their present talk of peace and coexistence. The President should speak bluntly, and over more so, as bluntly as did Khrushchev in London last week when he boasted of Soviet hydrogen bombs and intercontinental missiles.

The President's theme to the Soviet people must be direct and simple: That Stalin committed not only the crimes Khrushchev admits, but also many that Khrushchev has not admitted, and that it is this great bundle of crimes which forced us to arm in self-defense, and to create overseas bases and defensive alliances. As never before, the President's messages to the enslaved peoples of the world can carry conviction because even the Soviet people have at long last been set to thinking, to questioning and doubting. Because they already have been told that Stalin bamboozled them, and have had a partial documentation, they are prepared to hear more.

The possibility of such an approach by us must have occurred to the Soviet leaders. On the record, they've been much smarter propagandists than we have. They must be unhappy and even uneasy about the possibility. Take a look at some of Premier Bulganin's remarks in Great Britain last week. He suggested we Westerners should let bygones be bygones, and not discuss past responsibility for international tension too much. It's easy to understand why he feels that way, but it would be stupid and foolish for us to acquiesce and submit. The Soviet crimes of the past are the basis for much of the world's present unhappy situation and for our present fears. That is what the Soviet people must be told.

In the past week or two both President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles seem to have made a start along the lines I am recommending. The President called for rectification of Stalin's crime in enslaving the captive nations. Mr. Dulles mentioned Stalin's lies about the Korean war and germ warfare. But these were individual paragraphs in long speeches devoted primarily to other topics. In that context the paragraphs could have little or no impact upon the Soviet people.

What I feel is urgently needed is a series of top-level speeches, dealing with Stalin and Stalin alone, backed up by and promoted by every available media and every publicity and promotion technique. Such speeches should be directed specifically to the Soviet and satellite peoples and not to American public opinion. In them, I hope our Secretary of State will look abroad, instead of toward Madison Avenue and November 1956. As a graduate of the Avenue, 21 years ago, I urge upon him the viewpoint that by this rearrangement of viewpoint, he may astonish his advertising agencies and do a better job of public relations and even win a better chance of victory. I agree, however, that we must use one advertising technique: We must repeat our story time and time again, using every medium we can, to get it into the Communist empire and to keep it there. The Soviet propagandists, like American advertisers, know the value of repetition. Our Government must learn it and apply it as well.

Some may argue that what I am proposing is undiplomatic, that it is tactless, that it will offend the Soviet leaders and lessen the chance for peace. My reply is "Nonsense." I do not deny that there is often the need for

tact and diplomacy in dealing with the Russians. But the Soviet leaders do their best every day to speak to the peoples of the free world over the heads of the free world's leaders. Their own conduct can serve as a precedent and a justification for what I propose, although I don't like to advance their conduct as either a precedent or justification for anything.

The Soviet people are thinking. They are asking questions. They are breaking out of old patterns of passive belief and acceptance. This gives to us of the free world a historic opportunity and one we may not soon get again. If we grasp this opportunity boldly and exploit it imaginatively we can, I am confident, achieve gains of the first magnitude toward our objective of peace and international understanding. If we let the opportunity slip by, a new equilibrium may be created in the Communist world, a new set of myths can develop, and rather quickly, to dominate the thinking of the Kremlin's subjects so that our future messages will again go unheeded, even if not unheard. The opportunity is now here. The time to exploit it is now. I do not understand the delay. Can it be attributed to the upside-down world described by an official so high ranking that he shall be nameless? His topsy-turvy substitution occurred before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He gave us a new version of victory, a version which made him sound more like a Madison Avenue public-relations man than a statesman. He flatly denied that the Soviet leaders are leading from strength and suggests that their hand is a Yarborough.

The decision to take the needed action is up to the President of the United States. I pray to God he will grasp that opportunity for the good of all humanity. He has the kind of understanding for the problem if he will but apply it. I well remember his understanding and his eloquence in this area. When I was Assistant Secretary of State, in the toughest job I ever tackled, and when he was Chief of Staff, he was my favorite witness before congressional committees. He understood the kind of issues I'm discussing today—as also did Generals Marshall and Bedell Smith—far better than did the top officers of the State Department. I hope he will unleash his understanding and leadership in this field of communication of ideas—I hope he will unleash it again through his leadership at this time.

THE BOXCAR SHORTAGE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a few moments ago the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] addressed the Senate on the subject of the recurring boxcar shortage. On May 9, 1956, I invited the Senate's attention once more to that crisis which seems to hit us on a seasonal basis every year. Hearings have been conducted on Senate 2770 by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I am certain that a great many Senators are waiting for action on this matter as impatiently as I am. I earnestly hope that the committee will report this measure favorably in the very near future so that this critical situation will be alleviated after these months and years of postponement.

I join with other Senators today in asking the Interstate Commerce Commission to do whatever it can to stimulate, first of all, the proper movement of boxcars into markets, so that the available supply can be properly used; and, secondly, to do whatever it can to encourage the railroads to fulfill their re-

sponsibilities in providing boxcars, which are urgently and desperately needed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I sincerely join the distinguished Senator from Minnesota in asking for prompt action on the bill to which he has referred.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say that I have concluded hearings on the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We know the Senator has concluded hearings.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is on the agenda of next Wednesday's regular meeting of the committee. I hope we can report the bill then, because I am afraid the ICC will not do anything unless we pass the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to commend the Senator from Washington for what he has done to expedite the processing of the bill. I testified before his subcommittee. The Senator has had many other duties to perform, as was exemplified by the appropriation bills today. My point was merely to join with my colleagues in urging favorable action by the committee and, once the bill is reported and placed on the calendar, prompt action by the Senate.

Two articles which describe the boxcar shortage from a Minnesota viewpoint appeared in the Minneapolis Star on May 28 and 29. They are written by the Minneapolis Star staff writer, Herb Paul. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Star of May 28, 1956]

BOXCAR SPEEDUP SOUGHT IN CONGRESS

(By Herb Paul)

Congress has been asked for immediate legislation to help speed movement of present supplies of railroad boxcars to prevent upper midwest market-bound grain from becoming "mired by the most drastic boxcar shortage it has faced."

E. L. Peterson, director of the Minneapolis Traffic Association, called on grain dealer and farmer country elevator associations to make their members' voices heard in Washington in a concerted effort to obtain such legislation before Congress adjourns.

"We are again confronted with another boxcar shortage," he said. "Every indication tells us it will be more severe than last year."

A survey conducted by L. L. Crosby, chairman of the Minneapolis Grain Exchange Car Supply Committee, of nearly 2,400 country elevators showed these results:

Out of the first 300 replies received by the end of last week, 78 country elevators reported they were plugged with old grain because of inability to obtain boxcars.

Of this number, 35 were in North Dakota, 7 in South Dakota, 16 in Minnesota, and 20 in Montana.

Nationally, Peterson said, the car shortage is rapidly getting worse. As of May 7, 1955, the average daily boxcar shortage was 3,578 cars, while on May 5 of this year it was 4,603 cars, an increase of 1,025 cars.

Peterson, to hasten congressional action, urged Senator MAGNUSON, Democrat of Washington, chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to seek immediate passage of the bill he introduced

permitting penalty per diem charges during boxcar shortages.

Per diem charges are rental charges on cars used by non-owning roads and today are fixed at \$2.40 per day by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The ICC, Peterson said, is powerless to further increase the per diem charges and the responsibility rests with Congress to which the ICC answers.

Hearings started on the bill in March, at which time Peterson urged its approval. But a group of railroads opposed the bill as it was written, although reported in sympathy with its objectives, and a substitute bill was offered.

Peterson said the grain trade and country shippers feel passage of either bill would speed up and stimulate the return by western railroads of cars owned by western roads.

Pointing out both bills involve the matter of per diem on car rental charges, Peterson called Magnuson's attention to the fact railroads now are in the process of formulating substantial increases in their demurrage rules and charges.

This is the charge a railroad imposes upon a shipper who takes more than a "reasonable" number of hours to load or unload a car. Peterson believes that because of the demurrage increases, grain shippers are justified in asking increased rentals be imposed on railroads using another line's equipment.

Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, already has cited the seriousness of the boxcar shortage and he urged Magnuson's committee to expedite action "so that we may at last be saved from the seasonal recurrence of a boxcar shortage this year."

HUMPHREY inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a story in the Minneapolis Star on the action of the executive committee of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners (NARUC) demanding congressional action on the car shortage. The NARUC has backed the bill.

It also appealed to the Office of Defense Mobilization to extend the amortization program for rapid tax write-off on new equipment which was terminated last year so more boxcars could be included in its provisions.

[From the Minneapolis Star of May 29, 1956]

BOXCAR SHORTAGE BLAMED ON EAST

(By Herb Paul)

An insight as to how the boxcar shortage situation applies to the upper Midwest was presented by two Minnesota railroad experts at the convention of the Midwest Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners at Omaha, Nebr.

They were M. J. Galvin, public relations counsel for Minnesota railroads, St. Paul, and E. S. Ulyatt, general superintendent of transportation of the Northern Pacific Railway.

Speaking at the invitation of Paul A. Rasmussen, chairman of the Minnesota Railroad and Warehouse Commission, president of the association, Galvin and Ulyatt discussed what they termed is a most troublesome subject as far as our industry and a great segment of shipping public are concerned.

"Particularly," Galvin said, "because we raise and market grain and other agricultural products which come at certain peak or load seasons and have to be moved to concentration or processing points over comparatively short periods of time."

One main cause of the perennial boxcar shortages, he said, is the fact the upper Midwest, as a producing country, ships a great amount of products to the concentrated population in the East—and has difficulty getting its boxcars back.

As a result when western lines request return of their cars each spring, they find by

July they have only about 80 percent of ownership available. And by October this drops to about 75 percent.

Today, with mechanized harvesting, much of the grain goes to market immediately so the impact on country elevators, rail shipping, and storage facilities in the rural areas has been terrific.

Grain that goes to the terminal market must be sampled, graded, and offered for sale, either stored or diverted to other destinations, all of which takes time.

Galvin believes this situation only can be remedied effectively by additional storage facilities in rural or other points close to the harvest and not readily remedied by boxcar supply.

It would be simply transferring the congestion from rural areas to terminal points where the headache might be greater.

"If the railroads had on hand all boxcars needed to move the grain at harvest time stored on the rail sidings," he said, "it would only be a matter of days when the terminals would become so plugged with cars awaiting inspection, sales, and switching for diversions or unloading that the headache would be much greater than it is today."

Another thing that contributes to the boxcar shortage, Galvin said, is the fact that all Commodity Credit Corporation grain loans come due the last of April.

When the time comes for the Government to take over the grain when the loan is above the market price, the CCC must start to process its paper, he said.

"A couple of years ago they moved the loan paper to central points where, we have been told, it sometimes takes as long as a month to process the paper and take over the grain."

"Then we often find the movement of that grain to terminals is delayed into June and July, tying up boxcars that otherwise would be available for movement of the current crop."

Galvin believes southern and northern crop loans might be made for the same period of time and not all come due on one date.

Ulyatt said car rental per diem charges are an important factor in the car supply and distribution.

"We favor legislation (by Congress) which would authorize and require higher per diem charges during car shortages, as well as high per diem generally, upon the ground such higher charges will provide an incentive for increased ownership."

He said increased per diem charges during a car shortage partially will offset the revenue loss sustained by a railroad when its cars are appropriated by other roads, and will promote quicker movement of freight cars at all times.

He said that "as long as it is cheaper to rent a car than it is to own one (and that is the situation today) underbuilding will be the policy of the strategically situated (eastern) railroads. And construction of new cars will be held to minimum requirements."

Ulyatt said Northern Pacific generally operates with below 80 percent ownership of its cars, which places a severe handicap on the shippers it serves.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, 8 years ago Senate Resolution 175 was considered in committee at a hearing over which the late Senator Reed of Kansas presided. More than 500 witnesses testified in favor of the very thing that is now in the bill to which the Senator has referred. At that time the ICC promised to see to it that cars would be provided to haul grain in early spring. And I believe the Senator from Washington

will recall that there were 50,000 bushels of flax on the Montana prairies, and a great number of bushels of wheat. At that time we secured from the Interstate Commerce Commission every promise that it could make to regulate the use of railroad boxcars. Nevertheless, today the situation is as bad as it was at that time. That is why I am so eager to join the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Minnesota in asking prompt action. I have had telegrams and letters from all over the Northwest urging action on the bill.

INTERNATIONAL FARM YOUTH EXCHANGE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the most constructive and imaginative efforts now being conducted in the whole field of international exchange of persons is the program sponsored by the National 4-H Club Foundation called the International Farm Youth Exchange. In the interest of removing the causes of world tension and promoting peace, this International Farm Youth Exchange program arranges for the exchange of rural youth between the United States and nearly 50 countries throughout the world.

Wearing blue jeans and work clothes, the boys and girls who participate in this program live and work as regular members of the family in such diverse places as the farming villages of Western Europe and the rice paddies of Japan. Demonstrating by their deeds that the American people have not lost touch with our heritage of manual labor, these young Americans are correcting a common misconception about us widely held abroad—the assumption that everything in the United States is machine driven or machine run.

At the same time, youths from Europe, Latin America, Asia, and the Near East have come to this country to live as members of farm families in nearly every State of the Union. They are sharing the day-to-day pleasures and hardships of American farm life, and in this process they are having an opportunity to feel the pulse of rural life in our own democracy. Minnesota farmers alone have been hosts to 41 exchanges from countries throughout the world.

Mr. President, I think it is important to note that the cost of operating the International Farm Youth Exchange is not paid by the United States Government. The National 4-H Club Foundation, which sponsors the exchange, obtains contributions from 4-H clubs, civic groups, farm organizations, foundations, American industry, interested individuals, and others who feel that through this program they can contribute in some measure to the establishment of better understanding at the family level, which must be the basis for a lasting peace.

The International Farm Youth Exchange will soon be conducted out of the National 4-H Club Center, which is being developed in Chevy Chase, Md., by the National 4-H Club Foundation. 4-H Club members themselves are giving a dime each to help establish this "working" 4-H shrine. When the

4-H Center is in operation, we, as Members of Congress, will have the opportunity to meet there with 4-H Club members from our States. At this national 4-H shrine, symbolic of the dignity of agriculture, we can discuss the operation of our national Government and help 4-H'ers from our States to prepare to serve their country as good citizens in a democracy.

Those who take part in the International Farm Youth Exchange have broadened their perspectives through the down-to-earth experiences they have shared in the homes and on the farms of this country. Without a doubt they form the nucleus of a well-informed democratic leadership in the rural society of their native lands. We can see, too, in the Americans who left rural communities for this overseas experience, a corps of enlightened citizens well aware of the problems and perplexities of this ever-shrinking world. Moreover, we should not overlook the thousands of farm families who, as host families, have acquired a better understanding of their world neighbors.

Mr. President, this is the 9th year of the International Farm Youth Exchange, under which 630 of our rural youth have gone abroad to live and work with our rural neighbors in other lands. This year 300 exchanges will be conducted with nearly 50 countries.

I feel that the National 4-H Club Foundation, the Cooperative Extension Service, and the farm people themselves are to be commended for the success of this unique and worthwhile program.

As one Senator, I hope it will continue to grow and to serve the cause of peace in the years ahead, and I join with others in commending it for an outstanding program of service to our country.

FREE OR REDUCED AIR TRANSPORTATION RATES FOR MINISTERS OF RELIGION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3149) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act in order to permit certain air carriers to grant free or reduced-rate transportation to ministers of religion.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. 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. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 232, extending greetings to the American National Red Cross on the occasion of its 75th anniversary. I call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] to the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 232) extending greetings to the American National Red Cross on the occasion of its 75th anniversary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, although this is a House concurrent resolution, it was unanimously approved by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. There are certain reasons why the American National Red Cross wishes to have the resolution agreed to this week. I therefore ask for its immediate consideration. Nothing is involved in it except congratulatory recognition of the American National Red Cross.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 232) was agreed to, as follows:

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.

The preamble was agreed to.

PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICE IN RURAL AREAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2039, H. R. 2840. I call the attention of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] to the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2840) to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. A similar bill has been reported by the committee in previous sessions, and it has been passed by the Senate previously.

The bill has now been passed by the House. What we seek to do is simply what the Senate has already done before.

The bill provides for public library services in rural areas. There are presently approximately 27 million Americans without access to any local public library services and 90 percent of these people live in rural areas. Additionally, about 53 million people have local library services which are deemed by competent persons to be inadequate.

The bill has for its purpose the development of public library services in rural areas, providing modest funds in grants for a period of 5 years which will stimulate the States to develop methods of providing library services to residents of small towns, villages, and farming communities which now totally lack them or where they are inadequately supplied.

The committee wishes to emphasize the 5-year nature of this program. It is anticipated that 5 years of Federal assistance should be sufficient to energize a program for expansion of library services so that at the end of the period the States and localities will be able to provide adequate services. John S. Richards, president of the American Library Association, in testifying in favor of this bill, assured the committee that his organization believed that the program should be limited to 5 years and that in that period of time the States would be stimulated to solve most of their rural library problems.

The cost for this program of stimulating State extension of library services to rural areas—incorporated or unincorporated communities of 10,000 population or less—will be \$7,500,000 for each of 5 years.

It should be stressed that because of greatly developed professional cooperation among librarians and the institutions they serve, the mere provision of library services in rural areas almost immediately opens up enormous library resources to these areas. Librarians have worked out cooperative methods of lending their books and files and other materials to such a degree that there can be a constant flow of valuable library materials to these rural areas once the outlets are established for their utilization.

Another expected result for this legislation lies in the chain reaction which comes about from demonstrating to communities the values of library services. Where no library services exist, communities cannot be expected to fully understand their value and importance. Once acquainted with what an adequate library does for them, people will be able to evaluate and hence work for continuation of the services with local resources.

The money appropriated under this bill will be allotted to the States in the following manner: Each State will receive a basic allotment of \$40,000, except the Virgin Islands, which will receive a basic allotment of \$10,000. The balance of the appropriation will be divided among the States on the basis of their rural population as compared with the rural population of the United States. The allotment for each State must be matched by the State on the basis of the per capita income of the State as compared with the national per capita income.

In order to receive funds each State must prepare a State plan for the further extension of public library services to be submitted to the Commissioner of Education, who is required to approve the State plan if submitted to him by the authorized State agency and if the plan complies with the specifications set forth in the act. The State plan may

use any method for extending public-library services that it determines will use the funds to maximum advantage. The State plan may make use of public libraries in local rural areas so long as the funds granted under the bill go for the extension of public library services to adjacent areas. In order to be eligible a State plan must certify that the State appropriation to the State library agency has not been reduced below that of the year previous to the one in which Federal funds are to be received. The State has complete authority in the selection of books, materials, and personnel. The determination as to whether or not library services are inadequate will be made by the State library agency.

One of the Senators most interested in the bill is the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. I am happy to yield to him at this time.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama, the chairman of the committee, which gave such gracious consideration to the bill which came from the House.

If the bill is to be effective, the States must cooperate, and they must do their share in order to participate in its benefits. The need for the bill was, I think, shown quite adequately before the committee. More than that, one of the most interesting comments about the bill, to my mind, was that in my correspondence concerning the bill I found I received letters from not only professional teachers or professional educators, but also from ranchers, farmers, and even mechanics, from my own State and other States adjacent to it. All these persons were interested in the bill.

I feel certain this is a step in the right direction, a step which I think should have been taken, perhaps, a long time ago.

I pay my tribute to the distinguished Senator from Alabama for his consideration and active support of the bill.

Mr. HILL. I thank the distinguished Senator from Colorado for his kind words; and I again express appreciation for the deep interest which he has taken in the bill.

I wish also to express appreciation to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] who also demonstrated great interest in the bill.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I express appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, for the cooperation the committee has had in trying to develop some of the health bills and also the library bill during the past month or two, and publicly, on the floor, I wish to acknowledge our indebtedness to the Senator from Alabama for the fine teamwork he has elicited in the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FREE OR REDUCED AIR TRANSPORTATION RATES FOR MINISTERS OF RELIGION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2030, S. 3149.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3149) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, in order to permit certain air carriers to grant free reduced rate transportation to ministers of religion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if there are no other Senators who desire to address the Senate at this time, I am prepared to move that the Senate stand in recess.

Before doing so, I again call attention to the announcement made previously today that the Senate will consider tomorrow the various bills to which I alluded when the Senate convened today.

It may be that if the Senate can complete the consideration of these bills in time tomorrow, we can proceed to the consideration of the social security bill. If not, the Senate will probably go over until Monday and resume the consideration of the unfinished bills on Monday, and then begin the consideration of the social-security bill.

Mr. President, I should also like to announce the possibility that on Monday next there will be a call of the calendar.

Pursuant to the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Thursday, June 7, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 6 (legislative day of June 4), 1956:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (b) of section 504, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. Lewis Blaine Hershey, O6530, United States Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended, and sections 303 and 306 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of

1948. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law:

Major to lieutenant colonel

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

Butterfield, Charlotte Gage, 21244W.
Ray, Elizabeth, 21324W.
Blalock, John Wilmer, 6043A.
Rodzankas, John Frank, 6044A.
Turner, Egbert Snyder, Jr., 6122A.
Lambert, Floyd Aubrey, 5721A.
Imig, Paul Jacob, 6211A.
Krogh, Laurence Bertram, 6254A.
Swenson, Shir H., 6371A.
Little, John Preston, 6373A.
Callaway, Roy Lavert, 6374A.
Peterson, Lee Lieske, 6376A.
Deppen, William Christian, Jr., 6379A.
Haas, John A., 6381A.
Allen, Stanley Ernest, 6382A.
Ray, Wilbur Richard, 6383A.
Lemons, Joseph Pascal, 6384A.
Ceely, William David, 6387A.
Felle, Clarence William, 6388A.
Carstensen, Dale Lafayette, 6389A.
Bruner, Frederick William, 6391A.
Collins, Harold Colbert, 6392A.
Lathan, Noel Olin Elder, 6394A.
Morgan, Fred Arthur, 6395A.
Ellis, Bythel Laurence, 6399A.
Dickens, Thomas Nolan, 6400A.
Mattie, John Duane, 6401A.
Johnston, Charles Harvey, 6402A.
LaRowe, John Simon, 6403A.
McCullough, William Edward, 6404A.
Sheehan, Roy Hampton, 6405A.
French, Russell Leroy, 6406A.
Benson, Frank Tipton, 6408A.
Royce, Clare Howard, 6409A.
Spencer, Harold Melville, 6412A.
Guider, Herbert Neal, 6415A.
Morat, Charles David, Jr., 6417A.
Lanning, George Richard, 6418A.
Wooster, Vernon Oliver, 6419A.
Sharpless, Thomas Frank, 6421A.
Kernan, Robert Mills, 6422A.
Smith, Sidney George, 6423A.
Burnett, Robert Leon, 6425A.
Bear, George Harold, 6427A.
Swanson, Richard Walter, 6429A.
Walter, Clarence Douglas, 6430A.
Norton, William Nicolson, 6431A.
Lawton, Kenneth, 6432A.
Pash, Robert Norman, 6434A.
Neff, Charles Laban, 6435A.
Woinowsk, Russell Kenneth, 6437A.
Abercrombie, John Woodrow, 6438A.
Risher, John Randall, 6439A.
Short, Howard Earl, 6440A.
Smith, Everett Hensel, 6441A.
Reeder, Vendor Harvard, 6442A.
Simonetti, Lino David, 6444A.
Merrill, Woodrow Taylor, 6446A.
Whitehead, Chauncey Brownloe, 6451A.
Jones, John, Jr., 6452A.
Lasly, Walter D., 6453A.
Thabault, George Bernard, 6457A.
Hoke, Peter Joseph, 6458A.
Crosson, Norman Robert, 6461A.
McDowell, Glenwood, 6462A.
Stewart, Carl W., 6464A.
Higginbotham, Harold Kenneth, 6466A.
Dell Angelo, John Andrew, 6467A.
Reeder, D. M., Jr., 6468A.
Forsblade, Kenneth Dave, 6469A.
Adleman, Julius J., 6470A.
McDonnell, Heston, 6471A.
Hay, Frank Olmested, 6472A.
Reed, Henry George, 6473A.
Reese, James West, 6475A.
Riddle, Charles Lewis, 6477A.
O'Bert, John James, 6478A.
Creo, Andrew Bartholomew, 6479A.
Swanson, Theodore Benedict, 6481A.
Drew, Troy, 6482A.
Long, Alan Guy, 6486A.
Lumpkin, William Hiram, 6487A.
Bray, Jack William, 6491A.
Hefling, Robert James, 6494A.
MacGregor, Wallace Fletcher, 6496A.
McFarlan, Frank August, 6497A.
Habeck, Carl William, 6500A.

Wright, Julian Carleton, 6501A.
 Prevatte, James Osborne, 6502A.
 Moore, William Weatherly, 6503A.
 Deppe, Ralph William, 6505A.
 Ferrell, Frank Ellington, 6507A.
 Hart, Malcolm Detraz, 6508A.
 Sprawls, Philip Claudius, 6509A.
 Akins, Dudley Stephenson, 6510A.
 Sweigart, Bert LeRoy, 6511A.
 Stallings, Guy Harrison, 6512A.
 Chiarella, James Santo, 6516A.
 Mills, Thomas Harris, 6517A.
 Sanders, Roy Clifton, 6518A.
 Sensenbrenner, Ralph Debal, 6519A.
 Moore, George Eugene, 6520A.
 Driver, John James, 6522A.
 Dacko, William, 6525A.
 Strauss, William, 6526A.
 Jones, Hubert Ledyard, 6527A.
 Rudolph, Ray Harding, 6532A.
 Kerr, Jean Louth, Jr., 6533A.
 Weisbrodt, Charles Richard, 6534A.
 Snalder, Himey Jones, 6536A.
 Warthman, Jack Dussell, 6537A.
 Milholland, George William, 6538A.
 Salisbury, Stanley Gordon, 6540A.
 Rhode, Storm Charles, Jr., 6542A.
 Hight, James Lester, 6543A.
 Ondo, Michael, 6544A.
 Calof, Donald Robert, 6546A.
 Christenson, Richard Andrew, 6548A.
 Johnson, William Melbourne, 6549A.
 Funk, Carl Franklin, 6550A.
 Sullivan, Arthur Joseph, 6553A.
 Johnson, Lycurgus Waldemar, 6557A.
 Douthett, Elwood Moser, 6559A.
 Taylor, Henry Weston, Jr., 6560A.
 Hunt, Seaborn McDonald, 6526A.
 Cole, Edward Lee, 6563A.
 Elliott, Charles Robert, 6564A.
 Barrett, Alfred William, Jr., 6565A.
 Jacobson, James Louis, 6566A.
 Bean, James Otto, 6571A.
 Tansel, Dave Collins, 6572A.
 Schold, George Bertie, Jr., 6573A.
 Harper, Harmon Hicks, 6574A.
 Edelen, Henry Hill, Jr., 6576A.
 Slough, James Carl, 6577A.
 Ireland, Melvin J., 6578A.
 Ofner, David Bernhard, 6579A.
 Elston, Ernest Woodrow, 6580A.
 Poole, George Irvin, Jr., 6581A.
 Turbak, Chester, 6582A.
 Bass, Feris Achile, Jr., 6584A.
 Clark, DeLair Aubrey, 6585A.
 Creyts, Harold George, 19548A.
 Campbell, William Joseph, 6587A.
 Gray, Leon Walton, 6589A.
 Nye, Richard Sadler, 6590A.
 Topper, Morse, 6591A.
 Gibson, Robert Duane, 6592A.
 Price, Andrew Henry, 6594A.
 Tilghman, Marvin Hugh, 6596A.
 Wagner, Wilfred William, 6597A.
 McLaren, William Aiden, 6599A.
 Bryan, William Tagg, 6601A.
 Fincher, William Walter, 6603A.
 Edwards, Kenneth Rhea, 6604A.
 Kremer, Harry Darwin, Jr., 6608A.
 Zorka, Jack Carl, 6609A.
 Ellis, Ollie McLaurin, 6610A.
 Schobel, Sumner, 6611A.
 Blackman, Richard Orchard, 6612A.
 Brown, Frank Lobdell, 18085A.
 Sirney, John Ashton, 6613A.
 Browning, John Robert, 6616A.
 Riggs, Carl Nelson, 6617A.
 Krause, Harris F., 6619A.
 Bradford, Carl Walker, 6620A.
 Dascombe, Charles Burr, 6621A.
 Boddie, James Warner, 6622A.
 Stringer, Robert Dillon, 6623A.
 Lindsay, Andrew Gowen, 6624A.
 O'Hern, Luther, 66251A.
 Burt, Joseph Autry, 6627A.
 Bright, David Morgan, 6628A.
 Stallings, McLendon Montgomery, 6629A.
 Hartwig, Robert Louis, 6630A.
 Thompson, Arthur John, Jr., 6631A.
 Patterson, Warren Shaw, Jr., 6632A.
 Swindler, Harold, 6633A.

Dehner, Joseph Harvey, 6635A.
 Saville, Wesley Thomas, 6636A.
 Deane, William Boyd, 6637A.
 Dennis, Larry Denton, 6638A.
 Buechner, William Austen, 6639A.
 Jarrell, Robert Edward, 6640A.
 Barber, James Luther, Jr., 6641A.
 Schulherr, Richard Modglin, 6643A.
 McCormack, Bailor Daniel, 6644A.
 Linko, George Andrew, 6645A.
 Parks, Bernard Grant, 6646A.
 Hunt, Earl Gilbert, 6647A.
 O'Donnell, John Thomas, 6648A.
 Carpenter, John Woolsey, 6649A.
 Shipley, Edward Vail, 6651A.
 Boselli, Theodore John, 6653A.
 Riddick, James Walter, 6654A.
 Gaylor, Don Gordon, 6656A.
 Yoder, Harry David, 6658A.
 Chauvet, Jack Sydney, 6659A.
 Robinson, John Henry, 6660A.
 Andrews, John Albert Cornelius, 6662A.
 Neving, Gilbert, 6665A.
 Murphy, Robert Marshall, Jr., 6666A.
 Tattini, Leno, 6667A.
 Quattlander, Frank Paul, 6668A.
 Wilson, Irl Donaker, Jr., 6669A.
 Fontana, Robert Edward, 6670A.
 Porter, Lester Williams, 6672A.
 Crutchfield, James Oscar, 6673A.
 Turk, Laurel Agee, 6674A.
 Castle, Vernon Henry, 6675A.
 Murden, Charles Holt, Jr., 6676A.
 Zurek, Walter John, 6677A.
 Andersen, Homer Paul, 6678A.
 Poe, John Everett, 6680A.
 Miller, Lynus Parker, Jr., 6681A.
 Grending, Carl Nelson, 6682A.
 McCleary, Robert Joseph, 6684A.
 Bohman, Thomas Spare, 6685A.
 Kellerman, Jack Hickman, 6686A.
 Reinhardt, Herbert Wilton, 6687A.
 Fox, Robert Winston, 6690A.
 Ritter, Herbert Waldemar, 6691A.
 Herrington, John Athol, 6693A.
 Deterding, Floyd Milton, 6695A.
 Edwards, James Thomas, 6696A.
 McGlasson, Robert Bruce, 6697A.
 Ivey, Maury Herbert, 6698A.
 Kafer, Ernest Emanuel, 6699A.
 Austin, John Florea, 6700A.
 Parker, Van Robison, 6701A.
 Francis, Tim Benton, 6702A.
 Morgan, Russell Dodson, 6703A.
 Fussell, James Glen, 6705A.
 Hill, John Theodore, 6707A.
 Moe, John Gillette, Jr., 6708A.
 Ragon, Dale Ambrose, 6710A.
 Johnston, Robert Edward, 6711A.
 Pryor, Daniel Franklin, 6712A.
 Jennings, Elton Jordan, 6714A.
 Hall, Thomas William, 6715A.
 Allen, Ed Crow, 6716A.
 Chandler, George William, 6717A.
 Mona, Reuben Edward, 6718A.
 Stewart, John Leger, 6719A.
 Cartwright, Everett Jackson, 6720A.
 Slater, Ralph Phipps, 6721A.
 Wilson, Woodrow, 6722A.
 Hamilton, Samuel Davis, Jr., 6723A.
 Konin, David Harry, 6724A.
 Rogers, Dale Edward, 6726A.
 Spohn, Clifford Adams, 6727A.
 Kruege, William Arthur, 6728A.

MEDICAL CORPS

Bilotta, Laurence Alexander, 19227A.
 Kloess, Edward John, 19806A.
 Kennett, Donald Michael, 19228A.
 Wright, Paul Eugene, 19229A.
 Perri, Frank Adrian, 19230A.
 Twichell, Gilbert Alfred, 19231A.
 Johnston, Maurice Blair, 19232A.
 McFall, Voris Francis, 19234A.

DENTAL CORPS

Hutchinson, William Rex, Jr., 18899A.
 Dilley, Harold Edward, 18900A.
 Ekstrom, Maurice Fred, 18901A.
 Connell, Thomas Benton, 18902A.

VETERINARY CORPS

Sasmore, Daniel Paul, 18995A.
 Bills, William Edward, 18996A.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Lee, William Henry, 18082A.
 Lunnie, Francis Melrose, 19435A.
 Kretschmer, Ernest Theodore, 19461A.
 Farrell, Thomas Augustus, 19436A.

NURSE CORPS

Peschon, Ida Elaine, 20904W.
 Zeller, Dorothy Nellie, 20915W.
 Conroy, Elizabeth Julia, 21925W.

CHAPLAIN

Powers, William Edward, 18760A.
 Cameron, George James, 18763A.
 Fulkerson, Maurice Dale, 18764A.
 McWilliams, Alfred Edward, 18765A.
 Cutress, Albert Leo, 18766A.
 Holt, Maurice Robert, 18767A.
 McArthur, Luther Wheeler, 18768A.
 Pennington, Henry Clay, 18769A.

First Lieutenant to captain

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

Smith, George Washington, Jr., 28026A.
 Hogue, Norman Kirkland, 28027A.

CHAPLAIN

Ansted, Harry Burton, 27662A.

Second Lieutenant to first lieutenant

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

Wells, James Paschal, 28619A.
 Troutman, Clarence Walter, 28618A.
 Moody, Stanley A., 28620A.
 Reed, Robert Harvey, 28631A.
 Samples, Wheeler Dewey, Jr., 28622A.
 Thulin, John Harold, 28626A.
 Bohn, Lowell Fred, 28623A.
 Stone, Denver, 28624A.
 Foster, Dudley John, 28621A.
 Christman, William Charles, 28628A.
 Black, Harley Samuel, 28627A.
 Stone, Lewis Walter, 28629A.
 McNeill, Royce Houston, 28630A.
 Phelps, Harold Lawrence, 28625A.
 Evans, Richard Earl, 28641A.
 Frazier, John F., 28632A.
 Townsley, William Harter, 28647A.
 Clark, Robert Scott, 28636A.
 Hope, Joseph Jesse, 28643A.
 Enzian, Richard Bryan, 28640A.
 Greenleaf, George Henry, 28642A.
 Blake, Thomas Aubin, 28634A.
 Enney, James Crowe, 28639A.
 Morgan, Frederick John, 28644A.
 Chadwick, Elbridge Gerry, 28635A.
 Dauenhauer, Ervin Francis, 28638A.
 Abney, Kenneth Lee, 28633A.
 Thomas, James Carroll, 28646A.
 Cole, Charles Owen, Jr., 28637A.
 Owens, Eugene, 28645A.
 Watson, Everett B., 28648A.
 Thomas, Cornelius Alexander, 28649A.
 Roberts, Ben Allen, 28650A.
 Hickenbottom, Richard, 28651A.
 Moore, Arthur M., 28652A.
 White, John, 28655A.
 Ulrich, Donald Eugene, 28654A.
 Vehling, David Read, 28653A.
 Thomas, Lloyd Edward, 25450A.
 Rosburg, Charles Reed, 27907A.
 Fanning, Robert Wayne, 28657A.
 Jordan, Walter Fritz, Jr., 28658A.
 Burgdorf, William, 28659A.
 Liethen, Frank Elmer, Jr., 25155A.
 Haggard, Thomas Gene, 28660A.
 Hennessey, Charles B., 28662A.
 Holloway, William Victor, 28663A.
 Hook, Cecil M., Jr., 28661A.
 Patterson, Kenneth Morris, 27909A.
 Collins, James Quincy, Jr., 27908A.
 Bateman, Thomas Scott, 28664A.
 Hildebrandt, Verne B., 27910A.
 Caleb, Phillip I., Jr., 28665A.
 Alexander, Fernando, 28666A.
 Kimsey, Melbourne, 27148A.
 Simpson, John Edwin, 25642A.
 Andrada, Thiofilos, 27911A.
 Doherty, Robert Edward, 27912A.

McGouldrick, Francis Jay, Jr., 28667A.
Brown, Gordon Richard, 27914A.
Fincher, Donald Blake, 27151A.
Webber, James Hugh, 27149A.
Bennett, James Robert, 27150A.
Harwood, James Thomas, 27152A.
Rigney, James Hinds, Jr., 27153A.
Carter, Donald Eric, 27917A.
Craft, Roby Robert, 27915A.
Welch, Henry Owen, Jr., 27918A.
Matthews, Frank Alvin, 27916A.
Wilkes, John August, Jr., 28668A.
Pluennke, Harold Curtis, 28673A.
Zoerlein, Ralph Walter, 28671A.
Bennett, Robert Bernard, 28674A.
Delvecchio, Vincent E., 28670A.
Pytel, Stanley J., 28672A.
Davis, Frederick E., 28669A.
Kakacek, John Gerard, 27919A.
Kroen, Edward J., 28675A.
Gindoff, Alan Solomon, 27920A.
Martin, Billy, Jr., 28676A.
Batten, John Marshall, 28677A.
Davis, Paul Edwin, 28678A.
Stone, Gordon E., 28680A.
McGovern, Charles E., 28679A.
Elmore, Willie E., Jr., 28681A.
Balsden, James K., 28682A.
Walters, Neil Ince, 28684A.
Thoburn, Russell Eugene, 28685A.
Lyons, Albert Eugene, 28686A.
Turek, Edward H., 28683A.
Ingalsbe, Orville, Don, 28687A.
Weidner, Charles Herman, 28690A.
Pinson, Charles R., 28689A.
Tice, Fred R., 28688A.
Kerr, Thomas Bailey, 28691A.
McClellan, Robert Joseph, 28693A.
Lewis, George F., 28692A.
Kott, Richard Francis, 27922A.
Butler, Gunning, Jr., 28694A.
Lockwood, Frederick St. John, 3d, 28695A.
Martino, Joseph P., 28696A.
Ralph, William Delbert, Jr., 28697A.
Walborn, Chester Alden, 27154A.
Timm, Robert Herman, 27923A.
Norman, Russell, 27926A.
Needham, Paul Eugene, 27925A.
Pinchuk, Lanis, 27928A.
Pedjoe, John Paul, 27927A.
Miller, Carl William, 28701A.
Tucker, Lester W., 28703A.
Duncan, Clyde Eugene, 28698A.
Kennedy, Charles Roy, 28700A.
Mills, Billie B., 28702A.
Wiegand, Karl Leo, 28704A.
Falkner, Donald Clark, 28699A.
Millson, Chris, Jr., 28705A.
Hudson, John A., 28707A.
Byrkit, Robert Allen, 28706A.
Shugart, James Elmer, 27938A.
McClain, Larry David, 27937A.
Rutscher, John Jerome, 27934A.
Carnahan, Jerald Dean, 27935A.
Hancock, Gordon Kjolvik, 27931A.
Boughton, Alain George, 27933A.
Gill, Linden Lee, 27929A.
Kimbriel, John Ruell, 27930A.
Crowder, Calie Gene, 27936A.
Tudino, Frank Anthony, 28070A.
Matthes, James R., 28712A.
Lee, Vernon R., 28715A.
Thomas, James Herman, 28709A.
Culp, Kenneth C., 28714A.
Wold, James W., 28717A.
Jenson, Henry J., 28716A.
Schaffhauser, Carl N., 28711A.
Watson, John F., Jr., 28719A.
Gentry, Roy L., Jr., 28713A.
Baker, James D., 28708A.
Knoke, Frederick L., 28718A.
LaPorte, Donald C., 28710A.
Drennon, Philip Rodney, 27940A.
Josephson, Kent Alan, 27941A.
Noe, Philip Sanford, 27939A.
Gerber, Richard A., 28721A.
Wood, Milton Boyd, 28720A.
Irwin, Donald L., 28722A.
Fitzpatrick, Richard L., 28724A.
Kuska, Robert J., 28723A.
Hayek, Allan Donald, Jr., 27942A.

Witt, Raymond Julian, 27943A.
Weber, Kenneth Lewis, 28725A.
Landry, Edward B., 28726A.
Humke, John W., 28728A.
Scarlett, Bobby Reldue, 28727A.
Morris, Jack Allison, 28729A.

(NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.)

IN THE NAVY

Paul A. Weber, Jr. (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps), to be an ensign in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Lieutenant commander

Herbert D. Steinbeck

Lieutenant

William C. Dempsey
Francis Gilbert
Wilford D. Hooper

The following-named Reserve officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Commander

Orville F. Nielsen

Lieutenant commander

Thomas S. Marks

Lieutenant

Robert D. Cordier
Samuel O. Cornell
Vernon N. Houk
Walter M. Johnson

The following-named Reserve officers to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Commander

Edward J. Copping, Jr.
Gordon H. Rovelstad
Winthrop F. Smith

Lieutenant commander

Theodore E. Carlson
Sun R. Cloud

Lieutenant

Robert E. Forner
Joseph C. Gleeson, Jr.
Louis R. Pistocco

Manuel A. Benero, United States Navy, retired, to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, pursuant to title 37, United States Code, sections 275, 276, 277, 403 (a), 406 (a), 407 (a), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve aviators) to be ensigns in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Edwin C. Adamson, Jr.
Kenneth L. Ahlgren
George W. Allen
Stephen O. Armstrong, Jr.
Robert B. Arnold
Carl G. Austin
Harold Barnes
Frederick R. Bartlett
Richard D. Bishop
Walter H. Blaseck
Charles G. Bostwick, Jr.
Darrell H. Brooks
Gerald G. Buc
William McK. Burnett
Raymond M. Burris
John K. Cammall
Karl L. Carlson
James F. Carroll
Richard J. Cavicke
Robert T. Chase, Jr.
Norman B. Chezem

Arvid E. Forsman
Thomas J. Foster
Henry J. Fox IV
Richard W. Fox
John L. Frederick
George Gedney, Jr.
Ernest H. Gleim
Erwin A. Goschke
Malcolm N. Guess
Arthur J. Hack, Jr.
Roger H. Hageman
Wilbur G. Hager
Winfred F. Hampton, Jr.
David L. Harlow
Francis A. Hiser, Jr.
Robert L. Hollingsworth
Bill "J" Hoskins
Edward J. Jacobs, Jr.
Alfred C. Johnson, Jr.
Robert E. Johnson
Robert H. Jones
Larry L. Jongewaard
Donald E. King
Hollis H. Kirkpatrick
Donald O. Knerr
Frank A. Krisman
Joe V. Laceyfield
David S. Langner
Willis I. Lewis, Jr.
Cleland V. McBurney
Walter H. McCall
Rodney F. McCartney
Thomas W. McElrath
Robert D. McLin
Patrick P. Marsha, Jr.

The following-named enlisted personnel to be ensigns in the line (aviation ground) of the Navy, for temporary service, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Gillard W. Apgar, Jr.
William H. Appley
Samuel B. Aston
John H. Bailey, Jr.
Albert Barre
Dale F. Bear
William T. Bocim
James F. Bowlin
Donald C. Breuer
James S. Broos
John R. Burgoon, Jr.
Lloyd B. Camp
Louis J. Cason
Fred L. Clark
Samuel W. Cobean
Judson K. Cokefair
Richard "L" Conn
Walter G. Cronise, Jr.
Thomas V. DeMarino
Henry J. Demers, Jr.
Norman L. DeNoon
William G. Dugan
Jewell H. Eastham
Abe P. Fennell, Jr.
William T. Fenton, Jr.
Raymond F. Fitzpatrick
Harold E. Ford
Richmond D. Garrett
John D. Gilbert
Gordon E. Gilmore
Gail E. Gundersen
William F. Hale
Thomas S. Herring
Harvey Herzog
Carl M. Hill
Chester H. Holleman
Frederick Hoole
Robert S. Hughes
Irvine D. Irby, Jr.
Edward H. Johnson
James L. Jordan, Jr.
William R. Kane
James P. Kavin, Jr.
Lewis D. Keller
Clyde T. Kirkman

The following-named warrant officers to be ensigns in the line (aviation ground) of

Robert M. Matta
Bernard L. Minetti
Thomas G. Moore
Kendall E. Moranville
Samuel W. Morey
George M. Mulvany
Jack H. Nichols
William V. Patterson
Robert M. Pedersen
Ralph E. Poore
Raymond W. Porter
Lorenzo J. Rathke
John J. Richard
Kenneth J. Rieder
John K. Ritchie
Ray Roff, Jr.
Theodore A. Santuae
Douglas D. Schaadt
Estill E. Schnetzler, Jr.
Paul F. Selby
Eugene L. Soldwedel
James R. Spohnholtz
Russell E. Stearns
Duncan P. Stevens
John D. Stich
Thaddeus J. Szpara
Don W. Taylor
Eli L. Tucker, Jr.
Thomas A. Tucker
William C. Uelman
Raymond A. Vohden
Billy V. Wheat
Irving M. Wiltse
Robert O. Wirt
Robert J. Wuebler

the Navy, for temporary service, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

George C. Adams	William B. James
Ellis E. Austin	James R. Kay
Charles S. Carter	William J. Mitchell
Francis L. Gilmore	James A. Moore
Fred "B" Glover	Jacob W. Pangle
William C. Guthrie	Joseph F. Riley

The following-named chief warrant officers to be ensigns in the line (aviation ground) of the Navy, for temporary service, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Robert F. Ace	William R. Lander
Gordon K. Ayres	Francis C. Norris, Jr.
William H. Brown	James C. Petersen
James Carpenter	Charles M. Quinlan
Richard W. Carter	Charles E. Savo
Billy M. Harkins	Anthony J. Schiavone
Norman O. Keesling	Robert F. Tucker

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to, and permanent appointment in, the Supply Corps of the Navy in the grade of lieutenant:

Charles L. Gillis
Lowell T. Hughes
Norlin A. Jankovsky

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to, and permanent appointment in, the Supply Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (jg.) and the temporary grade of lieutenant:

Charles W. Barrett	George L. Stansbury
Robert R. Harvey, Jr.	III
Frank T. Maynard	

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to, and permanent appointment in, the Supply Corps of the Navy in the grade of ensign:

James G. Farrell
Joe Mook
James L. Stidham

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to, and permanent appointment in, the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy in the grade of ensign:

George M. Gans, Jr.	John P. Jones, Jr.
Carleton C. Hoffner, Jr.	Raymond E. Paulsen
	Paul A. Petzrick

Horace B. Jones, Jr.

The following-named officers in the Supply Corps of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (jg.), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Walter T. Meyers
John N. Postak
William J. Ryan

William H. Alexander, Supply Corps, United States Navy, for transfer to, and permanent appointment in, the line of the Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (jg.) and in the temporary grade of lieutenant.

Norman E. Beck, Supply Corps, United States Navy, for transfer to, and permanent appointment in, the line of the Navy in the permanent grade of ensign.

(PERMANENT PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY)

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant:

Lieutenant, line

Smith, Jack D.	St. Marie, Joseph
Averitt, Gordon F.	Gale, Robert D.
King, Cecil	Hobbs, James B.
North, Sylvester F.	Waterfield, Willard F.
Pegues, John K., Jr.	Mosley, Aulcey D.
Stenke, George	Tillotson, Ted K.
Peugh, Everett R.	Garrett, Bernard H.
Criner, James E.	Hounihan, John C.
Halleck, William L.	Childs, John T.
Leibold, William R.	Thomas, Preston G.
Bramblett, John J., Jr.	Padgett, James P.
Bish, Arthur A.	Coburn, Ernest L.
Thomson, William O.	Wilkinson, Raymond O.
Pescott, Robert	
Leach, Everett N.	Sandberg, William G.
Ramsey, Walter A.	Tomsky, Jackson M.
Christensen, Earl D.	Pinning, Joseph E.

Reid, Albert R.	Turpin, Lander H.
Antar, Albert	Dersin, Clement
Goebel, Herman E., Jr.	Gire, Howard A.
Fuchs, Julius E.	Rowland, Mervin
Mikkelsen, Richard E.	Clark, Andrew
Lewallen, John D.	Willis, Chesley E., Jr.
Peterson, Loyd G., Jr.	Murphy, Gerald E.
Evans, George J.	Selby, Howard K.
Birdsong, Harold S.	Forrester, James H.
Jacks, Robert G.	Brackney, Louis S.
Powers, Wilbur P.	Raymer, Edward C.
Whitman, George W.	Roberts, Douglas H.
Dievendoff, Frank	Law, Thomas L.
Lillienfeld, Joe J.	Winant, Barent P. III
Church, John H.	Davis, Ralph E.
Read, Garlin R.	Babine, Arthur L., Jr.
Macaulay, George W.	Rozell, Curtis J.
Villines, William M., Jr.	Sneed, Beckom U.
McGuire, Eugene J.	Saxton, Frank
Murdock, Lloyd E.	Ravan, Landrum E.
Jackson, Robert G.	Thomas, George C.
Christensen, Donald A.	Russell, William D.
Turner, James D.	Burnham, Rowland E.
Callaghan, Jerry E.	Waterloo, Francis C.
Stradtman, John F.	Hirz, Joseph D.
Johnson, Robert M.	Riba, Robert
Woods, Searle W.	Kaiser, Karl D.
Faver, Walter M.	Arp, Phillip S.
Askin, Thomas B. H., Jr.	Weaver, Edward H.
	Koch, Joseph
Ingersoll, Richard W.	Wheeler, James W., Jr.
Roush, Randall C.	Gerlach, Richard E.
Perl, Burton K.	Madeo, Joseph F., Jr.
Jarrett, Alonzo C.	Hunter, Glenn A.

Lieutenant, Supply Corps

Davis, Harold R.	Nelson, George W.
Reade, Lowell A.	Abraham, Donavon E.
Reed, Clarence E.	Rains, William D.
McKenzie, Charles H.	Needham, Thomas P.

Lieutenant, Civil Engineer Corps

Bodtke, David H.
Martin, Robert A.
Fail, Raymond P., Jr.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Abele, Henry F.	Bagby, Hallam O.
Abercrombie, Jerry T.	Balderson, Buele G.
Abrahams, Thomas P.	Baldwin, Charles C.
Abrahamson, Dean A.	Ball, Courtland D., III
Adkins, Kenneth G.	Barke, Arthur R.
Adler, Ronald E.	Barnes, Harry G., Jr.
Adorney, Frank	Barnes, Robert G.
Ahlquist, Stanley W.	Baron, Charles R.
Aiau, Harvey C. K.	Barry, Thomas M.
Albers, William P.	Barthelenghi, George H., Jr.
Albright, Richard K.	Bassett, Melvin S.
Alexander, Robert C.	Bates, David H., Jr.
Aldredge, Donald L.	Bauchspies, Rollin L., Jr.
Allen, William D.	Bean, Edward W., Jr.
Allyn, Richard H.	Beard, Donald W.
Altee, Thomas M.	Beat, Robert O.
Amendt, John H.	Bedworth, Wilfrid J.
Ammerman, Don J.	Beers, Robert C.
Anderson, Andrew G., Jr.	Beeton, Harvey J.
Anderson, Curtis O.	Bein, George E.
Anderson, Forrest P.	Bell, Bill J.
Anderson, Robert C.	Bell, Clyde R.
Anderson, Robert N.	Bell, Gershom R.
Andrews, Frederick C.	Bell, William R.
Appich, William H., Jr.	Belton, Jack G.
Apted, George L.	Bennet, Leslie W., Jr.
Armel, Lyle O., II	Bennett, Richard L.
Armstrong, Philip M.	Bennett, Richard W.
	Bennie, Donald B.
Arnold, John E.	Benning, Carl J., Jr.
Arrington, Robert A.	Bentley, William C.
Ash, Leonard C.	Bergbauer, Harry W., Jr.
Ashley, Bruce H.	Berge, Norman K.
Aucolin, Leonard L.	Berger, James K.
Aumuller, Richard W.	Best, Eddie F.
Avary, James C., Jr.	Betsworth, Brian C.
Avritt, Richard C.	Bierer, Bion B., Jr.
Babcock, Donald E.	
Baciocco, Albert J., Jr.	

Bird, Joseph W., Jr.	Carrington, James H., Jr.
Bivens, Arthur C.	Carson, George L.
Bizon, Joseph E.	Carter, Charles C.
Blackmore, Thomas A.	Carter, James D.
Blanchard, Robert C.	Carter, Robert D.
Blandine, Robert E.	Carterette, Robert T.
Blaszczak, Walter J.	Cassell, Dean G.
Blum, Frederick J. III	Catlett, Jack C.
Blundell, Peveril	Cauble, Donald K.
Bocock, Kenneth S.	Chadbourne, Harland A.
Bodling, Paul F., Jr.	Chadwick, John K.
Boggs, Steve V.	Champlin, Gerald B.
Bohannon, William L.	Charest, Alexis N.
Boncer, Lawrence	Charest, Philip G.
Booth, Roger G.	Chase, Edgar M.
Booth, Theodore W.	Chase, Warren A.
Boris, Andrew Paul	Check, Robert T.
Borthwick, Robert B.	Chesley, James F.
Botten, James R.	Chewning, Robert W.
Bottenberg, Foster L.	Chisum, Albert, Jr.
Botula, Bernard C.	Christensen, Eugene J.
Bourdeau, Paul T.	Christensen, Raymond J.
Bowers, Donald L.	Cirbus, Dominic E.
Bowling, Roy H.	Clark, Charles R.
Boyd, John H., Jr.	Clark, David P.
Boyer, Walton T., Jr.	Clark, Edwin B.
Boyet, Stephen G.	Clark, Lynn R.
Boyle, Darrell D.	Clark, Richard G.
Bradbury, John I.	Clarkin, James J.
Braden, Melvin E., Jr.	Clements, Billy R.
Bradshaw, Robert D.	Clinton, Thomas G.
Brady, Francis T.	Coe, David C., Jr.
Bredelhof, Charles M.	Cole, Edgar E.
Breland, Ernest W., Jr.	Cole, William S., Jr.
Britton, William L.	Coleman, James O.
Brooks, Edwin H., Jr.	Colgan, John G.
Brown, Larry J.	Collier, Larry D.
Brown, Walter H., Jr.	Collins, Philip K.
Browning, Siras D.	Conolly, Robert D.
Broz, George A.	Conrad, Charles, Jr.
Brubaker, Russell E., Jr.	Conrad, Peter C.
Brummage, Richard L.	Converse, Douglas
Brunskill, Robert J.	Coogan, John M.
Brunson, Wright A., Jr.	Coogan, Richard D.
Buck, Charles W.	Cook, Vernon H., Jr.
Bucy, John T., Jr.	Cooke, Donald L.
Bull, Joseph L. III	Cooley, Arthur W.
Bullard, John R.	Corbett, Eugene A.
Bullock, William A.	Corbin, Malcolm R., Jr.
Burgess, James A.	Corboy, Michael R.
Burt, Thomas E.	Cornell, Arthur F.
Bush, Lawrence A.	Coskey, Kenneth L.
Bushong, Brent	Coughlin, Paul G.
Bussell, Robert B.	Cour, Edward E.
Butcher, Nathan T.	Crader, Clifford L.
Butcher, Paul D.	Craig, Earl C.
Butler, Charles T.	Cramton, Philip B.
Butler, James K.	Crane, Leonard B., Jr.
Butrym, Stanley B., Jr.	Crater, Ray F.
Buy, Jay R.	Crepeau, George A.
Bynum, Frank B., Jr.	Cricchi, John V.
Byrd, Sam R.	Crinklaw, Douglas L.
Byrnes, Robert E.	Crook, Richard W.
Byron, Robert S.	Cross, Charles H.
Callaghan, Joseph M.	Cross, Lorin R.
Callicott, Jack D.	Crouch, Michael B.
Calnan, Eugene T.	Cruden, David S.
Campbell, Bruce H., Jr.	Crum, Paul M.
	Cuccias, Leo P.
Campbell, George R.	Culver, Eugene A.
Campbell, Jack	Cunningham, Edward F.
Campbell, Robert E.	
Campbell, Robert J.	Curl, Kent W.
Campbell, William N.	Curtis, Fayne E.
Camplin, Paul E.	Dally, David F.
Cannell, Donald T.	Dalton, Richard V.
Cannon, David E.	Daly, Harry P., Jr.
Cannon, Leo J.	Daly, Richard G.
Cannon, George A.	
	Daniels, James M.
Cardwell, John J.	Davidson, Robert P.
Carlson, Olef M., Jr.	Davis, Bill N.
Carlstrom, Richard H.	Davis, John B.
Carothers, Phillip F., Jr.	Davis, Michael C.
	Davis, Robert C., Jr.
Carpenter, Arthur J.	Davis, Walter J.
Carr, John H.	Davison, John W., Jr.
Carr, Nevin P.	Deal, Walter C., Jr.
Carrier, Willis H. II	

- Dearborn, Richard E.
Dearman, Kermit E.
Debit, Dion G. B.
DeHart, William
DeLamar, Dean O.
Delaney, William E.
DeMartini, Edward J.
Denman, Charles C., Jr.
Derby, Arthur E., Jr.
deSaulles, George A.
Devereaux, John R., Jr.
Dickman, Jerry A.
Dickson, William T.
Dierdorff, Loren M.
Diesel, Charles N.
DiGiacomo, Joseph G.
Dillard, Marvin B.
DiNola, Michael J.
Dixon, Edward R.
Dixon, Norval W., Jr.
Dixon, Osmund W., Jr.
Dodds, Robert M.
Doelling, Robert D.
Dolan, John G.
Dolan, William R.
Donahue, Paul F.
Donaldson, Robert J.
Donaldson, Robert S.
Donnelly, Robert G.
Donovan, Daniel D., Jr.
Dooley, Bobby J.
Douglas, Lee W.
Douglass, James G., Jr.
Dowds, Donald H.
Dowe, William J., Jr.
Doyle, Ingell H.
Dozier, Charles D.
Drago, Anthony J., Jr.
Drain, John F.
Draper, Frazier
Drew, Russell C.
Dubino, Andrew D.
Dudley, Paul L., Jr.
Duffy, Bernard A.
Duffy, Paul G.
Duhrkopf, Don J.
Duke, Bobby G.
Duke, Marshal D., Jr.
Dunaway, John A., Jr.
Dunbar, Vance O.
Dunkin, Ray L.
Dunn, Charles B.
Durbine, Peter
Dwyer, George M.
Eckhart, Franklin F.
Ecklund, Glenn L.
Eddy, Denver D.
Eddy, John A.
Edwards, Jerry J.
Elbert, Don C.
Elliott, Orville G.
Ellis, David E.
Ellis, Donald F.
Ellis, John H., Jr.
Elmore, John F., Jr.
Elster, James M.
Emmerling, Henry C., Jr.
Endlich, John
English, Edward V.
Evans, Boyce D.
Evans, Ralph M.
Evans, Robert C.
Everts, Ronald J.
Ezzell, Leon J.
Fagan, Donald F.
Fahlstedt, Barry R.
Falconer, Alastair S.
Farber, Karl H.
Fawcett, Craig R.
Fead, Louis M.
Feeney, Richard L.
Fehl, Frederick C., Jr.
Feller, Allan C.
Fellowes, Frederick G., Jr.
Fellows, Charles D.
Felt, Donald L.
Feltham, John C., Jr.
Ferguson, Albert E.
- Ferguson, William W.
Fergusson, Ernest W.
Fette, Estal J.
Field, Harford, Jr.
Fischbein, Ernest
Fischer, David H.
Fisher, John C.
Fitzgerald, Thomas W.
Fitzgerald, David
Fitzpatrick, Edward C.
Fleming, Raymond T., Jr.
Flood, Francis A., Jr.
Florance, John E., Jr.
Flynn, Francis P.
Flynn, Michael D.
Foley, Edmund F.
Foley, John E.
Font, Carlos G.
Fossum, Paul G.
Fox, Charles W., Jr.
Frank, Benjamin L.
Fraser, George K., Jr.
Fraser, Robert E.
Frederick, Donald R. A.
French, Fred H.
Frick, Joseph F.
Friedel, Gordon W.
Frier, John M., Jr.
Friesen, Floyd A.
Frost, John F. III
Fudge, David A.
Furey, Laurence T.
Furgerson, John A.
Furmanski, John A.
Gallagher, Hugh L.
Gallagher, Robert
Gallup, Shelley P.
Galvin, Bernard J.
Gandy, John D.
Gantt, Richard G.
Gardner, Harvey E.
Gardner, Louis J.
Garnett, Walter W.
Gehman, Robert S.
Gibbs, Charles E. J.
Gildea, Joseph A.
Gillette, Halbert G.
Gillmore, Arthur H.
Glaizer, Alvin S.
Godek, John
Godfrey, Forrest J.
Goldner, Robert R.
Goldsmith, Watson W.
Goodreau, Robert W.
Goodrich, John R.
Goodwin, William D.
Gordon, Bruce J.
Gordon, Ralph L.
Gordon, Richard F., Jr.
Gowing, Richard M.
Gradel, Robert
Graf, Frederic A., Jr.
Grahert, Walter H.
Graveson, George L., Jr.
Greeley, Michael T.
Green, Harry J.
Green, Thomas B.
Greer, Marvin S., Jr.
Greer, Wayne C.
Gregory, George B.
Griggs, Norman E.
Grinstead, William C., Jr.
Groenert, Frederick E.
Groff, Peter F.
Gross, Arthur J.
Gruber, Robert A.
Gunning, Patrick J.
Gurnsey, Ronald A.
Hackney, Benjamin F.
- Hackney, Thomas M.
Haggquist, Grant F., Jr.
Hahn, Frederick, Jr.
Halg, Robert B.
Haley, Robert J.
Hall, Donald F.
Hall, James N.
- Hall, John P.
Hall, Philip L.
Hall, William C.
Halsey, Charles H., Jr.
Halverson, Richard K.
Hamilton, Glenn D.
Hamm, Clement D., Jr.
Handford, Richard
Hanegan, Ralph E.
Hangartner, Lyle G.
Hansen, Rodney V.
Hanson, Albertlea
Harney, Russell F.
Harris, Frank B.
Harris, James W.
Harris, Richard A.
Harris, Robert K.
Harrison, Donald K.
Harvey, Charles O.
Harwood, John B.
Harwood, Lewis D.
Haskin, Robert E.
Hatch, Harold G.
Hatcher, Robert E., Jr.
Hatfield, William R.
Hawk, Arthur L.
Hayes, Albert M., Jr.
Hayes, Jerome B.
Hays, Estel W.
Head, William N.
Headland, Carl B.
Hebbard, LeRoy B., Jr.
Heise, Paul R.
Helgeson, Harry E., Jr.
Helmandollar, Allen W.
Helvey, Julius L. II
Hempel, Robert E. III
Henderson, Nathan S.
Hendrick, David R.
Henley, John R.
Henson, John M.
Herkner, Richard T.
Herring, "E" Belmont
Herriott, Donald M.
Higginbotham, Allen B.
Higgins, Hugh W.
Higgins, Thomas G.
Hill, Earl E., Jr.
Hill, James J.
Hill, John H.
Hill, Marshall E.
Hiller, Melvin L.
Hincks, Herbert A.
Hines, John C.
Hinman, Albert H.
Hobgood, Ray A.
Hoch, John E., Jr.
Hocking, James R.
Hodges, George P., Jr.
Hodges, James W., Jr.
Hodson, Theodore L., Jr.
Hoffman, Harley E.
Hoffman, Robert B.
Hogan, Walter V.
Holcomb, Gordon B.
Holcomb, "M" Staser
Hollan, James J.
Holland, Elbert R.
Holland, William A.
Hollen, Frederick M.
Hollenbeck, Gerald R.
Holley, Melvin M., Jr.
Holt, Ivey B., Jr.
Holt, John J.
Holt, Kenneth N.
Hoover, John S.
Hope, Edgar G., Jr.
Hopkins, David F.
Hopkins, Daniel J.
Horton, Robert L.
Hostettler, Stephen J.
House, Edward C.
Houston, Albert W.
Howard, Albert W., Jr.
Howell, Harry E.
Hoyt, Richard L.
- Hozey, Ira D., Jr.
Hubal, Augustine E., Jr.
Hubbell, Walter B.
Huber, John J., Jr.
Hudson, Roland W.
Huffman, Malcolm L.
Huffman, Sam H., Jr.
Hughes, Kenneth P.
Hukill, Henry D., Jr.
Hullryde, Donald
Humphreys, Felton M., Jr.
Hunzeker, Myron E.
Hurd, John B.
Hurley, Robert J.
Hurt, Thomas W.
Hussey, Clifton M.
Hutchinson, Kenneth F.
Inskeep, William F.
Irving, Leo H.
Jacobs, Edward J.
James, Joe M.
James, Joel L., Jr.
Jamison, Billy D.
Jaynes, Jack K.
Jefferis, Allen S.
Jenkins, Folsom
Jenkins, James R., Jr.
Johnson, Allen L.
Johnson, Arne C.
Johnson, Clarence A. E., Jr.
Johnson, Eldon D.
Johnson, Henry C., Jr.
Johnson, William R.
Johnston, John M.
Johnston, James I.
Jones, Alfred L., Jr.
Jones, Arthur L., Jr.
Jones, Donald S.
Jones, "T" Embury, Jr.
Jones, Thomas W., Jr.
Jordan, James S.
Joyce, Bernard K.
Judd, Roy L.
Kaai, Samuel W.
Kaiser, Dean E.
Kane, Paul E.
Karcher, Robert K.
Kassel, Robert H.
Kattmann, Roger H.
Kauderer, Bernard M.
Kaye, Michael C.
Keefe, Jerome M.
Keester, Louis J.
Kehoe, Thomas J., Jr.
Keimig, Allen D., Jr.
Kelley, Alfred G., Jr.
Kelley, Roy A.
Kendrick, William O.
Kennedy, William E.
Kern, Robert A.
Ketner, Harry T.
Kiddle, Bradley D.
Killian, Donald J.
King, John E., Jr.
Klee, Robert E.
Kloeping, Herbert E.
Knapp, William R.
Knight, Robert H.
Knipp, Walter J.
Kniss, Donovan E.
Knoerr, Don H.
Knotts, Philip L.
Koch, Donald F.
Koch, James R.
Koci, Vaclav H.
Koenig, Edgar F.
Kotick, Robert E.
Kowalski, Robert J.
Kratz, Marshall L.
Kretzschmann, Curt H.
Krochmal, Alfred F.
Kruse, Charles H., Jr.
Krusi, Peter H.
Kucyk, Peter M.
- Kuffel, Robert W.
Kunstmann, Clarence M.
Kurth, Donald A.
Kutzleb, Robert E.
LaBarre, Richard E.
Lafferty, Jerry D.
Lage, Robert L.
Laib, Ernest E., Jr.
Lake, Walter W.
LaLonde, William F.
Lammers, Francis E., Jr.
Langer, Donald A.
Lanier, Robert J.
Lanphear, Roy E.
Lardis, Christopher S.
Larrew, Marvin F.
Larsen, John H.
Larson, Howard J.
Lashbrook, Durwood E.
Latham, William B.
Laughlin, Gerald F., Jr.
Lawler, Frederick W.
Lawler, William A.
Lawrence, Donald S.
Leavitt, Horace M., Jr.
Ledbetter, Reid
Leenerts, Rolland E.
Leicht, Joseph, III
Lemmon, Virgil J.
Lenihan, Edward L., Jr.
Lent, Willis A., Jr.
Lepper, James R.
Levey, Sanford N.
Libby, Charles D.
Lichlyter, Stanford E.
Lina, Robert A.
Lindsay, Robert B.
Lipford, Charles E.
Litwin, William S.
Lloyd, Theodore L., Jr.
Locke, Barrie B.
Logan, Joseph B.
Lohr, Chester H.
Low, Frederick M.
Lowry, George C.
Lucas, Milton A.
Luthin, Richard B.
Lyman, John S., Jr.
Lynch, William A.
Lyon, Peter W.
MacGregor, John
MacIntyre, Donald
Mahony, Wilbur J.
Malone, Thomas L., Jr.
Manion, James H.
Margeson, Alan J.
Markham, Lewis M.
- Markley, Edward K.
Marsh, William C.
Marshall, Lawrence J.
Marshall, Richard M.
- Martin, Charles W., Jr.
Martin, Charles W., Jr.
Martin, Frank L., Jr.
Martin, Robert C.
Maser, Walter G.
Mason, Sidney F.
Mason, Wesley R.
Matais, George R.
Matheson, Eugene C.
Mathews, Bobby D.
Mathews, Donald W.
Matteson, Max R.
Matthews, William B., Jr.
Mattison, Ralph M.
Mauldin, Richard A.
Maue, Benjamin C.
Maxim, Rodney E.
Maxwell, Philip H.
May, Charles T., Jr.
Mayberry, Thomas A., Jr.
Mays, Clayton P.
McAllaster, Archie F.
- McCanna, Marvin G., Jr.
McCarty, Charles M.
McComb, Robert B.
McCormick, Daniel G.
McCoy, John F.
McCrane, Brian P.
McCullen, John G., Jr.
McCurdy, William E., Jr.
McDaniel, Johnny B.
McDonald, Clovis K.
McGovern, Joseph J.
McGreedy, Walter J., Jr.
McKee, Jack V.
McKenna, Patrick
McLaughlin, Bernard R.
McNaughton, James M.
McQuesten, John T., Jr.
McVay, Donald H., Jr.
Meacham, Arthur J.
Mead, George R.
Meador, William A.
Melson, Edward C., Jr.
Mercer, Donald M.
Meredith, Stuart T.
Merget, Andrew G.
Meyer, William C., Jr.
Mhoon, John E.
Middleton, Charles O. III
Milani, Louis F.
Milano, Vito R.
Millard, Grant A.
Miller, Curtis W., Jr.
Miller, Donald M.
Miller, Evan K.
Miller, Floyd H., Jr.
Miller, Grant W.
Miller, Joseph J., Jr.
Miller, William V., Jr.
Mills, James R.
Mills, Merle E.
Mirman, Joseph E.
Mitchell, Carroll K.
Mitchell, Howard C.
Mitchell, Jerry L.
Mittell, David P.
Mock, Roy L.
Monroe, William D. III
Moonan, Raymond L.
Mooney, John B., Jr.
Moore, Carlton H., Jr.
Moore, Clarence E.
Moore, Milton W., Jr.
Moore, Rufus J.
Moran, Thomas M.
Moreau, Arthur S., Jr.
Morelli, Frank P.
Morgan, James D.
Morgan, Joseph R.
Moriarty, Edwin S.
Morris, Robert D.
Morrison, John H., Jr.
Morse, Edward A.
Moss, Irvin R.
Moulton, Daniel B.
Mowery, Dale H.
Muench, Gerald W.
Muka, Joseph A., Jr.
Mullender, Thomas J., Jr.
Mumford, Charles E.
Murdoch, Alan G.
Murphy, Elbridge F., Jr.
Murphy, Gordon F.
Murtagh, Thomas J.
Musoraffiti, Francesco A.
Naylor, Frankie L.
Nelson, George E., Jr.
Nelson, Keith
Nelson, Teddy N.
Nesbitt, Harry J.
Nevarez, Antonio
Neville, Paul E.

- Nielsen, Donald E.
Nolan, Richard W.
Nomady, Verne G.
Norby, Merlin R.
Nord, James R.
Nordhill, Claude
North, Robert R.
Northrop, Robert E.
Nuss, Charles R.
Nutter, Andrew T. J.
Nystrom, Frederic L.
O'Connell, John D.
O'Keefe, James L., Jr.
O'Leary, John B., Jr.
Oliver, Perry S., Jr.
Olson, Harold L.
Olson, Conrad B.
Olson, John R.
Olson, John S.
O'Rourke, Daniel, Jr.
Osborne, Charles N.
O'Shea, John A., Jr.
Ostronic, Francis J.
Owens, Robert M.
Pacia, Erwin
Padgett, Harry E.
Palmeri, John J.
Paolucci, Donald C.
Pape, William J. II
Park, Carroll W.
Park, John B.
Parker, Thomas C., Jr.
Parkes, Joe
Parr, Donald R.
Paulk, John E.
Pearlman, Samuel S.
Peckworth, Dana
Pederson, Alton A.
Perot, Henry R.
Perrey, Philip L.
Perry, David L.
Perry, James W., Jr.
Perry, Lowell E.
Personnette, Alan J.
Pertel, Joseph A.
Pestcoe, Joseph
Peters, Edward R.
Peters, William J.
Petersen, Edwin J., Jr.
Petersen, Leroy E.
Peterson, George E., Jr.
Peterson, John W.
Petrie, Roland A.
Petry, William A.
Pettit, Thomas E.
Phelps, Robert L.
Phillips, Charles A.
Phillips, John T.
Phillips, Walter M., Jr.
Piazza, John R.
Pickett, Gordon D.
Pickett, Thomas R.
Place, Allan J.
Platt, Alvin W.
Platt, Ralph E.
Ploss, John H.
Poland, James B.
Pollum, Edgar W.
Poor, Robert A.
Pope, Daniel K. IV
Pope, James F.
Porter, David N.
Porter, Jerome K.
Porter, William H.
Porterfield, Robert E.
Potter, Arthur M., Jr.
Powell, Julian B.
Prell, Raymond B.
Prentice, Paul N.
Prentiss, Dickinson
Preston, John L.
Prewett, William T.
Price, Walter P.
Prickett, Bruce L.
Priddy, Clarence L., Jr.
Prieb, Charles R.
Profilet, Clarence J.
Pugh, Richard
Purdum, William H.
Purser, Fred O., Jr.
Purvis, Ronald S.
- Quirk, John T.
Quirk, William J.
Raffaele, Robert J.
Ramsey, Gayle
Ramsey, William E.
Randall, Howard F., Jr.
Randall, Howard W.
Ratcliff, Stephen D.
Rawlings, Lawrence J.
Reddick, Robert E., Jr.
Reed, Charles A.
Reeg, Frederick J.
Reffitt, Raymond E.
Reid, Jack M.
Reilly, William F.
Reith, George, Jr.
Reynolds, James H.
Rhodes, Randolph L.
Rice, Daniel W.
Rice, Harry E. III
Rich, Robert T.
Richards, Lloyd W.
Richardson, Harold M.
Rieken, Richard G.
Rigdon, Roland H.
Riley, Raymond T.
Rinne, Keith D.
Ritz, Merlin C.
Roach, Francis L.
Robbins, Noel
Roberson, George D.
Roberts, Lytle C. III
Robinson, William A.
Robson, Harry E.
Rodgers, James B.
Rodgers, James R.
Roe, Charles W.
Roepke, John R.
Rogers, Charles E., Jr.
Rogers, Ralph E.
Rogers, Warren F.
Roland, Gerald K.
Ross, William T., Jr.
Rubb, Milton R.
Ruch, Martin, Jr.
Ruddick, George R., Jr.
Rudolph, Francis A., Jr.
Rusch, John M.
Russell, Charles T.
Rutzler, Joseph A.
Ryan, James A., Jr.
Ryan, William A.
Sanders, Ben T.
Sanks, David R. III
Sargent, Richard E.
Sassano, John P.
Sawyer, Charlie H.
Schaaf, Thomas W.
Schaefer, Edward D., Jr.
Schaller, Robert A.
Schasteen, James C.
Schermerhorn, James R.
Schmidt, Herbert H.
Schmidt, Walter P.
Schmitz, Richard J.
Schulte, Jean H.
Schultz, Eugene D.
Schuster, Dale G.
Schweitzer, Robert J.
Scott, Edward T.
Scott, Kenneth M.
Scott, Norman H.
Sebring, Leland H.
Seeba, Herman A.
Seeger, Charles R.
Seitz, Richard L.
Selz, George O.
Seward, John K.
Seymour, Conrad L.
Seymour, Ernest R.
Shakespeare, Franklin B.
Shappell, John R.
Sharrah, Ronald L.
Shaw, John H.
Shay, Fred L.
Sheeley, Elmer E., Jr.
Sheets, Jean P.
Shilling, John D.
- Shirley, William B.
Shoopman, Bertram H., Jr.
Showalter, Louis R., Jr.
Shrewsbury, Lawrence H., II
Shropshire, Edwin D., Jr.
Shuck, Thomas L.
Shughrou, John J., Jr.
Sima, Frederick F., Jr.
Simmons, Arlis J.
Simmons, Clayton M.
Simmons, Reginald C.
Simpkins, George C.
Skelton, Stuart A.
Skerrett, Robert J.
Skillman, Charles F.
Skolnick, Alfred
Skomsky, Louis J.
Sladky, James A.
Slater, Donald L.
Slyfield, Frederick J.
Smiley, Charles B.
Smiley, Douglas I.
Smith, Alfred A.
Smith, Delvin W., Jr.
Smith, Donald B.
Smith, Frederick D., Jr.
Smith, George L.
Smith, James T.
Smith, Joseph C.
Smith, Morgan H.
Smith, Norman A.
Smith, Thomas J.
Smith, William L.
Smithberger, Thomas J.
Smutter, Clarence H.
Snee, John J.
Sneigrove, Edward R.
Snively, Abram B., III
Snouse, William H.
Snuffin, Jerry A.
Snyder, Aaron W. S.
Snyder, Herman L., Jr.
Snyder, Ned C.
Sokol, John
Solon, Thomas V.
Sonnenburg, Paul N.
Sonnicksen, Ronald G.
Southernland, Thomas C., Jr.
Spar, Edwin F.
Speelman, Thomas W.
Spencer, Roy S., Jr.
Spicer, Oscar F.
Spiegler, Felix R.
Spiller, Fraser W.
Spohr, Carl J., Jr.
Stafford, Frank R.
Stafford, Kenneth B.
Stallings, Clyde, Jr.
Starcher, Charles W., Jr.
Starnes, Billy G.
Stead, Kenneth A., Jr.
Steinke, Harris E.
Stevens, James P.
Stewart, David H.
Stillwell, Robert L., Jr.
Stoner, John W., Jr.
Storm, Richard E.
Strange, William M.
Strasheim, Don N.
Strawn, James H.
Stride, William F. A., Jr.
Strohecker, Franklin M.
Strong, Dean L.
Struven, Robert L.
Studebaker, Clayton A.
Stuntz, John R.
Sturgeon, William J.
Sullivan, William W.
Sutherland, Doyle L.
Sykes, Lewis B.
- Talbot, Frank R., Jr.
Talbot, James R., Jr.
Tall, Charles H. III
Tally, Billy F.
Tarlton, Joe E.
Tarpley, William A.
Tavis, Lee A.
Taylor, Edmund B., Jr.
Taylor, Reeves R.
Taylor, Thomas H.
Templeman, William E.
Terry, Daniel G. W.
Thies, Walter L.
Thole, Charles P.
Thomas, Clifford C., Jr.
Thomas, Don W.
Thomas, Earl G.
Thomas, Frederic J.
Thomas, George R.
Thomas, John C.
Thomas, John D.
Thompson, William M.
Throop, James R.
Thweatt, Freddie J.
Toadvine, Stephen P.
Toland, Hugh J. C., Jr.
Tolman, Milton H.
Tomlinson, Alva C.
Tortora, Anthony M.
Trammell, Webb D.
Traweck, Billy B.
Trawick, Charles V.
Treat, Richard A.
Trost, Carlisle A. H.
Truax, Evan C.
Trueblood, William E.
Tuttle, George S.
Tuttle, John R.
Umbarger, Robert C.
Upshaw, Donald E.
Vahlkamp, Eugene W.
Vail, Joseph L.
Van Allsburg, Donald E.
Van derGoore, Jacob L.
Vanhoof, Eugene R.
VanWestendorp, Steven
Varner, Duane L.
Vaughan, Edgar III
Velazquez - Suarez, Francisco A.
Vining, Albert D., Jr.
Visnich, Sam
Voelker, Donald C.
Vosseller, John H.
Voyer, Irving L., Jr.
Wachtel, Joseph J.
Wagner, David F.
Waldorf, Daniel M.
Walker, Charles S.
Walker, Harold E., Jr.
Walker, James B., Jr.
Walker, Peter R.
Walker, Wilmer E.
Wall, Joseph E.
Wall, Richard H.
Wallace, Thomas M.
Walling, Eugene K.
Waller, Michael P.
Walshe, Edward C., Jr.
Walters, Harold L., Jr.
Walters, Isaac J. III
Ward, Gene P.
Ward, Hugh W., Jr.
Ward, Robert B.
Warren, James W., Jr.
Warren, Thomas C.
Waters, George H.
Watson, Lawrence H., Jr.
Weaver, Jerold Q.
Weaver, John H.
Webb, James I.
Webster, James M.
Weddington, George L., Jr.
- Wehrman, Philip W.
Wellings, John F.
Wells, Don V.
Wells, Walter H., Jr.
Westmoreland, Ralph M.
Wetrich, Charles R.
Wheeler, James B.
Whitcomb, Richard A.
White, Charles E.
White, Donald C.
White, Frank L.
Whittier, James F.
Will, Otto W.
Willenbrink, James F.
Willever, Edward L.
Willhauck, Marion
Williams, David W.
Williams, James B.
Williams, Louis A., Jr.
Williams, Ralph T.
Williamson, James J.
Williamson, Harry H.
Willis, Jack R.
Wilner, Jack D.
Wilson, Glenn A.
Wilson, Harry A.
Wilson, Jack L.
Wilson, James A., Jr.
Wilson, James G.
Wilson, Richard V., Jr.
Wilson, Vaughn E., Jr.
Wilson, William F.
Winfield, Gordon T.
Winfree, Herman D., Jr.
Wisdom, Robert W.
Wise, Peyton R. II
Wise, Richard S.
Witcher, John R.
Withrow, John E., Jr.
Wittrock, Henry L.
Wolff, William F.
Wolke, Victor B. C.
Wong, Raymond W. C.
Wood, Edgar K., Jr.
Wood, John P.
Woodall, Franklin T., Jr.
- Woodberry, Earle B.
Woodburn, Craig E.
Woods, Robert C.
Workman, Harry E.
Worth, Edward R.
Wray, Walter D., Jr.
Wright, Charles H., Jr.
Wright, James D.
Wright, Kenneth L., Jr.
Wright, Richard T.
Wright, William F., Jr.
Wright, William W.
Yanaros, John O.
Yeager, Donald R.
Young, Alfred A. III
Young, David B., Jr.
Young, Joseph A.
Youngjohns, Richard P.
Youse, James A.
Zahn, Raymond C.
Zebrowski, Joseph P.
Zirps, Christos
Barrett, Patricia F.
Bradley, Nancy M.
Campbell, Jean L.
Carter, Joanne G.
Coleman, Rose E.
Dickey, Barbara J.
Dunham, Dixie L.
Matthes, Maureen D.
Erhart, Dorothy L.
Gilbert, Amarette H.
Hartington, Pauline M.
Higgins, Sarah P.
Hillyard, Effie J.
Kearney, Carolyn E.
Kunze, Genevieve D.
Lewis, Nancy A.
Lotspeich, Mary J.
Masback, Margery E.
Mogge, Marjorie H.
Radyx, Sylvia G.
Shapland, Georgia L.
Smith, Cecily J.
Swing, Eleanor S.
Vradenburg, Joanne P.
Watkins, Joann E.
Wilson, Lois J.
Young, Sue E.

SUPPLY CORPS

- Almen, Richard E.
Badger, George R.
Bailey, Donald P.
Boyer, Charles L.
Brain, George W.
Brainard, John W.
Bruyneel, Louis K.
Bryant, Robert K.
Canon, Roscoe H., Jr.
Christopher, Robert N.
Coleman, Ernest B.
Corn, James R.
Curtis, Richard E.
Dempster, Darrell D.
Donzell, Richard J.
Ebert, Scott W.
Fishback, Burney L.
Freese, Ralph F.
Frost, Shirley D.
Gilmore, Roger W.
Gippen, Franklin M.
Girod, Roy O.
Govan, David M.
Greenwood, Joseph L.
Gunther, Roy W.
Hemmett, George V.
Hodges, William J.
Hoffner, Carleton C., Jr.
Hohenstein, Charles R.
Jernigan, Joseph W.
Johnson, Richard L.
Jones, Glenn
Jones, Horace B., Jr.
Jordan, Alva F., Jr.
King, Braxton R.
Kispert, Lane A.
Kollios, Achilles E.
Kuhlmann, Dietrich H.
Larson, Nelson S.
Lathrop, Charles F.
Lemly, William D.
Lenderman, James L.
Lenz, Allen J.
Livermore, Robert E.
Malone, Joseph L., Jr.
Massie, Samuel P.
McCandless, Claude C., Jr.
McCrabb, Donald E.
McGee, James E.
McNeill, Neil E.
Mercier, Arthur G.
Merrill, Kenneth E.
Miller, Richard K.
Morehouse, Charles W.
O'Donnell, Terrence F.
Olson, Harvey T.
Osborn, Robert H.
Pardau, Orville J.
Paulsen, Raymond E.
Paulson, Raymond L.
Ranken, John T., Jr.
Rohleder, Richard P.
Rothenberger, Donald
Russell, Frederick R.
Salgado, Paul R.
Sankey, Harry W.
Sawyer, Preston, Jr.
Schlaufman, Louis C.
Schucker, Robert M.
Schwenz, Richard W.
Scolpino, Frank J., Jr.
Sullivan, Joseph P.

Temte, Knute P. Wong, Ronald M.
 Thalman, James E. Woodward, Ralph C.
 Thomas, Norman C. Woodworth, Edward T.
 Thweatt, John G., Jr. Woolley, Herbert T.
 Vanscoyoc, James S. Avary, James L.
 Wadsworth, Ben A., Jr. Collicott, Fernel L.
 Wald, Stanley B. Davidson, William I.
 Weber, Robert J. Faust, Delbert L.
 White, Frank L. Merrick, Walter F.
 Wilczynski, Jeremiah Taylor, Bayard A., Jr.
 Williams, Raymond L. Wood, Lee, Jr.
 Williams, Rex M.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Agee, Aaron B. Mitchell, Thomas J.
 Allen, Roy L. Morse, James W., Jr.
 Bigelow, David S. O'Leary, John F.
 Burns, William J., Jr. Ormond, Jay K.
 Chourre, Jack M. Reedy, Roger F.
 Coates, Edward E. Reeves, Ronald B.
 Cottingham, Edward L. Robinson, Charles F.
 Crowley, Irwin D., Jr. Shaw, Robert W., Jr.
 Dady, Ralph E. Smith, Matthias J.
 Falk, Harvey A., Jr. Stewart, Stanley P., Jr.
 Gaulden, Roy D., Jr. Stump, Edward J.
 Hartell, William K. Trunz, Joseph P., Jr.
 Haycraft, William R. Tyhurst, James E.
 Haynes, Howard H. Verdi, Stanley N.
 Hughes, Edmund C. White, Robert K.
 Huston, Robert J. Wiederecht, Donald A.
 Jones, Thomas K. Wilson, Dean G.
 Koblos, Michael C. Yoshihara, Takeshi
 Kreshin, Lawrence Blough, Loney L.
 Lapolla, Joseph Parrish, Oscar F., Jr.
 Lewis, Frank H., Jr. Pinch, William C.
 Merica, Charles A.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Adams, Chauncey C., Jr. Jordan, Ray D.
 Bailey, Jack S. Nymann, George A.
 Bauerschmidt, Alan D. Roach, Leon M.
 Cook, Paul E. Roller, Billie
 DeGrotte, Henry C., Jr. Rowell, Dalton A.
 Diaz, Gilbert A. Smith, Bill J.
 Dobbs, George I. Storms, Jack R.
 Feith, Joseph Turner, David H.
 Furrey, William R. Wagner, Carl M.
 George, Robert E. Wetzels, Orval B.
 Howard, Vaughn Wimerly, Clyde O.
 Jones, Daniel M. Livingston, Lois R.

NURSE CORPS

Mueller, Dona D.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Edward J. Thullen
 Theodore J. Toben, Jr.

The following-named (Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Robert B. Bittner
 Donald L. Macleay, Jr.

The following-named Marine Corps Reserve officers for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Albert G. Borlan Robert E. Lewis
 Walter R. Brown Willie L. Lowe, Jr.
 Pasquale L. Cacace Jack "L" Maxwell
 Willard I. Crumbach Melvin W. McCourry, Jr.
 John L. Driefer William I. Morgan, Jr.
 Robert D. Flint Harry L. Myers
 Joseph F. Golden Paul J. Pardy
 Jesse R. Greer Oswald V. Scott, Jr.
 Arthur R. Hickie Robert M. Sweeney
 Harold F. Jones Lester D. Widick, Jr.
 Robert P. Leslie

The following-named Marine Corps Reserve officers for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant in the Marine

Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Albert G. Borlan Robert E. Lewis
 Walter R. Brown Willie L. Lowe, Jr.
 Pasquale L. Cacace Jack "L" Maxwell
 Willard I. Crumbach Melvin W. McCourry, Jr.
 John L. Driefer William I. Morgan, Jr.
 Robert D. Flint Harry L. Myers
 Joseph F. Golden Paul J. Pardy
 Jesse R. Greer Oswald V. Scott, Jr.
 Arthur R. Hickie Robert M. Sweeney
 Harold F. Jones Lester D. Widick, Jr.
 Robert P. Leslie

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 6 (legislative day of June 4), 1956:

ADMINISTRATOR OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS

Charles J. Lowen, Jr., of Colorado, to be Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Frederick A. Seaton, of Nebraska, to be Secretary of the Interior.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 6, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
 The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who alone art acquainted with our many needs and knowest that we are not sufficient of ourselves to meet them, grant that in our walk and work during this day we may be guided by Thy infallible wisdom and guarded by Thy infinite power.

We beseech Thee to bless our President, our Speaker, and the Members of the Congress with Thy bountiful grace and prosper all the efforts that are being made to maintain our country's honor and security, health and strength.

May the hardships and adversities, which we are encountering in the great adventure of establishing peace on earth, never cause us to doubt Thy care or disturb our faith in Thee, but may we be strong and of good courage, assured that Thy divine providence will continue to protect and preserve us.

Hear us in Thy love and mercy through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 3638. An act 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.).

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 9720. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agen-

cies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HILL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. THYE, Mr. MUNDT, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. DWORSHAK, and Mr. POTTER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 10003. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill disagreed to by the House, and agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. STENNIS, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. BEALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1026. An act for the relief of Nihat Cengiz; and
 S. 1244. An act for the relief of Eva Gershebin Rubinstein.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6143) entitled "An act 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."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9390) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18 to the foregoing bill.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9720)